

DIDEROT'S SHADE; THE DISCUSSION ON 'UT PICTURA
POESIS' AND EXPRESSION IN FRENCH ART CRITICISM
1819-1840

Maria Anna Jonker

Ph.D. dissertation, University of Amsterdam, Faculty of
Arts, 1994

Chair: Evert van Uitert

I would like to thank Hans van Helsdingen, Evert van Uitert and Jan de Vries for their valuable remarks and support.

A word of thanks to Marcel de Jong, Bruno Braakhuis and Marion Laan is also in place here for their help with correcting and editing my manuscript.

Without the help of the Library of the University of Amsterdam and that of the library staff of this university's Department of Art History, writing this book would simply have been impossible.

Of the Parisian libraries, the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal and the Bibliothèque Historique de la Ville de Paris in particular have been enormously helpful.

My research was funded by the Stichting voor Kunsthistorisch Onderzoek, Netherlands' Organization for Scientific Research, NWO.

The photographs in this book are reproduced by courtesy of the Library of the University of Amsterdam.

I completed my manuscript in 1993. Several important publications in the field of French art and art criticism of the eighteenth and nineteenth century were published too late to be of any real use to me. I regret particularly that I have not been able to benefit from Richard Wrigley's work on French art criticism and the excellent bibliographies accompanying it.

CONTENTS

Introduction	4
Chapter 1, <i>UT PICTURA POESIS</i> AND EXPRESSION BEFORE THE 1830'S	21
Chapter 2, DAVID, LESSING AND THE SEARCH FOR MIDDLE GROUND	103
Chapter 3, UNITY AND MODERNISM	167
Chapter 4, THE EIGHTEEN-THIRTIES	236
Chapter 5, DELECLUZE; Art for the nation	260
Chapter 6, PLANCHE; a Classicist defending Shakespeare	323
Works cited	385
Illustrations	405

INTRODUCTION

In this book I will attempt to trace the history of one aspect of art criticism in France during the period 1819-1840, i.e. the debate on ut pictura poesis. French artists and art theorists in general had great faith in this theory, which set out to elevate painting to the level of poetry and tragedy. History painters depicted lofty actions in order to achieve the same seriousness and high intellectual level as the writers of tragedy and epic poetry. To compete with poets in their ability to depict human action and emotion they strove to achieve perfect drawing of the human form and practised peinture d'expression, the art of painting the outward signs of emotion. However, painters and theorists alike were aware that painting could never match poetry in its portrayal of complicated events and emotions. The nature of painting, they knew, was to reproduce the external appearance of things and when trying to tell a story the artist could only capture one moment. In this moment he had to achieve maximum eloquence.

During the first half of the nineteenth century the theory of ut pictura poesis still had many adherents among artists and critics. However, their struggle to maintain it became ever more difficult. Destructive currents had been at work since the last quarter of the

seventeenth century when Roger de Piles drew attention to the qualities unique to painting, i.e. colour and realism. Artists and art theorists of the eighteenth century had tried to harness these qualities for the elevated aims of history painting, as Thomas Puttfarcken (1) has pointed out in an admirable study on the theories of Roger de Piles and their influence on later generations.

Another eighteenth century development was that the balance between tragedy and painting seemed to be changing in favour of the latter. Playwrights were no longer content to limit themselves to verse, but began to experiment with mime and pantomime as bearers of expression and effect. The emphasis placed on conveying emotion through gesture and facial expression became so great that exaggeration seemed to invade art. In France the critic Denis Diderot argued for more naturalness in both painting and theatre but far more fundamental criticism came from Germany.

Winckelmann's writings on antique art revealed its beauty of form and simplicity of gesture to the European public. His compatriot Lessing also saw in these features the main qualities of antique art and mounted an attack on the value of ut pictura poesis which would have far-reaching consequences. He believed that art should turn the handicap of depicting only a single

moment to its advantage and should seek out not the most expressive moment but that containing the greatest beauty. Lessing's theory signalled the trend which would lead to the complete separation of art and literature, and ultimately of art and the depiction of reality.

Although the theories of Winckelmann and Lessing were very important for the development of art, Lessing's influence in particular was only felt in France after the turn of the century. French painters and critics made use of Winckelmann's theories to free art from the theatricality which had plagued it and to give it the naturalness and immediate impact on the viewer so obviously lacking in the works of the French history painters in the first half of the eighteenth century. The great history painter Jacques-Louis David was seen by many as the painter best able to put this directness, naturalness and elevation back into art.

In a study on Diderot's theories of painting and theatre, Michael Fried (2) has described the large debt which David owed to these theories. Fried believes the key concept of Diderot's theories to be that of "absorption", by which he means the way in which figures, both on stage and in paintings, should behave as if there were no viewer, so as to achieve complete naturalness. In a far less convincing article, (3) Fried has tried to demonstrate that French painters of the

late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were wholly preoccupied with the unavoidable theatricality of painting which depicted a momentary action. My main objection to this article is that it presents the question of theatricality, which was indeed important during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as a problem which occupied the painters of those times. In fact it was a concept used mainly by art critics holding widely differing views on the art of their day to denote equally disparate tendencies in art. Diderot used the word theatricality to describe the exaggerated Rococo art of his time whilst his opponents used it to describe the works of the painter Greuze, whom he greatly admired. It was ultimately to play an important part in the discussion on history painting's role as an expressive medium during the period under review in this book. This debate was maintained throughout the 1830's, most notably by the two leading critics, Planche and Delécluze.

The history of the ut pictura poesis theory, or the theory of the relationship between theatre and painting as it became in France during the course of the eighteenth century, was described by James Rubin (4) for the period from 1790 to 1810. During this period we see the gradual deterioration of the concept. Critics observed that many painters now saw it as a licence for

simply copying scenes which they had seen in the theatre and adopting actor's gestures in their works. The theatricality which Diderot had loathed in both painting and theatre seemed to return, at least in the works of minor painters. Whether the work of David himself, still the most important painter of the time, was free from theatricality was not easy to decide. His increasing interest in the beauty of Greek statues which led him to make the figures in his paintings pose like isolated actors on stage seemed to suggest so. The dramatic action demanded of history painting seemed to give way to this new tendency in his work.

Another threat to elevated history painting emerged during the period between 1790 and 1810, in the shape of growing interest in the realistic depiction of events from recent history. Such subjects had always been regarded as requiring too much realism to be fit for the elevated art of history painting. They should either be depicted in the form of allegory, or if shown realistically, classed as genre. David's pupil Gros gave a new lease of life to history painting through his ability to combine elevation and realism in his paintings of events from Napoleon's reign. At the same time, tragedy was also succumbing to an ever greater degree of realism.

During the period which will concern us in this

book, young painters were embracing the realism introduced by Gros, choosing subjects even less elevated than Napoleonic battles. Their strong humanitarian and political interests, and the wish to shock and be noticed, drove them to depict scenes of carnage and desperation which they had read about in the press. However, the suggestion that this trend signalled the end of the theory of ut pictura poesis must be refuted. The painters themselves and the few critics who dared support them saw their work as a protest against the lifeless reproduction of antique art, held up as the example for them to follow. This copying seemed to them to rob French art of the deep, even harrowing emotion which they wanted to express. They were highly interested in developments then taking place in the French theatre, led by their contemporaries who wanted to put back the authenticity and expressivity which they believed French seventeenth-century tragedy to lack. Like playwrights, the painters of the day believed that the unities of time, place and action, which had always been observed by poets and painters, hampered them in their search for these expressive qualities. In discarding the unities they gave a new meaning to the concept of ut pictura poesis. No longer tied to the portrayal of only one moment, art could finally compete with poetry in the depiction of complicated stories and

emotions.

Most critics took up a position on the middle ground between the desire for expression shown by the young painters of the 1820's and the portrayal of beautiful form which many now believed David's main achievement to have been. Even so, the two sides in this discussion of form versus expression could never be wholly reconciled. On the contrary, as the nineteenth century progressed they seemed to grow ever more opposed. On some points they agreed, both rejected the shocking and often trite realism of contemporary history paintings. Nor did they think that painting should solely serve the artist's self-expression, as Théophile Gautier and critics in his circle increasingly came to believe. They saw a return to the rigid application of the unities as the only solution for painting's degeneration. Action should again be centred around a protagonist, as most theorists on history painting had prescribed in the past, and gestures and facial expressions should be correctly drawn in order to be intelligible. The question remained whether dramatic action and expression, however elevated, could express the abstract values with which history painting claimed to be preoccupied or whether this purpose was better served by simpler images, like the statues of Ancient Greece, or the devotional images of later times. Critics

who still believed in history painting's ability to move and elevate its audience tended to criticise David and to advocate a return to the theories of Diderot and his contemporaries. While Pontus Grate's study (5) on Planche answers many questions about the art criticism of the Bourbon Restoration and the July Monarchy and the critic's position in the debates of the time, he barely touches on his adherence to eighteenth-century theory or his reasons for this.

Planche contested the views of two older and well-respected critics, Quatremère de Quincy and Delécluze, who championed a theory of expression in painting which was not mimetic but Platonic. They believed that the simplicity which Greek art and the religious painting of the Italian Renaissance had in common, served as a symbolic expression of an abstract religious idea. Not surprisingly, they defended Winckelmann and Lessing, and David when he emulated Greek art.

In her study on the concept of expression as it developed during the Restoration, Marguérite Iknayan (6) tackles the problem of mimetic interpretation giving way to a Platonic one. However, she does not examine this development in relation to the link between theatre and painting, which is vital to our understanding of the art and theory of this period. Nor does she discuss the conflict between advocates of the two different concepts

of expression during the July Monarchy, when their differences were starkly revealed.

I hope that my study will shed new light on the views of critics of the period from 1820 to 1840 about the validity of the ut pictura poesis theory, and on the related issue of expression in art. Since virtually none of the critics involved in the debate was able to step out of the shadow of David, which still loomed over French art long after his exile and his death in 1825, we will also gain a new insight into the critical appreciation of his works after he had ceased to dominate the French art scene in person. After David's death, his example was often used by art critics to support their views in debates which had in some cases not even begun when the painter was still alive. This tendency is particularly noticeable in the writings of Delécluze, whose interpretations of David's paintings and ideas are often considered very accurate because he was David's pupil and knew the painter very well. However, they were not written down until long after the master's death.

I believe that this study will provide an insight into the development and vulgarisation of the concept of juste milieu which emerged during the Restoration and July Monarchy, which has been lacking in recent studies on the subject. Albert Boime (7) tried to describe the

phenomenon of eclectic thinking and the related notion of juste milieu. Unfortunately he emphasises only the similarities in the thinking of artists and writers in the first half of the nineteenth century and neglects the debates which led them to take up opposing points of view. In Boime's opinion Delacroix and Planche held opinions comparable to those of Delavigne and Delaroche, the writer and artist who epitomised the juste milieu attitude. In truth Planche and Delacroix looked down on the work of these contemporaries and countered the attempts of Delaroche and Delavigne to reconcile tradition and modernity in art with their own work.

Michael Marrinan (8) is mainly interested in the development of juste milieu art during the July Monarchy. He believes its origins to lie in Louis-Philippe's attempts to use history painting for political propaganda. For this reason he attacks Boime's view that eclecticism and reconciliation are simply manifestations of the spirit of the age. Where Boime's scope is too broad, however, Marrinan's is too narrow. He neglects both paintings not created to serve the political purposes of the July Monarchy and the development of the juste milieu concept in art before 1830.

Francis Haskell (9) questions the use of terms derived from politics to label attitudes in artistic

disputes. Reservations may be justified in general but it must be said that the art critics who authored the concept of juste milieu art also played an important part in the development of the political juste milieu. This argues strongly that a combination of artistic and political aims underlay the development of the juste milieu.

Period of Study

It may seem unusual to limit the scope of a publication on French art criticism in the first half of the nineteenth century to the years from 1819 to 1840. We tend to base our periodization of the history of French art and art criticism on the succession of revolutions and regimes which marked French political history for the greater part of the nineteenth century (10). The year 1815 would therefore seem a logical starting point.

However, the first truly important event in art after Napoleon's downfall took place in 1819. This was the appearance at that year's Salon of Géricault's The Raft of the Medusa, and the bitter disputes which ensued. Equally, 1830 and 1848, both years of Revolution, would seem suitable milestones for bringing this book to a close. My decision to take instead the

year 1840 therefore needs further explanation.

As I was negotiating a path through the jungle of art critical writing in the newspapers and magazines which sprang up in France during and after the Restoration, I gradually came to discern differences in quality between the critics and periodicals and the art criticism of certain years. Perhaps unsurprisingly, unimportant Salons did not yield inspired art criticism. Around 1840, in the middle of Louis-Philippe's reign, several successive Salons were seen by the critics as so insignificant that they hardly felt the urge to take up their pens. At these times, art and art criticism both came to a standstill.

During my research I found no evidence of similar ebb tides around 1830 or 1848. In the years before 1830 the struggle for political and artistic freedom led to the appearance of extremely important works of art and literature, and manifestoes and critical essays of great detail and quality. After the Revolution, critics and artists alike were disenchanted about the form which the liberties they had fought for had taken during Louis-Philippe's reign. However, the most perceptive of them still illustrated their concerns through important works of art and critical essays, some building on the achievements of the 1820's and some violently reacting to them. We must therefore conclude that the years of

great political change are indeed of similar importance for our understanding of developments in the cultural life of France.

Around 1840 even Planche and Delécluze, the sharpest of critics, produced hackneyed and uninspired essays and no longer felt the need to dwell on questions which went beyond the particular work of art in question. Only a whole new generation of writers, artists and critics (Baudelaire, Courbet, Champfleury, Mantz and Thoré among them), defending new ideas, combined with renewed Revolutionary stirrings could produce a minor Renaissance in the 1840's. The first signs of new preoccupations emerging during the first ten years of the July Monarchy will be discussed in the chapter on the 1830's.

The year 1830 appears to have been a turning point for the development of French culture in the two decades after 1820. Many of these developments lost force around 1840, while new ideas only gradually replaced them over the next ten years.

The critics whose work will occupy us in the final two chapters of this book, Planche and Delécluze, were active until well after 1840. Whilst apparently clinging to outdated principles, they were still occasionally capable of contributions to art criticism which showed a rare insight. Even so, their great days were over.

Planche's reputation was based on his critical writings from the period 1830-1840, and his conflict with Delécluze on the value of mimetic versus Platonic expression was also fought out during those years. Although Delécluze's most important contribution to art criticism, his book Louis David: Son école et son temps, first appeared in 1855, it was written during the 1830's and clearly illustrates Delécluze's point of view in the debates of that period.

Sources

The art historian conducting research on the years around 1830 is faced with an abundance of source material. During this period, a new middle-class reading public emerged. In addition to the established newspapers, often aimed at a small readership and representing a political party, new newspapers catered to the needs of the general public. Newspapers like La Presse and Le National, both founded during the 1830's, tried to keep hold of and enlarge their readership by publishing excerpts from exciting novels by well-known writers and employing the same authors as art and literary critics. Gautier was La Presse's feuilleton writer during the greater part of his career and Jules Janin was primarily famous for his feuilleton pieces in

Le Journal des débats.

The space for this and more general comment was created by issuing newspapers daily, instead of two or three times a week as had still been common during the Restoration period, by increasing the number of pages and the size of the paper used.

The public's apparent appetite for information on cultural developments was also satisfied by fortnightly cultural magazines. Of these, L'Artiste and La Revue des deux mondes were the most important, both offering their readers essays of extremely high quality.

The type of article which is of most interest to the art historian is of course the Salon review. After the 1820's, a decade in which only three Salons were organised, the Salon became an annual event, causing an enormous increase in the number of reviews appearing in newspapers and magazines. However, the discussion was mainly conducted by the famous feuilleton-writers of the important newspapers and magazines, like Delécluze in Le Journal des débats, Planche in La Revue des deux mondes, Gautier in La Presse, and Pillet in Le Moniteur universel. Sometimes, particularly during the 1820's and early 1830's, a talented newcomer would write a remarkable Salon review (of these I would mention Thiers, Stendhal, Rabbe, Arnold Scheffer) but none of them went on to careers in art criticism.

The more important a Salon was, the more art critics would join the debate surrounding it. Apart from rigidly defending their own positions, the leading feuilleton-writers would viciously attack their rivals and newcomers to the debate, ridiculing their arguments. The Salon of 1824 stands out as an absolute highlight in this respect, provoking judgements which were to have a lasting impact. Many of the arguments used in the debates of the 1820's and 1830's were in fact conceived by critics to denigrate their rivals in short-lived debates, and became standard arguments only later, often in watered-down form. Moreover, critics now held in great esteem by art historians sometimes won very little publicity for articles which are now famous. A case in point is that of Baudelaire, whose Salons of 1845 and 1846 went almost completely unnoticed. Baudelaire does not concern us here, because he was a newcomer to the artistic debates of the later years of the July Monarchy. However, like the views of many other critics, his judgements come to us taken out of their original context. We have forgotten that many of their arguments were not developed for their own sake or for later generations, but were ammunition in a war between the critics. I hope to give readers of this book a flavour of these debates, although they are only featured in a very condensed form.

NOTES

1). Th. Puttfarcken, Roger de Piles' Theory of Art (New Haven, 1985).

2). M. Fried, Absorption and Theatricality: Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot (Berkeley, 1980).

3. M. Fried, "Thomas Couture and the Theatricalization of Action in 19th-Century French Painting," Artforum 8(1970) 10: 36-45.

4. J.H. Rubin, Ut Pictura Theatrum, Painting as Theatre: An Approach to Painting in France from 1791 to 1810, Thesis, Harvard U, 1972.

5. P. Grate, Deux critiques d'art de l'époque Romantique: Gustave Planche et Théophile Thoré (Stockholm, 1959).

6. M. Iknayan, The Concave Mirror: From Imitation to Expression in French Esthetic Theory 1800-1830 (Saratoga, 1983).

7. A. Boime, Thomas Couture and the Eclectic Vision (New Haven, 1980).

8. M. Marrinan, Painting Politics for Louis-Philippe: Art and Ideology in Orléanist France 1830-1848 (New Haven, 1988).

9. F. Haskell, "Art and the Language of Politics," 1974, Past and Present in Art and Taste (New Haven, 1987) 65-74.

10. A notable example of using political history as a guide in the periodization of nineteenth-century art history is the handbook by R. Rosenblum and H.W. Janson, Art of the Nineteenth Century: Painting and Sculpture (London, 1984).

CHAPTER 1 *UT PICTURA POESIS* AND EXPRESSION BEFORE THE
1830's

The Rise of History Painting in Seventeenth-Century
France

In 1648, French artists and theorists united to form the Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture. Membership of this prestigious academy finally freed artists from the indignity of being classed as mere craftsmen and gave them the official status of "liberal artists", whose work was associated with that of writers and orators. French classical thinking of this period tended to stress the intellectual side of painting and to promote history painting as the genre through which the intellectual needs of both viewer and painter were best served. The genre itself had evolved in Italy, where humanistic thinking demanded painting which addressed the great actions of mankind, the storia.(1)

Painters of this genre depicted mythological tales and classical and Biblical scenes, which were thought to inspire the viewer to ponder interests and duties far above the personal. History painting had this high aim in common with the most elevated literary genres, tragedy and the epic poem. Hence the Academy supported

the ut pictura poesis theory, understanding it to mean that painting was poetry without speech and poetry speaking painting. Although this interpretation of Horatius' words was in fact completely wrong(2), ut pictura poesis remained the most important theoretical concept for history painters until well into the nineteenth century, when the genre itself began to decline in importance.

In France, the patrons of history painting were the king, the nobility, the church and rich members of the bourgeoisie. As such, gifted history painters knew they were charged with responsibility for the spiritual well-being of the best of their fellow-men and were much more than tradesmen. The view that history painting should earn the artist a decent income but no more and that only painters of the lesser genres, like landscape and genre, gathered riches, seemed to gain currency over the years. In the nineteenth century it was succeeded by the idea that for a painter of true genius his calling was of greater importance than worldly gain, so that the most pure genius would remain misunderstood and poverty-stricken.

The fact that bright colouring and interest in the lesser genres seemed characteristic of the arts of the trading nations Venice, Flanders and Holland added to the belief that intellectual art and the pursuit of

wealth through painting were hardly reconcilable. However, at least during the nineteenth century, painters like David, Delacroix and Delaroche earned fortunes with their work, and it would therefore seem that the image of the poor bohemian genius often bore little relation to reality.(3)

From Line to Colour

The fact that history painting was an intellectual and poetic art form did not mean that the history painter was not expected to master the technical aspects of his art. The history painter was required to be an outstanding draughtsman and colourist, but his technique was supposed to remain implicit as it was merely a tool to serve his art. Of the two skills drawing was the more important because it enabled history painters to render perfectly the outlines of human figures, their attitudes, movements, facial expressions and gestures. This mattered greatly since tragic poets and history painters alike observed Aristotle's rule from the Poetics that tragedy should portray human beings in action.(4) Of the great draughtsmen of the past, Raphael was the one most admired by the Academy. He had no equal in his skill in outlining the human form and his knowledge of facial expression.

Colour was required to be subdued and in harmony with the mood of the subject. Poussin, who was considered to be the greatest history painter of his age, was seen as a master of such use of colour. He was thought to have subscribed to the antique theory of the modi, which prescribed that all aspects of a work of art should be in harmony with each other and with the subject.(5) The theory of the modi was also linked to the concept of decorum. This was more immediately concerned with the persons and places shown in history painting. The way in which they were depicted should not run counter to the viewer's sense of historical correctness. Characters should be depicted in poses which were both dignified and appropriate to their rank, age and role in the story.(6) The need for the subjects of history painting to appear dignified often led to a knee-jerk rejection of modern dress as unsuitable for the genre. This attitude is discernable in the writings of many of the critics whose works I shall discuss in this book.

In their famous Querelle des anciens et des modernes, the Rubénistes attacked the lack of concern for artists' technique shown by the Poussinistes. In his Parallèle des anciens et des modernes (1688-1697), Charles Perrault tried to demonstrate that progress was as possible in art as in science and technology. He

divided the development of art into three stages, classical antiquity, the Renaissance and the time of Louis XIV, in which art had been perfected still further. The artists of classical antiquity had only achieved perfect imitation through line and colour, whilst those of the Renaissance had also learned the expression of emotions. Perrault's own time saw the development of perspective, chiaroscuro and beautiful composition. Although he was not interested in illusionism as such, Perrault was enthusiastic about the technical prowess which artists had achieved in recent years, whereas the Poussinistes barely considered it worthy of discussion. Elements of Perrault's theory recur in the period discussed in this book. Supporters and enemies of the growing realism of early 19th century art both used Perrault's view of the development of art in classical and modern times.

During the last quarter of the seventeenth century, Roger de Piles challenged the predominant role of line and literature in classicist art theory.(7) He believed that, in painting, "colour" was more important than "line" because colour could help the painter to draw the viewer's attention to his work. According to De Piles, people would walk past works of art exhibited in a public building quickly, their minds occupied with their own affairs, unwilling to spare time to look at a canvas

in detail. Paintings should therefore forcibly seize the viewer's attention with technically brilliant, beautiful and harmonious colour and by providing a perfect imitation of reality.(8) De Piles' thinking may have inspired works of art which were not merely of interest to an intellectual elite but appealed to a far wider public. He praised Rubens as a masterful colourist and tried to lend weight to his argument by pointing out that the painters of antiquity were admired mainly for their realism. The most famous example was of course Zeuxis' picture of grapes, which at first sight were indistinguishable from real fruit. In De Piles' opinion the viewer's first impression was the most important moment in the process of accepting and understanding a work of art, because the attractive effet of a finished painting's harmonious colours and chiaroscuro would retain the spontaneity of the painter's original idea. He introduced a vision of what constitutes a painter's genius and originality to French art theory which had previously been absent. He believed he had found it partly in the skill of the hand, whilst the Poussinistes located creative genius in the intellectual aspects of painting.

Painting and Theatre

The most important poetic genre in seventeenth-century France was the classical tragedy in alexandrines developed by Corneille and Racine and based on Greek tragedy. It was often referred to as poésie dramatique. Since history painters imitated tragic poets in their depiction of human beings in action, the rules for the composition of history paintings were borrowed from the rules for the composition of tragedy. These were in turn based on the rules set out in Aristotle's Poetics and developed further by seventeenth-century French writers and theorists.

As classical tragedy was considered an elevated art form, the audience had to be kept in a serious mood during the whole of a performance. The strict rules for the composition of tragedies served to ensure decorum in this respect.(9)

The two most important problems which the tragic poet faced were that he should neither overburden the intellect of his public nor offend its sense of decency. To ensure that the public would grasp the writer's intentions the tragedy should form a perfect unity, which could not give rise to misinterpretation, ridicule or controversy. If it did, the writer must be at fault.

The most serious threat to the unity of tragedy was

the introduction of elements from the lesser theatrical genres, comedy and farce. Like the lesser genres in painting they were realistic, sometimes to the point of becoming obscene. Neither should the audience's sense of time and place be disturbed. It was thought that the credibility of the events unfolding on stage would be diminished if the story was long or moved between several places. For this reason, the whole action should take place in one location, and the time taken by the performance should be similar to the imaginary duration of the events portrayed. It was generally accepted that a play should describe a period no longer than twenty-four hours. If these two rules were obeyed the tragedy would possess unity of place and unity of time.

These two unities were subservient to the most important unity of all, unity of action. This rule dictated that a tragedy should be dominated by one main event or protagonist and that secondary intrigues or episodes were permissible only where they served to increase the audience's understanding of the primary action or the main character's plight. The introduction of too many persons and events, like the use of several locations or a disproportionately long period of time, would inhibit the public's understanding of the play.

The author of a tragedy should strive for authenticity in his depiction of historical events,

characters and dress, only when they did not clash with viewers' moeurs, and could be understood by them. A tragedy should show mankind idealised, standing far above the machinations of ordinary life and should have universal appeal.

The rules mentioned above had obvious consequences for the way in which tragedies were performed. They were played out on sets which did not remind the public of a particular time or place. There were no changes of sets between the acts, and the same sets could be used for all the tragedies in a company's repertoire. The actors wore costumes based on contemporary court dress and on stage they observed court etiquette. Since realism, visual or textual, was not considered desirable in tragedy performances they were usually very static. The actors spoke their lines as orators would, facing the public, they used only facial expression and gesture to support the text and barely communicated with each other.

History painters could not literally copy the rules for tragedy. For one thing they were dependent on the public's understanding of facial expressions and gestures to make their meaning clear. Moreover, a writer of tragedies could depict a sequence of events whilst the history painter could portray only one moment. For this reason he had to choose the most significant moment

of a story and depict it in such a way that the viewer could understand what had caused this situation to come about and what would follow. Over the years, opinions on how this should be achieved changed. During the seventeenth century, when the French Academy's philosophy on painting was in its formative years, painters were still allowed some freedom. For example, it was sometimes thought that the painter should be allowed to stretch time slightly in his work, by depicting events which closely followed each other and were causally linked, as Poussin had done in The Gathering of the Manna (1637-'38; ill. 1). This painting shows the despair of the Israelites in the desert transforming to joy as the manna falls from heaven, in a sequence which can almost be "read" since it stretches across the canvas from left to right. It was felt that Poussin had managed to depict the péripétie, the critical point in the action which also formed the nucleus of the tragedy's plot.(10) During the eighteenth and nineteenth century the Academy's thinking was dominated by the opinion that the painter should use all the tools at his disposal to render a telling portrayal of the one all-important moment.

Since this book will be mainly concerned with the art theory of the eighteenth century and later, I will leave seventeenth-century writing aside when discussing

the way in which art theorists interpreted the concept of ut pictura poesis. However, it must be said that Perrault and De Piles inspired eighteenth century theorists as well as the earlier theorising of Poussinistes like Félibien. It was argued that since a painting should possess unity of action, it was wise to limit the number of persons, particularly in large paintings, so that the composition would be simple and easy to understand. The painter could make clear who the protagonist was, his role in the story depicted and his relationship to the other persons in the painting, by means of grouping, perspective, colour, light and shade, the use of peinture d'expression and gestures.(11) The painting's vitality was thought to be enhanced by adding a few but not too many details to contrast with the main action and at the same time to comment on it. These details were equivalent to the episodes of a tragedy. It was considered that the attitudes and gestures of the persons depicted should be elevated, with Greek statuary the perfect example. While opposition to the rules set by the Academy grew, this mighty institution applied them with ever increasing severity until, during the period under review in this book, there remained nothing more than a series of strict and banal prescriptions which often hampered painters in their work instead of helping them.

In the importance they assigned to the role of lighting and shadow in creating unity in a painting, eighteenth century theorists showed the debt they owed to De Piles. His once controversial ideas had become part of accepted theory, though not without alteration. De Piles had believed that the appeal of colour, light and shadow was immediate but largely independent of the painting's intellectual meaning, while the Poussinistes had contended that the painter's first and foremost concern was to make the painting's composition serve the intellectual impact of his work.(12)

Abbé Dubos, one of the great theorists of the eighteenth century to write about ut pictura poesis echoed De Piles' plea for realism in painting, since he was convinced that painting was superior to poetry in the depiction of reality. However, he suggested that De Piles' principle of composition pittoresque was less important than a painting's composition poétique, the intellectual content of painting as celebrated by the Poussinistes.(13) The advantage of painting over poetry, he believed, lay in the directness with which it could show objects, scenes from nature and simple actions and emotions. He believed that poetry remained the better of the two art forms for depicting more complicated actions and emotions. Dubos' ideas seemed to accord perfectly with Aristotle's instruction that art should depict an

action. He had great faith in the ability of peinture d'expression, gesture and grouping to make a painting's meaning understood. He believed the language of images to be natural and direct and that of words artificial and indirect.(14)

The theorist and painter Antoine Coypel (1661-1722) also believed in the value of the expressive gesture but he assumed that in order to overcome paintings' limitations, the gestures depicted by painters should be borrowed from the emphatic, artificial gestures used by actors on stage. In the same way, he and his son Charles-Antoine, director of the Academy from 1747 to 1752, believed that De Piles' effet might serve not just to attract the viewer to a painting but also to allow him to grasp its meaning immediately. They were deeply interested in the dramatic and purely artificial possibilities of chiaroscuro, which enabled the painter to mass his background figures and retain a degree of sketchiness depending on their relative importance in the painting.(15)

Dubos and the Coypels had been influenced by Locke's sensualist (or sensationalist) philosophy. From it they derived the notion that only that which could be experienced by the senses could be emotionally experienced and intellectually understood. For eighteenth-century French theorists feeling acquired the

greatest importance. Dubos prescribed that a history painter should try to move his public deeply. His painting should form a bridge between his own soul and that of the viewer.(16) This explains why peinture d'expression, even in the exaggerated form advocated by the Coypels, and the dramatic use of painting's technical aspects, played such an important role in eighteenth-century art theory. They were the painter's way of reaching the viewer's feeling and intellect via his sense of sight, which was believed to be linked directly to emotion. Like Dubos and De Piles, the Coypels admired every painter from Raphael to Rubens. By combining a great interest in the intellectual side of painting with an equal interest in painting technique they managed to give the theory of ut pictura poesis a new lease of life.

The sensualist philosophy also brought about a new preoccupation with the self and the peculiarities of personal taste and genius. Eighteenth-century art was not only art of feeling but, particularly in the growing appreciation of the lesser genres, art for the connoisseur. Appreciation of the painter's hand and the peculiarities of genius was already present in De Piles' theories. During the eighteenth century the lesser genres flourished in France and the landscape, still-life and genre painting of other countries became widely

admired.

Appreciation of less lofty art forms than history painting would never disappear in France, although it remained the Academy's official policy to reserve the highest place in the hierarchy of genres for history painting.

In conclusion, we have seen that the history painter played on the public's feelings through the choice of an elevated subject, the dramatic impact of well-manipulated peinture d'expression and through grouping, lighting and shading.

The eighteenth century saw the institution of the Salons, the exhibitions organised by the Academy at which its members could present new works. During the Revolution the state took over the organization of the Salons and opened them to every French artist. They enabled artists to introduce themselves and their work to prospective buyers and patrons. A class of gallery visitor came into being which was not influenced by the Academy's attitudes and was therefore able to judge works of art independently. Artists could now perhaps really feel that their work formed a bridge between their own soul and that of an amateur of sensitivity and discerning judgement. From an intellectual pastime for the rich, history painting was slowly becoming an art form which appealed to a much wider public. Although

some of the new exhibition-goers would never be able to afford to buy a painting, the Salons gave this public a chance to form an independent opinion on the art of their time.(17)

Regeneration of History Painting During the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century

During the years from 1740 to 1750, there began a reaction to the interest in the lesser genres and colour which had begun with the Rubénistes. Lenormant de Tournehem, who took up the post of "General Director of Buildings and Monuments" in 1745, tried to re-establish the elevation and seriousness of the history painting of Poussin's time. As was to be expected, Poussin himself again became the example for young painters to follow instead of Rubens. In fact only a few of Poussin's paintings, notably The Testament of Eudamidas (ill. 2) and The Death of Germanicus, were singled out for praise. History painting was now no longer only within the reach of a few people who had money and leisure time and could appreciate intellectually demanding art. The Salons had democratized art and those who wanted history painting to lead the way for all painting again saw it as not just an elevated, but also a moralistic, didactic art form whose purpose was to teach the people of the

French nation their duty as citizens. The exemplum virtutis which Poussin's paintings communicated to their elite audience now had to be understood by the masses.(18) Dubos' and Coypel's message about the direct visual appeal of peinture d'expression was well understood, and Dubos' tribute to Poussin for the masterful way in which he had applied his knowledge of peinture d'expression, gesture and grouping to make the public grasp the meaning of The Death of Germanicus inspired many eighteenth-century painters, critics and theorists. Perhaps it is even true, as Michael Fried has suggested, that the subjects of many eighteenth-century history paintings were chosen more for their dramatic potential than for their moral elevation.(19)

Poussin depicted the moment when the poisoned Germanicus dies surrounded by his family and friends, and appeals to them to avenge his death. Seventeenth-century viewers were perhaps most impressed by Germanicus' stoicism in the face of death, whilst those of the eighteenth century may have been equally touched by Germanicus' display of love and care for his family. The public mood of the eighteenth century was very much aware of the complications, unjustness and depravity of modern society. Stressing the need for regeneration, 18th century thinking held that harmony in the basic relationships between people was as important as the

stoical, unselfish attitude towards one's personal fate and one's duties which had been characteristic of the seventeenth-century aristocratic sense of duty. After 1700, when the role of the bourgeoisie became ever more important in French society, the role of history painting changed. It now needed to demonstrate the simple virtues of human beings who still lived in close contact with nature to people with little leisure time, almost entirely preoccupied with their own interests, the bewildered victims of a dangerous society, torn between duty and personal need. The simplicity of the Ancient Greeks, the Romans of the Republic and the Kingdom, great heroes from national history and the farmers of their own time taught city dwellers forced to live unwholesome, dangerous and egotistical lives, that an alternative did exist to their society which corrupted aristocracy and commoners alike. This belief in the need for regeneration of society did not at first necessarily have Revolutionary implications, as is perfectly clear in Physiocratic thinking, for example. (20)

Not surprisingly, this idealistic search for a better way of life which had not lost touch with nature, brought about a renewed interest in the art of classical Greece, which demonstrated the perfection and strength which the human body could only possess in this more

primitive and noble society. Interest in the study of classical art, which had always been thought to be of great importance for history painters, increased still further. After all, the beautiful stances, simple, noble gestures and muted facial expressions of classical statuary seemed to many to be preferable to the theatricality of gesture favoured by the Coypels. Admiration for Poussin's simplicity and elevation and Dubos' emphasis on the naturalness of facial expression and gestures of the hands inevitably meant a rejection of the exaggerated, theatrical gestures which the Coypels expected of history painting. An independent art public had grown up since the establishment of the Salons. The next stage was the rise of independent art criticism. Denis Diderot was one of the first independent writers on art in France and one of the finest. He spearheaded a movement to free history painting from the influence of the unnatural gesturing of actors which he believed had dominated the genre during the first fifty years of his century.

Diderot

Diderot was not only a champion of simplicity and elevation in history painting, he was also one of the first critics to try to demolish the barriers which the

Academy had put up between it and the lesser genres. He was involved in the theatre both as a playwright and a theorist as well as being an art critic. His art criticism was therefore influenced by the desire for the regeneration and democratisation of the theatre as much as by the need for natural expression and renewal in history painting.

The intellectual circle around Diderot and d'Alembert's Encyclopédie brought forth the idea that the eighteenth-century theatre-going public should have a theatrical genre of its own, the drame bourgeois. The drame bourgeois was specifically concerned to depict situations from the lives of contemporary people caught between their needs as individuals and the pressures placed upon them by society. Diderot himself was the most important propagandist of the genre, writing several dramas. The plot of Le père de famille (1758) may provide an impression of the themes chosen by writers of dramas bourgeois. Albin, a rich young man, wishes to marry the poor Sophie, but his father forbids him to do so. Although his action is prompted by a deep concern for his son's well-being, the father can see no further than his son's material interests. Eventually, however, love wins the day, as the father recognises his son's maturity and right to independence. The simple, natural bond of love manages to overcome modern socie-

ty's lust for gain.

Diderot set out a theory for the new genre in the Discours sur la poésie dramatique (1758). In this essay he described the way in which the drame bourgeois could realistically portray contemporary life.

He directed that the characters in a drame bourgeois should speak ordinary, contemporary language, instead of the elevated alexandrines of classical tragedy. Their intonation and behaviour should be natural and they should wear contemporary costume. The relationship between the audience and the events taking place on stage was to be completely different from that in classical tragedy. Instead of addressing the audience directly, and so eliminating the distance between it and the stage, the actors should behave as if unaware of the public's presence, giving the viewers the impression that they were unexpected and unnoticed spectators of events taking place in reality.(21) Diderot believed that only in this way could the viewers feel sympathy for the individuals on stage, and only after experiencing the action at the level of emotion would they be able to master it intellectually. Like Dubos, Diderot considered the sympathetic reaction to a work of art to be more direct and intense than the intellectual response. The new drame bourgeois was a moving genre rather than an intellectually demanding one.

Diderot believed that the intellect responded to writing and speech and that feelings were reached mainly through visual impression and music. Actors who played in Diderot's dramas therefore had to study facial expression and mime until they could express every feeling without the use of speech. Diderot admired the English actor David Garrick who, during a tour of France displayed such a fine talent for mime and pantomime, that his audiences, half of whom did not speak any English, were deeply moved by his performances and understood the play perfectly. The ultimate test for an actress's mastery of mime was the scene from Macbeth in which the sleepwalking Lady Macbeth tries to clean from her hands the blood of the king, whom she and her husband have murdered.

This was indeed a far cry from the rigid gesture of the seventeenth-century orators and actors, who only used a limited set of facial expressions and movements of the hands to complement their speeches. Drame bourgeois attached no greater importance to speech as a means of communication than to looks, involuntary gestures, silences during the conversation, or the grouping of the actors on stage. The possibilities of mime and pantomime, already suggested by Dubos, would be further developed later in the century, particularly in Noverre's long narrative ballets, (ballets d'action).

Diderot's theories implied a relationship between reality, the theatre and painting which was completely different from that of seventeenth-century classical thinking, which tended to allow reality to encroach only insofar as it did not detract from the grandeur of history painting and tragedy. Since Diderot was no enemy of realism he tended to allow the lesser genres a more prominent place than they were accorded in the Academy's hierarchy of genres. He thought that actors could learn natural expression by studying the behaviour of people they saw in the street as well as certain works of art, particularly Dutch seventeenth-century genre painting which he believed showed perfectly realistic facial expression, gesture and grouping. In Diderot's version of the ut pictura poesis theory, painting seems to have become the example for theatre, whereas in the seventeenth century, painting had derived its importance from its relation to tragedy.

Diderot praised the works of the genre painter Greuze, which first appeared at the Salons held during the 1750's. In these paintings he saw the perfect counterparts of his dramas. Greuze's paintings usually showed scenes from the lives of ordinary eighteenth-century people, while also possessing some characteristics of history painting. Greuze, depicting people as they looked in his own time, made mankind seem

as dignified as it had looked in the works of Poussin. Stances and gestures were often based on Greek statuary and on figures in history paintings from the past, (22) but dress and scenery were rendered completely realistically. Diderot called Greuze's work peinture morale because, like an exemplum virtutis, it taught virtuous behaviour.(23) He did not doubt the painter's moral superiority. Thus, Greuze's paintings were very important in winning acceptance for a far greater degree of realism in history painting than the genre had ever known.

Diderot's efforts to achieve realism in the arts and the similarity which he discerned between his dramas and paintings, Greuze's genre paintings in particular, forced him to reconsider the rules of unity of action, time and place. As we have seen, the audience watching one of his plays was meant to receive the impression that it was witnessing real events. This implied that the audience was aware that the events shown on stage formed part of a great span of time, say a person's life or a long period in the history of a family. The same was true for Greuze's paintings. According to Diderot, time should not be stretched or shortened in any way in a painting. Since a painter could depict only one moment of an action he should choose the most significant and emotional one. This moment should strongly move the

viewer and give enough clues for him to reconstruct the rest of the story. In his Salons, Diderot demonstrated repeatedly that Greuze's paintings fulfilled his demands perfectly, mainly because Greuze was able to heighten the emotion of the moment through his masterly peinture d'expression.(24) His paintings enabled Diderot to exercise his rare gift for ekphrasis, the description of a painting. The sentimental stories which Diderot wove around many of these paintings are masterpieces of imaginative writing.

Diderot advised painters to depict events taking place over a period of time by creating a sequence of paintings, each of them showing an important moment in the story, giving the viewer the illusion that he could really follow events taking place over a long span of time. He similarly recommended that the playwright should create unity in his piece by building it around a series of moments of great expressiveness, the tableaux.(25) Not only were Greuze's paintings perfect works of art in their own right, they could also serve as a model for the playwright looking for a beautiful and emotional tableau. In painting as in the theatre, unity should not be superimposed on the work of art but should spring from the subject itself. Thus the painter could create the most perfect tableau by depicting an extraordinary event from family life, when the whole

family was together and its members were more ready to show their emotions than they would be under normal circumstances. The Village Bride (1761), which shows a family united to witness the signing of the marriage contract of one of the daughters, illustrates this principle perfectly, as does Filial Piety (1763; ill. 3), which shows a lame but noble patriarch, surrounded by his loving kin.(26)

Diderot also indicated that two seemingly disconnected actions could go on simultaneously during the separate scenes of a play to enhance its imitation of real life situations. The best example of this device is perhaps the opening scene of Le père de famille in which the protagonist Albin is nervously pacing the room, while his sister plays a game of solitaire. Brother and sister behave as if totally unaware of each other's presence.

In order to understand Diderot's desire to free painting from being tied to the depiction of only one moment, which was as strong as his wish to see natural unity in the medium, we need to look briefly at his criticisms of landscapes. Sometimes a landscape painting would inspire him to take an imaginary walk through it, overawed or moved to tears by its beauty. Instead of maintaining its distance from the viewer and forming a unified whole, the landscape painting seemed to surround

and even overwhelm the sensitive viewer.(27)

It is not known how widely Diderot's Salons were read during his lifetime. The members of the state-protected Academy were not prepared to accept criticism from laymen which might ruin their lucrative careers.(28) Therefore, Diderot's Salons could only circulate in manuscript form, and were not printed until 1795.(29) However, since Diderot enjoyed European celebrity status, we may safely assume that his art critical work reached the intellectual elite of his day. Ideas related to his on the regeneration of the theatre and history painting were widespread during the second half of the eighteenth century, and the hierarchy of genres was cast into jeopardy by the growing interest in paintings showing scenes from national history. A dispute arose as to whether such paintings, which were accurate in the depiction of modern costume as only genre painting had previously been, should be classified as genre or history painting. During the same period, the theatre saw a flood of new dramas bourgeois, historic drama and melodrama, all demanding the same meticulous accuracy of costume and setting which Diderot had thought one of the most impressive features of Greuze's work.

Lessing and Winckelmann

Diderot believed that genre painting could be an example for playwrights and actors, and like De Piles and Dubos he admired the quality which set painting apart from every other form of art, i.e. its immediate realism and expression. The concept of ut pictura poesis was still valued in eighteenth-century France; poetry and history painting were still believed to be linked by virtue of their moralism and elevation. However, interest was growing in the features which distinguished painting from poetry because they were seen to enhance the value of painting as a didactic art.

French theorists were not the only ones to point out the qualities unique to the visual arts. In Germany, Lessing did the same in his Laocoon of 1766. He also thought the main difference between poetry and the visual arts to be the fact that poetry could describe a sequence of events while a statue or a painting could only show one moment. He advised artists to turn the deficiencies of the visual arts to their advantage by depicting the moment of a story which showed man at his most beautiful. Unlike Diderot, he thought that a painter should diminish the intensity of facial expressions to create an image of beauty because he believed that man was never beautiful in moments of

great crisis. He praised the sculptor of the Laocoon group, because he had managed to lessen the horror of the facial expression of the dying Laocoon.(30) He concluded that artists should try to depict beauty and leave story-telling to the poets.

Lessing's disdain for the eighteenth century French view of history painting was emphatic. He referred to Zeuxis' painting of Helen and the comments made by the French theorist Caylus (31) on this subject. Zeuxis' painting showed only the naked Helen, whose beauty needed no comment. Caylus suggested that Helen should be covered with a veil and that the consciousness of her beauty should be conveyed to the viewer through admiring and lustful looks of a number of old men around her. Lessing pointed out that the ugly grimaces of a group of old men could never replace the simplicity and beauty of Zeuxis' painting. Caylus was concerned with expression, and not with beauty. This preoccupation, he contended, would make the scene described by Caylus look like a pantomime if it were ever actually painted.

Lessing's ideas can be compared to those of Winckelmann, who believed that Greek sculpture was the perfect model for artists wishing to depict perfect human beauty. In his view the Greek climate and culture had created the most perfectly beautiful human beings and the noblest of character. This had inspired the

Greeks to search for even greater, ideal beauty, which could be conceived in the mind alone.(32) According to Winckelmann, the description edle Einfalt und stille Grösze perfectly fitted the most important qualities of Greek sculpture, qualities which made a Greek statue a perfect work of art in its own right. He believed that in Greek art the whole body was beautiful and expressive rather than just the face and hands. The limited evidence then available only allowed the conclusion that Greek sculpture had been decidedly superior to Greek painting, since painters had adopted contour and expression from sculptors, and knew very little about perspective, composition and colouring.(33)

The French painters and critics who wanted to reform painting in the second half of the eighteenth century hailed Winckelmann as an important ally because his work encouraged artists and art students to study and copy Greek statues. In this way they would, it was hoped, learn the perfect drawing of the human body that was considered one of the most important assets of the history painter. The influence of Lessing in France is less easily traceable. The first French translation of his work appeared shortly after 1800 (34) and it was the politician, historian and art critic Guizot who first quoted Lessing as an important source for the theories he set out in his Salon of 1810. It is therefore

reasonable to assume that Lessing's theory of the separation of poetry and the visual arts was less well-known in France in the second half of the eighteenth century than that of Diderot and his followers.

Winckelmann's theories were not only important for the instruction of young artists, they also fuelled a discussion on the true nature of beauty which would achieve great significance over the course of the nineteenth century.

The Platonic concept of beauty mentioned by Winckelmann was of course well known to every art theorist. However, the art theorists of 18th-century France, following the lead of Renaissance Italy, generally believed that it was art's task to depict nature.(35) Understandably, Batteux's definition that art should imitate nature(36) (in Les beaux-arts réduits à un même principe, 1746) was repeated by nearly every art theorist writing during this era dominated by sensualism. However, his opinions were perhaps closer to those of Winckelmann and Lessing than to those held by other French theorists, in that he believed that art's task was to please and not to move its viewers. As to idealization, most theorists would not go beyond accepting Bellori's theory that, since ideal beauty was not found in any individual, artists should assemble the most perfect parts of several individuals. (L'Idée del

Pittore, dello Scultore e dell'Architetto, 1664). Although this possibility was recognized by Plato, he nevertheless admired the completely unrealistic art of Egypt and relegated the visual arts to a place of minor importance in his hierarchy of the arts. In his view philosophy was far better able than the visual arts to express abstract ideas. Bellori, still partly influenced by the naturalism of Renaissance theory, believed that the ideas depicted by artists were not metaphysical, but had their origins in the contemplation of nature.(37) Diderot seemed to return to Platonism when describing the most perfect stage performance he could imagine, the projection of scenes from reality onto the wall of a dark cave for people sitting with their backs to the light. However, Diderot was only interested in the illusionistic qualities of this concept and did not believe it must emanate from a world beyond the reach of ordinary mortals.(38) Only in the Essai sur le beau (1741), the work of the Jesuit Père André, and in the writings of Joubert, active around 1800 but published only after 1840, is the influence of Platonism unmistakable. Most French artists and theorists preferred to believe that classical statues were the depiction of perfect human beings, produced by a perfect society. They used Winckelmann's conclusions on the history of classical art without accepting the Platonic

part of his theories.

During the early years of the nineteenth century the theorist Quatremère de Quincy, often nicknamed "the French Winckelmann", defended the Platonic view of le beau idéal. In a series of articles in Les archives littéraires de l'Europe(39) he attacked the amateur Eméric-David who had defended the position of nature as the artist's only inspiration in an essay entitled Recherches sur l'art statuaire. In 1805, it won him a prize from the Institut. Quatremère de Quincy, who had briefly supported the Revolution of 1789 had gradually become opposed to most of the ideas which had engendered it. In his later years Quatremère de Quincy showed himself to be a royalist and profoundly religious. A Platonic, anti-sensualist concept of beauty was perfectly consistent with the position he adopted in political and religious matters.

Quatremère de Quincy never wavered in his Platonic ideas. When, during the 1820's, realism invaded history painting to a degree which he found unbearable, he attacked the concept of history painting itself in Essai sur la nature, le but et les moyens de l'imitation dans les beaux-arts (1823). Responding to Dubos he took Poussin's Testament of Eudamidas as his example. The painting showed the Spartan king Eudamidas, who on his deathbed appealed to his friends to protect his mother

and daughter, comparable in its subject to The Death of Germanicus. Quatremère de Quincy contradicted Dubos by claiming that the action, gestures and expressions of this painting failed completely to convey its beau moral to the viewer. The beau moral, closely linked to the beau idéal, was concerned with the elevated, noble deeds and ideas which it was art's purpose to express. Poetry, Quatremère de Quincy suggested, would have been able to express the concept of friendship which inspired Eudamidas' request. In contrast, Poussin had only rendered the bare facts, his painting showed nothing but a dying man surrounded by his grieving family and friends.(40) Quatremère de Quincy preferred classical statuary and the simple images of coins and medals to the elaborate compositions of history painting. These simple icons could be understood as symbols, allegories and personifications perfectly expressing an abstract idea, without giving rise to misunderstanding.

Quatremère de Quincy's royalist sympathies won him the post of Secrétaire Perpétuel of the Académie des beaux-arts when the Bourbons returned to France. However, during the 1820's his views on beau idéal and beau moral seem to have placed him outside the mainstream, which was concerned with winning a far greater degree of realism for artists and writers than critics and the Institut would allow them in their work.

This meant that the debate on the beauty and expression of the human figure retained the emphasis on their mimetic character which had been its most important feature during the eighteenth century.(41) Quatremère de Quincy's Platonism, related to that of Père André, must have looked suspicious to the opposition, especially after 1824 when the Bourbon Restoration grew ever more oppressive and the Jesuits were suspected of having great influence over the government. Many of the young intellectuals of the 1820's had been taught eighteenth-century sensualism as part of their philosophical education. As their demands for a new spiritualism in art and beyond grew louder, the influential Hegelian philosopher Victor Cousin stepped forward, preaching a Platonic idealism not bound to any existing religion. He believed that the work of art as a whole should express an elevated idea, and the human figure ideal beauty.(42) His interest in the mimetic qualities of peinture d'expression was less than that of earlier art theorists, although the eclectic nature of his philosophy would not allow him to completely disregard this feature, which had been so important in the eighteenth century.

History Painting: David

During the years after 1750, the government and the Academy used several methods to stimulate history painting. Commissions for history paintings were given to promising painters, particularly those who had made an impression at the Salon. The most talented could win the Prix de Rome, which gave them a chance to travel to Rome to study antique art and the works of Raphael and his Roman School, the two great examples for history painters. Despite the rigidity of the Academy's teaching and rules, the revival of Poussinesque history painting hardly got off the ground. Since, as we have seen, the vogue was for art and literature depicting man in his social and historical context, Greuze's paintings showing scenes from eighteenth-century family life and the new genre historique depicting scenes from modern history met the public's wishes better than traditional history painting could. Both genres were far more realistic in their depiction of human beings and their surroundings than was traditionally considered desirable in history painting and both could fulfil the eighteenth century's need for didactic art. However, the Academy refused to accept them as substitutes for history painting. Greuze was greeted with derision when he tried to gain admittance to the Academy as a history painter

in 1769, with a painting based on a subject from Roman history(43) and the genre historique was treated with suspicion until well into the nineteenth century. It should be noted that the public's taste was in line with the views of some theorists on history painting which depicted scenes from classical antiquity. They wished to see a degree of archeological correctness in history painting which was unheard of in the seventeenth century, although they believed their attitude to be a return to seventeenth century values.(44) Needless to say, this correctness was meant to enhance history painting's elevated character, never to detract from it.

The influence of the emphatic, theatrical peinture d'expression which the Coypels had recommended that history painters imitate was still visible in many of the paintings created after 1750, particularly those of Fragonard, Boucher and Carle VanLoo. To this, these painters added a sweetness and an unearthly character in their history paintings of erotic mythological subjects. The painter Vien championed the simplicity of classical art at a time when critics were lashing out at Rococo theatricality. Diderot remarked of VanLoo's Jason and Medea (ill. 4) that it was simply a portrait of the actress Mlle. Clairon in the role of Medea.(45)

One of the few French painters who truly succeeded in returning to Poussinesque severity was Jean-Pierre

Peyron. Seneca Opening his Veins on the Orders of Nero won him the Prix de Rome in 1773. His rival Jacques-Louis David had shown himself unable to shed the theatricality of the art of Boucher and Fragonard in his painting of the same subject. Although David won the Prix de Rome a year later with his Antiochus and Stratonice, the Academy's previous lack of appreciation of his work and later humiliations eventually caused the painter to turn away from this institution. David, although he was Vien's pupil did not completely escape the influence of Boucher, who had introduced him in the art of painting, until he came face-to-face with the masterpieces of classical and Renaissance art in Rome. After his stay in Rome his paintings met with ever greater praise from both the public and the critics.

The Oath of the Horatii (1785; ill. 5) earned David lasting fame as the artist who had freed French art from the mannerism and theatricality of former days. Critics looking back on his painting in later decades appear to have forgotten the innovative efforts of Peyron, Vincent, Brenet and others. They tended to give only Vien and David credit for the regeneration of French art.

The story depicted by David was that of the Horatii, a family who lived in Rome when it was still a kingdom. Livy tells the story of their conflict with the

Curiatii of Alba, who were threatening the city of Rome. Unfortunately, Camilla, one of the women of the Horatii family was married to a member of the Curiatii. The Horatii won the fight and killed Camilla's husband. When she dared to show her grief over his death she was in her turn killed by her brother, the only survivor among the Horatii. By putting patriotism before every other virtue their father successfully defended his son and won his exoneration. David originally intended to depict this final scene but Sedaine, a playwright whose ideas were close to those of Diderot remarked that the meaning of this scene depended on words more than on action. David therefore chose to show the Horatii pledging to fight until death and ignoring their womenfolk and their display of grief and fear over the impending bloodshed. Since none of the literary sources which relate the story of the Horatii mentions this event, David could show a moment of action which had to be understood in its own right, without reference to the written word. Edgar Wind mentions as David's most probable source a tableau in Noverre's ballet The Horatii.(46) The painter may have seen some works of this Diderot follower in Rome.

The mastery in drawing the human form shown by David in The Oath of the Horatii seemed to surpass anything undertaken by his contemporaries. There was

nothing sketchy or self-indulgent in his drawing. His skill in drawing allowed David to excel in his peinture d'expression. Since even the fingertips were exquisitely finished, there was no possibility of the viewer mistaking the gestures shown in the painting. Their power and naturalness no longer reminded the critics of the theatricality which had marred French painting for so long.(47) Moreover, The Oath of the Horatii, with its severe, relief-like composition, the gallery of Tuscan columns in the background, its stark lighting, subdued colours and astonishing authenticity of costume seemed to embody the simplicity of primitive society so fervently admired by eighteenth-century intellectuals. This primitivism is perhaps best seen in the contrast between the powerful phalanx of men on the left and the swooning, rounded group of women on the right. The expressive use of abstract forms, cubes and spheres, is probably linked to the way in which contemporary architects like Ledoux and Boullée made use of the symbolic qualities of these archetypal forms. These architects also preferred to apply the simple Doric and Tuscan orders to their work because of the connotations of simplicity and virtue which they carried.(48)

Although critics bestowed a great deal of praise on The Oath of the Horatii, those who attached great value to the Academy's rules identified many faults in the

painting. In his search for authenticity David had actually gone much further than the Academy would allow. He had disregarded its rules on unity, grouping, lighting and perspective in such a way that the painting lacked the hierarchical composition deemed necessary for it to be comprehensible to the viewer. The painting had almost no depth, because the figures in it were placed against a flat background and were very close together. This defect was particularly noticeable in the block-like group of men which completely lacked the softly flowing lines which could have created depth and variation. David had achieved beautiful grouping and perspective in the group of women on the right. Thus the immediate impression made by the painting was that it lacked unity.(49) This defect emerged all the more in relation to the story which David had depicted. The painting's complete lack of compositional hierarchy and the artist's failure to connect the two groups made it impossible to choose between them, the feelings of both competed for the viewer's attention. In this painting, David had not used his technique to guide the viewer's understanding of his work. It was impossible to know which of the two groups shown were the main characters and which was part of the secondary scene, meant to clarify the meaning of the work. The painting appeared to show two episodes of equal importance.

Many critics and art historians have speculated on the meaning of this successful painting.(50) All that is certain is that in The Oath of the Horatii David emphasised the conflicts produced by allegiance to impersonal ideals and duties, instead of simply holding them up for emulation. In his interest in conflict within the family David seems to have been influenced, though not exclusively, by Diderot's drame bourgeois. The composition of The Oath of the Horatii, with its depiction of two groups which do not relate to each other, shows the influence of Diderot's ideas about mise-en-scène. As we have seen, Diderot was a great believer in unstructured scenes of this kind because they looked natural.

Diderot's influence can be detected with near certainty in a slightly earlier painting, Andromache Mourning over Hector's Corpse from 1783. Using the dramatic possibilities of chiaroscuro David led the viewer's eye to the mourning Andromache and her young son rather than to the dead hero. The painting's theme was the grief of a wife and mother and not Hector's heroic death. In this painting David seems to have achieved the greatest dramatic impact allowed by the Academy's theories. Contemporary critics considered David's use of chiaroscuro in Andromache to be rather overdone.(51) The Death of Socrates (1787) was

undoubtedly inspired by Diderot's moving description of this scene in his Discours sur la poésie dramatique and his advice to artists to use it as a subject for their work.

The Oath of the Horatii had already raised eyebrows among the Academy establishment. David's Brutus (ill. 6) of 1789 did even more to create animosity between the artist and his colleagues. Like his previous painting it showed a scene from the days of the Roman Kingdom, believed to be a model of simplicity and virtue as much as classical Greek society. The painting shows Brutus, the first consul, meditating darkly in his house after ordering the execution of his two sons in punishment for their betrayal of Rome. Behind him lictors are bringing in the sons' bodies for burial by the family. Brutus' wife and daughters greet the sight with dismay, while the consul himself seems completely oblivious to it. This time the critics did not doubt who the scene's protagonist was. It could only be the virtuous, self-effacing hero Brutus, whose story was well known, particularly through Voltaire's tragedy. However, if one had only the painting to judge from, it would be difficult to identify Brutus as the main character.

As in Andromache, David had made abundant use of the dramatic possibilities of chiaroscuro, but only to light fully the grieving women and the bodies of the

sons. Although placed in the foreground, Brutus remains in the dark, banished from his proper place at the centre of the painting's composition (and of his family), to a position on the left. Again the painter seems to have wanted to show the rifts which ostensibly virtuous behaviour, however valuable to the state and society, may cause within a family. The use of chiaroscuro in this painting was even more bitterly criticized than that in Andromache. Not wishing to concede the possibility that Brutus was not shown here as an exemplum virtutis, the critics' only conclusion could be that David had been even less successful in composing a history painting than he had in The Oath of the Horatii.

Puttfarcken interpreted this as David's deliberate attempt to turn the Academy's teaching on its head. Instead of employing a painting's composition and lighting to clarify its meaning, he used them to discourage the viewer from making a hasty and simplistic interpretation. (52)

With the onset of Revolution David saw a chance for retribution against the Academy which had criticized his paintings so harshly. His membership of the radical Jacobin party led to its closure. The Jacobins used David's pre-revolutionary paintings to illustrate their own creed of unswerving patriotism, which should come

before the love of one's family. Doubtless they were attracted by the simplicity with which David had told the austere, sad stories of the Horatii and Brutus and added their own interpretation.

In his paintings made to serve the interests of the Jacobins, The Oath of the Tennis Court (1791-'92) and The Death of Marat (1793), David experimented with the realistic and yet elevated depiction of events from contemporary history. Napoleonic propaganda was also to make use of this kind of history painting. David's rendering of Napoleon's Sacre (1808) was his most important contribution. David's pupil Gros had unparalleled success in exploiting the demand for paintings celebrating Napoleon's battles. Both the Bourbon and the Orléanist regimes ordered many paintings of events from modern French history. The prejudice of the Academy could not prevent this becoming the most common form of history painting by 1835. In slightly over a century, history painting had evolved from an elitist, intellectually demanding form of art, depicting events from the distant past, to a vivid and realistic rendering of events from contemporary history, often created for overtly propagandist purposes.

In the works which he did not make to serve the interests of the Jacobin party or Napoleon but created on his own initiative, David's manner also changed. The

Intervention of the Sabine Women (1799) and Leonidas at Thermopylae (Salon of 1814), both started after Robespierre's downfall which ended David's active involvement with Jacobin politics, showed the influence of Winckelmann to a far greater degree than his previous work. After years of study, and first finding his inspiration in the Roman bas-relief and the chiaroscuro of Caravaggio, David had finally learned to make full use of the principles of ancient Greek art. He himself commented that this was the reason why he had omitted any concrete action from his depiction of Leonidas. The portrayal of an action would have necessitated the use of peinture d'expression, the theatrical grimacing which he now saw as one of the most important flaws of The Oath of the Horatii. Although we cannot be sure of this, David may already have been influenced by Lessing around 1800, when he planned Leonidas. Leonidas describes the atmosphere in the Spartan camp as the Spartans, under their king Leonidas, prepare for their last disastrous battle against the far stronger Persian army under Xerxes in 480 BC. According to his pupil Delécluze, David wanted to express the deep, majestic and religious feelings inspired by patriotism.(53) The violent, emotional conflicts visible in his earlier works had no part in this later, enigmatic painting.

In his later years David came to mistrust both the

peinture d'expression used by Boucher and VanLoo, and Diderot's plea for a more natural use of mime. Both kinds of peinture d'expression aimed to maximize their emotional appeal. Around 1800 David seems to have learned to appreciate the simplicity of free-standing Greek sculpture. In contrast to French art of the eighteenth century it invited contemplation and an intellectual response. Critics noted that the figures depicted in both The Sabine Women and Leonidas could be admired in their own right as perfect copies of classical works of art, and that they could not detect the unity of action which would invite an immediate emotional response in either.(54) By now, David was demanding that the visual arts show beauty and dignity for their own sake. In later chapters I will return to both The Sabine Women and Leonidas, since they were of far greater importance for the appreciation of David's work in the years after his exile and death than his successes of the pre-revolutionary period.

The eighteenth century saw the rise of drame bourgeois, which experimented with realistic, non-hierarchical scenes. In his two great successes of the 1780's, The Oath of the Horatii and Brutus, David tried to emulate these values. The subjects of the two paintings, although taken from antiquity, seem to have been chosen for the scope they allowed for reflecting

eighteenth-century concerns. Both show the conflict between social duties and domestic happiness and the compositions of both paintings make it impossible to choose between the two. On the contrary, the peinture d'expression and the composition used serve to bring the conflict home to the viewer. The influence of Dubos' and Diderot's demand for didactic art with direct sensuous and emotional appeal is clearly visible.

In both The Sabine Women and Leonidas, David seems to have adopted the far simpler expression demanded by Winckelmann. This simplicity did not seek an emotional response but allowed the viewer to contemplate and respond intellectually, judging a work of art mainly for its beauty, which was supposed to have an elevating effect in itself, without overt moralizing. It should be pointed out that David remained an adherent of the theory that Greek statues were inspired by reality throughout his life. He did not accept Quatremère de Quincy's theory of images being symbolic expressions of abstract ideas, although he appears to have come close to doing so in Leonidas.

A Brief Sketch of Developments during the 1820's

We finally come to the period which will concern us for the greater part of this book. David's influence was

still strong during the Bourbon Restoration. Although the master himself was banished from France because he had voted for the execution of Louis XVI in 1793, his pupils continued to dominate the art scene. Gros in particular took it upon himself to defend David's interests after the painter had left for Brussels, his place of exile. He tried to secure David's return to Paris but his attempts to achieve reconciliation between David and the new government were thwarted by the master himself, who refused to write a letter asking forgiveness. David, a Parisian by birth, claimed to be perfectly happy in Brussels, enjoying a a more peaceful life there than had ever been possible when he was still living in France.(55) The Académie des beaux-arts, which had taken the place left open by the Académie royale, the Government and the liberal opposition all endorsed his perfect drawing of the human figure as the example for young artists to follow. His oldest and most famous pupils, Gros, Ingres, Gérard and Girodet received huge praise for following David's teaching and applying the valuable principles he taught them when developing a manner of their own.

David's teaching had been characterised by the same sense of realism, liveliness and authenticity visible in his most successful paintings. His pupils worked after both plaster and living models as was common practice.

The originality of David's teaching lay in his asking models to assume a pose which suggested movement, for instance a man throwing a stone, which they could not possibly hold for more than a few minutes. In this way David's pupils learned to capture a momentary movement. David also took care to provide a variety of models by asking pupils whose build conformed more or less to classical standards to pose for their colleagues. His pupils often portrayed each other, in this way learning to depict different physiognomies and expressions.(56) David's younger, less talented pupils hardly seem to have benefited from this teaching. They were accused of copying Greek statues and actors in their work, which was judged highly theatrical for this reason.(57) The charge of theatricality, once reserved for the Coypels and the VanLoos, was now also levelled at David's School. Life seemed to disappear from the works of David's pupils once their inspirational master had left the country. Indeed, some vehement critics of David's School, like Stendhal, claimed that the master's own work had lost its vitality by the time he painted The Sabine Women. Rather than find an alternative for the theatricality which Stendhal felt plagued French history painting of the eighteenth century, he alleged that David had himself introduced theatricality. David copied Greek statuary, admired for its simplicity of stance and

expression, in a medium meant to depict dramatic interaction between human beings. The figures in his paintings therefore looked like old-fashioned and vain actors, only interested in the impression made by their own speech and gestures. During the 1820's, French theorists' demand for expression in art seemed to win back some ground from Lessing and Winckelmann's campaign for simplicity and beauty.

Most critics thought that a clear lesson could be drawn from the work of the untalented painters claiming to defend David's heritage during the 1820's. One should study the principles of classical art, which David had done almost half his life, and never literally copy either classical statues, David, or the poses of famous actors.

It should be clear that artists who wanted to draw attention to themselves during the Restoration period could best do so by creating works in a style which contrasted with the anaemic classicism of David's pupils. The realism which had never been completely absent from French art and which influenced even the defenders of the classical nude, now returned with a vengeance. The rivalry between classicism and Romanticism, which flared up around 1824, at first sight appears to have been a re-enactment of the conflict between the Poussinistes and Rubénistes, which took

place at the end of the seventeenth century, when De Piles published his theory of the superiority of colour over line.

The need to create works which contrasted with those of the Davidiens was probably not the only reason why the young painters of the 1820's showed a renewed interest in colour. The public for which they catered was even bigger and more differentiated than that of the eighteenth century. French intellectual life was concentrated in Paris and the population of this city and its level of education were growing. This public loved the spectacular, realistic, and often trite melodramas staged at the new boulevard theatres, and shunned the performances of the seventeenth-century tragedies at the Théâtre Français. It preferred illustrated novels, travel journals, histories, popular prints, sentimental genre and historical genre paintings to classical history paintings. It was spellbound by the new panorama and diorama. In order to capture this public's attention, writers and artists had to adopt many features of these popular art forms and probably took heed of De Piles' advice for luring the public to a painting with colour, beguiling work of the hand and realism. Peinture d'expression, which David had eliminated from his art around 1800, was now reintroduced by young painters wanting to exploit its

emotional appeal, and the idea that a work of art should form a bridge between the artist's soul and that of the viewer was often repeated.

In De la littérature considérée dans ses rapports avec les institutions sociales, of 1800, Madame De Staël embraced the cultural relativism championed by the theorists of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Dubos in particular had stressed the importance of climate, surroundings and time on human thinking and culture. Mme De Staël concluded from this and Dubos' emphasis on art's emotional appeal that artists and writers should express the ideas and aspirations of modern man using concepts which could reach the imagination and the heart.

In De l'Allemagne, written in 1810 and first published in France in 1814, Madame De Staël described German culture, which was completely different in its origins and preoccupations from the classically-inspired culture of France. Classical culture was concerned with the appearance of things, with form and beauty. The expression of deep thoughts and emotions was subordinated to this and only permitted as long as it did not clash with the requirement for beauty and regularity in art and poetry. German culture and the cultures of the North in general were inspired by Christianity. External beauty was of little importance

here. Christianity had brought with it a deep interest in the human soul and mind, and declared inner beauty to be more important than external beauty. Indeed, the two were often seen as contrasting or even incompatible. French artists and writers of the Restoration adapted Mme De Staël's cultural relativism, which had brought her into conflict with Napoleon when she defended the culture of a country which refused to be oppressed by Napoleonic France, but found it difficult to accept the strong anti-didactic and anti-utilitarian ideas also present in her work, which were inspired by Kant.(58)

Mme De Staël was not the only French author to bring Christianity back into focus. Chateaubriand had stressed the central role of the Church in the development of European society and culture in Le génie du Christianisme from 1802. Interest in religion and spirituality was slowly gaining ground in France, while at the same time the status of classical art and culture as the universal standard began to erode. Napoleon himself actively endorsed spiritualist thinkers like Royer-Collard and fought against the influence of the idéologues, the followers of Locke's sensualism during the Revolution and its aftermath.

However, although the need for new spiritual values was felt by many intellectuals during Napoleon's time and the Restoration, they were too much children of the

Revolution to seek it in established religion. Although the priest Lamennais would fight for a liberal stance for the church, the clergy's support for the Bourbons had greatly discredited it.

In Germany, the religious character of the new Romantic movement was of far greater importance than it would ever be in France. Schleiermacher in particular developed the idea of religion as a matter of feeling, of man uniting with the universe. In Germany, the spirituality of an aggressive, militaristic France was probably seen as superficial at best.

The aspect of German thinking which is of immediate interest to us is the theorizing on the theatre which had taken place there and which was summarized by Mme De Staël. The French were deeply impressed by the devastating criticism delivered by August Wilhelm von Schlegel on French seventeenth century tragedy. It was precisely these works which were used by Napoleon to demonstrate the supremacy of French culture to the peoples living under French rule. Fine productions of the works of Racine and Corneille were put on, performed by the best artists(59) and Napoleon took the best actors, among them Talma, with him on his journeys as cultural ambassadors of France. Naturally they excelled in this repertory, which was seen as one of the great achievements of French civilization. Schlegel, analyzing

French tragedy, judged it to be only a pale shadow of the Greek tragedy which it imitated, and rejected almost every rule which its French defenders like La Harpe still believed imperative. He shared Mme De Staël's idea that great art and literature had always sprung from the needs of the society and culture to which they belonged. In a review of Shakespeare's dramas he placed the great playwright in the unpolished but vital culture of Elizabethan England.(60) The idea that painting and drama were essentially modern art forms because they could realistically show the complex emotions and relationships which existed within modern societies, helped to link his theories to those of Diderot and other French advocates of reform in art and theatre. As we have seen, Dubos' cultural relativism and his theory of art forming a bridge between the artist's and the viewer's souls also resumed a central place in French thinking on art.

In this way, the French sensualism of the eighteenth century and the new theories of Schlegel and Mme De Staël were united as a battering ram against the defences of form and beauty constructed by La Harpe and the followers of Lessing and Winckelmann.

During the 1820's the lines of battle were drawn up between realism and expression on one side and form and idealization on the other. The pre-eminence of form and

idealization were defended by conservative critics, who regarded the art of classical Greece as the ultimate standard for all times, while the more progressive critics believed a certain degree of realism in setting and facial expressions to be important in art which served the needs of a nineteenth century public. However, it should be noted that conservatism in artistic matters often did not coincide with political conservatism. Many members of the liberal opposition embraced classicism, while Victor Hugo, who started his literary career as a religious royalist was one of the poets to be influenced by Schleiermacher's mysticism. (61)

It is clear that only a few facets of Romanticism were emphasised in Restoration France. As the conservative critic Delécluze put it, German mysticism did not gain much ground in France because it was alien to the French mind, and the cynical Romanticism of Lord Byron, which aimed to deliberately shock the public, was embraced by only a few artists, like Delacroix. Both were of less significance than the simple French requirement for more realism in art, or in Delécluze's words, "the picturesque erudition of Walter Scott".(62) Indeed, this author's historical novels displayed a descriptive accuracy unknown in French literature until the 1820's, when many translations of Scott's novels

were published. An array of novelists, playwrights and painters chose to imitate this realism, and Stendhal, author of Racine et Shakespeare (1823), one of the most important of the manifestoes to demand change in art and literature, appealed for the realistic depiction of subjects close to the heart of the Restoration audience. Napoleonic battles would be of particular interest to this public. The depiction of such events should be entrusted only to artists and writers in a position to portray the emotions of the soldiers through their own experience of warfare. Stendhal made this point because he had been an officer in the Napoleonic army and considered himself a good judge of the way in which these highly emotional subjects were rendered.

Most other critics and theorists of the 1820's only saw the dangers of painting in particular becoming too much an expression of the artist's own needs and emotions. Painters, they feared, would ultimately abandon the rules for composition, causing the public difficulty in understanding their work. Such a development would also lead to careless drawing which left gestures and facial expressions unintelligible and to indulgence in the development of a personal style, again at the expense of clarity. They were also concerned that artists would revert to imitating the colourist Schools, which had been fashionable during the

first half of the eighteenth century and for which David's drawing had provided an antidote. These schools excelled in the realistic depiction of nature and anecdotal detail, but were believed incapable of elevated history painting. Stendhal shared most of these fears and his desire for personal expression in art was restricted to the choice of subject.

Art and theatre critics and theorists writing during the 1820's were confronted with a flood of works by young artists and writers, hoping to make their mark by flouting the demands which the former made of elevated art and literature. Theatre and Salon criticism was the central arena in which the battle between the champions of form and ideal and the modernists who defended realism and expression was fought out. Only a few of the critics believed that they could stop the rising tide of innovation and realism by simply holding up the standard of the classical nude. Quatremère de Quincy and Delécluze represented this small but vocal group. Most others believed that the realism and interest in expression visible in the works of the playwrights Hugo and Dumas and the painters Géricault, Delacroix, Sigalon and Scheffer could be beneficial if kept in check by respect for the rules of composition, the correct drawing taught by David and the need for beautification, in order not to shock the public. This

meant that the works of David's most talented pupils, Gros in particular, as well as his own paintings, were held up to young artists.

Gros, who in his paintings Napoleon Visiting the Plague-House in Jaffa (1804) and Napoleon Visiting the Battlefield at Eylau (1808) had proved himself able both to idealize events from very recent history and to emulate colouristic Schools without becoming trite or unintelligible seemed an important example to follow. His works pointed young artists towards a juste milieu between the imitation of classical art and the unlimited freedom which they seemed to desire. In this way, the great tradition of the French School in painting could be maintained while at the same time room was left for a moderate degree of innovation.

The more it came under attack, the more the critics' preoccupation with the greatness of French art and culture grew. The last thing they wanted to see was a defeated France being culturally colonized by other European nations. Theatre critics would have loved to achieve the same balance between tradition and innovation as that visible in painting, but it was less easily identified in their art form. Napoleonic France had not yielded a playwright of the stature which Gros enjoyed as a painter. Budding playwrights could only laugh at the plays of authors like Casimir Delavigne,

who combined elements from classical tragedy with a sometimes shocking realism in plays of debatable quality. Many better plays were never performed. For this reason the notion of *juste milieu* was developed further in art than in theatre-criticism and theory.

During the Restoration, most defenders of the standard of the classical nude believed it to be a depiction of reality or beautified reality and did not share Quatremère de Quincy's Platonic ideas. Needless to say, Platonism neither entered the minds of Stendhal and other defenders of realism in art. The debate on a *juste milieu* in art around 1824 was thus conducted between the defenders of an ideal of beauty which they believed to be firmly rooted in the reality of life in classical Greece, and defenders of modernism who used ideas already developed by Dubos and Diderot, believers in sensualism and didactic art.

In chapter two I will look at this debate on the *juste milieu* in art, and the way in which the theories valued by those taking part in it affected their judgment on David's art, and particularly the supposed absence of convincing peinture d'expression in The Sabine Women. It will be shown that the discussion on the *juste milieu* was very much a debate about the merits of David, who was regarded as the founder of the modern French School in painting, and whose perfect drawing was

considered by most critics to be the only safeguard against the complete decline of this School. During the juste milieu debate his admirers tried to defend his drawing and teaching against the charge of theatricality, which had been levelled at David on the grounds of his growing interest in the beauty of classical statues and his pupils' imitation of the stances and gestures of actors. Stendhal, one of the most important participants in the juste milieu debate, was particularly vehement in his criticism of David's School. Others who defended David maintained that his work contained the natural and moving expression of emotions both the eighteenth-century sensualists and Stendhal wanted to see.

The notion of juste milieu can be used to cover a far wider range of ideas than those meant by the critics who tried to define a juste milieu in painting. The philosopher Victor Cousin is usually regarded as the spiritual father of the juste milieu concept. Cousin, who was a professor at the Sorbonne and the Collège de France, drew attention to himself in 1818 by setting out his eclectic philosophy to a young and enthusiastic audience. The lectures were not published until 1836, subtitled Du vrai, du beau et du bien. (63) The main attraction of his philosophy must have been that it promoted a new spiritualism for a generation which had

lost contact with established religion. To achieve this, Cousin familiarized his listeners with Platonism and the idealism of Fichte and Hegel. These philosophers believed that ideas could not be judged through sensual perception of the world, but that all material things could only be understood as the expression of an idea. He combined these notions with the French philosophy of the seventeenth century, which had stressed logic and reason as the means to understand universal truths, the existence of God and the soul.

Cousin's eclecticism combined the best aspects of existing philosophies to create a new system of thought, which could therefore unfortunately not boast much originality. The same basic eclecticism also guided the founders of the July Monarchy. The *juste milieu* which reigned during the July Monarchy was simply a combination of the achievements of the French Revolution, i.e. democratic government and the protection of civil rights, with the most important supposed virtue of the Ancien Régime, namely the disinterested monarch standing above all fractious interests and uniting the people. During the Restoration Cousin belonged to the liberal opposition. Many of the sensualists whose thinking had inspired the Revolutionaries of 1789 had supposed that the self and self-interest were the basis of all human action. In

reaction to this, many liberals of the 1820's contended that society needed a higher principle to give it shape, like the monarchy or the church to bind the people together, and feared the dictatorship, atheism and bloodshed of the Terror.(64)

Liberalism's strong humanitarian sympathies and belief in religious and political tolerance gained it the support of most reform-minded intellectuals of the Restoration. After the accession of the extremely conservative Charles X in 1824, liberalism soon attracted even Victor Hugo, who had lost faith in the Bourbons. We can therefore conclude that a strong idealism, seeking higher, abstract principles as a guide for life and society was always a main feature of post-Napoleonic liberalism. However, it will also be clear from the above that the Platonism propagated by Cousin had not yet assumed a role in the discussion on the juste milieu in painting which took place in 1824, although his eclecticism may have influenced some of the participants. In fact, it was probably the strongly humanitarian bent of liberal artists, critics and playwrights, which made them embrace Dubos and Diderot's didacticism and reject Platonism and mysticism.

The standard used by the critics was not an abstract theory but the great artistic achievement of David and his pupils. To them juste milieu was embodied

by the way in which Gros had combined beauty of form with the depiction of events from modern history which were of interest to every viewer. Their ideas were still largely based on those of the critics and theorists of the eighteenth century. Only Quatremère de Quincy believed that images should be the symbolic expression of an abstract idea. His incurable political and religious conservatism set him apart from almost all his colleagues and certainly from the hot-headed young artists who shocked the public with their unsettling depictions of recent dramatic events. However, the strong religious undertone of Gros' history paintings glorifying Napoleon's deeds made him acceptable even to Quatremère de Quincy. (65)

The conflicting demands for realism and spiritualism in Restoration thinking could not fail to clash eventually. In chapter three we will look first at the increasing realism in the composition of both paintings and plays. I will demonstrate that, particularly in painting, it served to counteract Lessing's interpretation of the ut pictura poesis theory, namely that art, which could only show one moment, should concentrate on beauty. Detractors of the compositional rules in painting were aware of David's originality in this field. Although his perfect drawing appealed to the conservative critics of the Restoration,

those who favoured more freedom, particularly in the use of the unities, could also point to his work as an authoritative example.

At the end of the Restoration period, those protesting against the realism now making inroads into painting and theatre still outnumbered those in favour of it. Stendhal's Racine et Shakespeare appeared when realistic depictions of Napoleonic history were greatly in favour with the liberals, who adored the Napoleon of the Hundred Days. He had granted Frenchmen constitutional rights and liberties. When Victor Hugo's Préface de 'Cromwell', which also appealed for realism and art to serve the needs of its time, appeared in 1827, many critics and magazines who had formerly defended these two principles had already turned away from realistic composition and rejection of the unities in both art and literature. Indeed, Victor Hugo himself was not a naive believer in realism as such, but asserted that the artist's subjective point of view should give the work its unity.(66) The sensitive and subjective artistic personality seems to play a more important role in Hugo's theorizing than it did in Stendhal's.

The desirability of catering for a non-intellectual public, with big, colourful, realistic paintings and realistic historical drama was increasingly doubted.

Realism came to be seen as leading to superficiality, to art that gave the bare facts of an historical event without shedding light on its intrinsic meaning or the emotions of the persons involved. Modern history painting and the theatre were compared to the diorama and panorama, which were considered only as devices to baffle and thrill their audiences, not as instruments of intellectual elevation. Gradually, arguments derived from those used by Quatremère de Quincy and Cousin began to creep into both the debate on the degree of realism and expressiveness permissible in the depiction of the human figure and that on the appropriate degree of realism for a painting's composition.

The Revolution of 1830 served to dispel many illusions. The July Monarchy, although greeted with enthusiasm, quickly proved itself to be a régime lacking the humanitarianism which people had hoped it would bring. The rich were allowed to grow richer while the poor were left to their fate. Artists and writers attempting realism in their work were seen as the servants of a bored, rich, middle-class public which had no need for elevating art. The July Monarchy supported the *juste milieu* art and theatre of Delavigne and the painter Delaroche. They combined modern subjects with correctness of style and observance of the unities, not in order to preserve the greatness of French painting

and theatre but simply to please a large, superficial public.

Critics of the July Monarchy and its artistic policies saw it defiling the juste milieu concept, which had been developed around 1824, in yet another way. One of the youngest participants in this debate, the journalist and politician Adolphe Thiers had wished to give artists full freedom to emulate whichever master of the past they admired as long as they retained the elegance and nobility of the figures painted by David. Thiers became a minister of the July Monarchy and it was perhaps his influence and that of king Louis-Philippe, who wanted to be seen as a liberal in artistic matters, which led the new regime to support every new direction in art which independent-minded artists developed.

It was not only the July Monarchy which seemed to degrade art, so too did the groups who opposed it. The Saint-Simonists and other utopian socialists had great faith in the didactic art which the sensualists of the eighteenth century had also championed. They believed that art and science should work together for art to have the maximum impact on its viewers. For instance, artists were directed to take panorama painters, who were seen as craftsmen, as their example.

With the beginning of the l'art pour l'art movement the outlook for French art seemed even more bleak to

many critics. In a later chapter we will examine the debt which this theory owed to Cousin; for the moment it is enough to note that Théophile Gautier, one of its most important representatives, did not believe in elevated, didactic or useful art, but only in art which pleased, and served no purpose at all. He was also one of the first art critics to believe that artists should express their personal, subjective view of things and interpret the world around them through the microcosm of their own selves. For critics adhering to the ideal of an elevated French School whose purpose was to serve the nation, this idea would always be unacceptable. Both Hugo's and Gautier's thinking showed the influence of those aspects of Madame De Staël's ideas, subjectivism and anti-didacticism, which their contemporaries had largely failed to take up during the Restoration.

However, the most important reason for art critics to turn to the Platonist and semi-religious ideas of Cousin and Quatremère de Quincy was probably the publication of Auguste Comte's books on positivist philosophy during the 1830's. The relationship between many of his ideas and those defended by the sensualists was clear. Comte believed observation and use of the intellect to be the only true sources of knowledge, and rejected the search for God and abstract principles.

To many observers this philosophy seemed to fit the

materialistic and superficial nineteenth century perfectly. The reaction of many intellectuals of the July Monarchy was to reassess the spiritual values offered by Cousin as well as established religion. Many of those who had witnessed the Revolution of 1789 saw a real threat to society in the growth of utopian socialism and positivism, and the increasing superficiality and selfishness of the citizens of their time. They believed that the terrible events which took place during this first revolution might be repeated if these tendencies were not resisted.

Delécluze, one of the most important and most conservative critics of the July Monarchy, and a man traumatized by the Terror, was also the foremost observer to embrace the Platonism of Quatremère de Quincy. He believed in paintings as easily understandable symbolic expressions of religious or moral truths and vehemently attacked the drama and peinture d'expression which Dubos and Diderot had encouraged because it could never help the viewer to experience deep religious feeling. Chapter five is entirely devoted to Delécluze's views and his interpretation of David's reasons for eventually condemning as theatrical the peinture d'expression so loved by his contemporaries. Delécluze lifted the debate between those wishing for realism and lifelike

expression of the emotions in art and those defending beauty of form to a level which it had failed to reach during the 1820's. He spoke for the tendency which longed for the supposedly simple life of the Middle-Ages, when art symbolized values understood and shared by everyone, and attacked the weakness of contemporary art which had nothing to communicate since a faith which united all the members of a society no longer existed. Although he never ceased to defend the great David, it will be seen that his reasons for taking this conservative point of view were those of a man steeped in the Romanticism of Chateaubriand and Mme De Staël.

The last chapter of this thesis will be devoted to the works of Gustave Planche. Planche is often bracketed together with the conservative art critics of the July Monarchy but his critical essays are seen in a new light when compared with those of Delécluze, against whom he fought a life-long battle. Although he was one of the most astute critics of the art and society of his time, he at first only partly accepted the Platonism of Cousin and retained his attachment to the sensualism of Dubos. For a long time he believed in peinture d'expression and drama and as such he naturally came into conflict with Delécluze. Only late in his career, after the Revolution of 1848 and the coup d'état of Napoleon III did this critic, who had been a young man in 1830, fully accept

Cousin's Platonism. Thus, in Planche's case, we again see growing resentment over developments in society finally leading him to refute Aristotelian art theory and to accept the idea of art as the simple expression of universal truths, giving modern society back something of the simplicity, stability and unity which it so patently lacked.

NOTES

1. In Alberti's theories, the words storia and istoria could be used to describe history painting itself as well as its choice of subject. See E. Mai, "Historia! -Von der Figurenmalerei in Theorie und Praxis seit dem 16. Jahrhundert," Triumph und Tod des Helden: Europäische Historienmalerei von Rubens bis Manet, exhibition catalogue Cologne, Zürich and Lyons (Zürich, 1988) 16 and 19.

2. See R.W. Lee, Ut pictura poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting (1940; New York, 1967), and W. Trimpf, "The Meaning of Horace's ut pictura poesis," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 36 (1973): 1-34.

3. See J. Barrell, The Political Theory of Painting from Reynolds to Hazlitt: 'The Body of the Public' (New Haven, 1986) 1-68. For an account of the social and financial position of French artists during the nineteenth century see A. Sfeir-Semler, Die Maler am Pariser Salon, 1791-1880 (Frankfurt, 1992).

4. "...tragedy is not a representation of men

but of a piece of action, of life, of happiness and unhappiness, which come under the head of action, and the end aimed at is the representation not of qualities of character but of some action; and while character makes men what they are, it is their actions and experiences that make them happy or the opposite. They do not therefore act to represent character, but character-study is included for the sake of the action. It follows that the incidents and the plot are the end at which tragedy aims and in everything the end aimed at is of prime importance. Moreover, you could not have a tragedy without action, but you can have one without character-study." Aristotle, The Poetics, transl. W. Hamilton Fyfe, The Loeb classical library (1927, rev. and repr. 1932; London, 1965) 25-26.

5. Poussin's writings give hardly any evidence for this notion. The most important source for it is a letter from 1647 to his friend and benefactor Paul Fréart de Chantelou. Poussin, N., "Correspondance" ed. by Charles Jouanny, Archives de l'art français nouv. pér. 5(1911; Paris 1968) 370-375.

6. See H. Körner, Auf der Suche nach der 'wahren Einheit': Ganzheitsvorstellungen in der französischen Malerei und Kunstliteratur vom mittleren 17. bis zum mittleren 19. Jahrhundert (München, 1988) 60.

7. Although De Piles first set down his theories in L'art de peinture de C.A. Du Fresnoy, traduit en François, enrichy de remarques, & augmenté d'un Dialogue sur le Coloris (Paris, 1673), they were taken up in 18th century theory in the form which he gave them in his Cours de peinture par principes (Paris, 1719).

8. Thomas Puttfarken (1985: 55) draws our attention to De Piles' interpretation of this term.

9. See J. Scherer, La dramaturgie classique en France (Paris, 1970).

10. See J. Thuillier, "Temps et tableau: La théorie des 'péripéties' dans la peinture française du XVIIe siècle," Stil und Uberlieferung in der Kunst des Abendlandes, III (Berlin, 1967) 191-203.

11. Puttfarken (1985: 131-132) mentions Coypel, Dandré-Bardon and Watelet as important defenders of this opinion.

12. Puttfarken (1985: 4-5, 38-40). Bernard Teyssède describes De Piles' role in the conflict between the Poussinistes and the Rubénistes in Roger de Piles et les débats sur le coloris au siècle de Louis XIV (Paris, 1957).

13. J.B. Dubos, Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture (1708; Amsterdam, 1766) 280-281.

14. "...le mot réveille l'idée dont il est le signe, qui ne se fait pas en vertu des loix de la Nature. Elle est artificielle en partie. Ainsi les objets que les tableaux nous présentent agissant en qualité de signes naturels, ils doivent agir plus promptement. L'impression qu'ils font sur nous doit être plus forte & plus soudaine que celle que les vers peuvent faire." (Dubos: 418). Dubos (242) also discerns two kinds of gestures, gestes naturels and gestes d'institution.

15. A. Coypel, "Sur l'esthétique du peintre," Conférences de l'Académie royale de peinture et sculpture, ed. by H. Jouin (Paris, 1883) 351. C.A. Coypel, "Parallèle de l'éloquence et de la peinture," Mercure de France, May 1751, Oeuvres (Genève, 1971) 113-120. See also Rubin (33), Puttfarken (1985: 131).

16. George Mras, Eugène Delacroix's Theory of Art (Princeton, 1966) 18.

17. This tendency is described by Thomas Crow in Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris (New Haven, 1985).

18. See J. Locquin, La peinture d'histoire en France de 1747 à 1785: Etude sur l'évolution des idées artistiques dans la seconde moitié du XVIIIe siècle (Paris, 1912) 158-165, and J.A. Leith, The Idea of Art as Propaganda in France 1750-1799: A Study in the History of Ideas (Toronto, 1965).

19. "...the doctrines of the hierarchy of genres and the supremacy of history painting as they were then held, evince the priority, not so much of a class of subject matter as of a class of values and effects, the values and effects of the dramatic as such." Fried (1980: 75).

20. See G. Vaggi, The Economics of François Quesnay (Basingstoke, 1987) 187.

21. "Si l'on avait conçu que quoiqu'un ouvrage dramatique ait été fait pour être représenté, il fallait cependant que l'auteur et l'acteur oubliassent le spectateur, et que tout l'intérêt fût relatif aux personnages, on ne lirait pas si souvent dans les poétiques: Si vous faites ceci ou cela, vous affecterez ainsi ou autrement votre spectateur. On y lirait au contraire: Si vous faites ceci ou cela, voici ce qui en résultera parmi vos personnages." D. Diderot, "Discours sur la poésie dramatique," (1758) Oeuvres esthétiques, textes établis, avec introductions, bibliographies, notes et relevés de variantes par Paul Vernière (Paris, 1965) 230.

22. Sauerländer points to Greuze's borrowing of figures from paintings by Poussin and classical sculpture. W. Sauerländer, "Pathosfiguren im Oeuvre des Jean-Baptiste Greuze", Walter Friedlaender zum 90. Geburtstag: Eine Festgabe seiner europäischen Schülern,

Freunde und Verehrer (Berlin, 1965) 146-150.

23. In his critical essay on Greuze's Filial Piety in his "Salon of 1763": "D'abord le genre me plaît, c'est de la peinture morale. Quoi donc! le pinceau n'a-t-il pas été assez et trop longtemps consacré à la débauche et au vice? Ne devons-nous pas être satisfaits de le voir concourir enfin avec la poésie dramatique à nous toucher, à nous instruire, à nous corriger, et à nous inviter à la vertu?" Salons, ed. by J. Sez nec and J. Adhémar, I (Oxford, 1957) 233.

24. Diderot describes the head of the old father in Filial Piety as follows: "Lorsque je vis ce veillard éloquent et pathétique, je sentis (...) mon âme s'attendrir et des pleurs prêts à tomber de mes yeux." Diderot, Salons, I: 234.

25. Fried (1980: 89) relates Diderot's concept of the tableau to that of earlier writers like Shaftesbury.

26. See Körner (105-115, 122). Körner cites Diderot's description of Greuze's The Village Bride. "La composition m'en a paru très-belle: c'est la chose comme elle a dû se passer. Il y a douze figures; chacune est à sa place, et fait qu'elle doit. Comme elles s'enchaînent toutes! comme elles vont en ondoyant et en pyramidant! je me moque de ces conditions; cependant quand elles se rencontrent dans un morceau de peinture par hasard, sans que le peintre ait eu la pensée de les y introduire, sans qu'il leur ait rien sacrifié, elles me plaisent." D. Diderot, "Salon de 1761," Salons, I: 141.

27. See for instance Diderot's description of a landscape by Louthembourg in his Salon of 1763. Salons, I: 225-226.

28. Crow (14).

29. For details on the publication of Diderot's Salons see Sez nec's Préface to the Salons, I:

VII, n.1.

30. "Der Meister arbeitete auf die höchste Schönheit (...) er musste Schreien in Seufzen mildern, nicht weil das Schreien eine unedle Seele verrät, sondern weil es das Gesicht auf eine ekelhafte Weise verstellte." G.E. Lessing, "Laokoon: Oder über die Grenzen der Malerei und Poesie," (1766) Lessing's Werke, III, ausgewählt von Karl Balser und Heinz Stolpe (Berlin, 1965) 176.

31. The Comte de Caylus (1692-1765), an amateur and antiquarian, was one of the most vociferous advocates of the regeneration of history painting around the middle of the eighteenth century. His contributions to the discussions of the time include books proposing new subjects to history painters, Nouveaux sujets de peinture et de sculpture (Paris, 1755), Tableaux tirés d'Homère et de Virgile, avec des observations générales sur le costume (Paris, 1757), from which Lessing took the painting criticized by him, and Histoire d'Hercule le Thébain, tirée de différents auteurs, à laquelle on a joint la description des tableaux qu'elle peut fournir (Paris, 1758).

32. "Diese häufigen Gelegenheiten zur Beobachtung der Natur veranlasseten die griechischen Künstler noch weiter zu gehen: sie fingen an, sich gewisse allgemeine Begriffe von Schönheiten sowohl einzelner Theile als ganzer Verhältnisse der Körper zu bilden, die sich über die Natur selbst erheben sollten; ihr Urbild war eine blos im Verstande entworfene geistige Natur." J.J. Winckelmann, "Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerey und Bildhauerkunst," (1755), Sämtliche Werke: Einzige vollständige Ausgabe, ed. by J. Eiselein, I, (1825: Osnabrück, 1965) 17.

33. Winckelmann (47).

34. translated by Ch. Vanderbourg, 1802.
35. E. Panofsky, 'Idea': Ein Beitrag zur Begriffsgeschichte der älteren Kunsttheorie (Leipzig, 1924) 23-38.
36. "La nature, c'est-à-dire tout ce qui est, ou ce que nous concevons aisément comme possible, voilà le prototype ou le modèle des arts." Ch. Batteux, Les beaux-arts réduits à un même principe (1746, ed. Paris, 1883; Genève, 1969) 33.
37. Panofsky (2-3, 60).
38. Criticism of Fragonard's Corésus and Callirhoé. Diderot, "Salon de 1765," Salons, II (1960) 189.
39. Reprinted as Essai sur l'Idéal dans ses applications pratiques aux oeuvres de l'imitation propre des arts du dessin (Paris, 1837). On Quatremère de Quincy's theories in general see R. Schneider, L'esthétique classique chez Quatremère de Quincy (Paris, 1910).
40. "Mais comment la peinture (...) auroit-elle pu instruire le spectateur du vrai motif de l'action, et lui révéler le trait si touchant d'amitié, qui fait le beau moral de ce testament?" A.-C. Quatremère de Quincy, Essai sur la nature, le but et les moyens de l'imitation dans les beaux-arts (Paris, 1823) 70.
41. See Iknayan (129-152).
42. For Cousin's sources of inspiration see F. Will, Flumen Historicum: Victor Cousin's Aesthetic and its Sources (Chapel Hill, 1965).
43. See J. Sez nec, "Diderot et l'affaire Greuze," Gazette des beaux-arts 67 (1966): 339-356.
44. Locquin (166-167). The changes in history painting during the second half of the eighteenth century were described by E. Wind in his article "The

Revolution of History Painting," Journal of the Warburg Institute 2 (1938-'39): 116-127. Many examples of history painting in which historical dress is depicted with great care can be found in the exhibition catalogue De David à Delacroix: La peinture française de 1774 à 1830 (Paris, 1974).

45. D. Diderot, "Salon de 1759," Salons, I: 64.

46. E. Wind, "The Sources of David's Horaces," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 4 (1941-'42): 124-138.

47. See D. Johnson, "Corporality and Communication: The Gestural Revolution of Diderot, David, and The Oath of the Horatii," The Art Bulletin 71(1989): 92-113.

48. Körner (149-155), R. Rosenblum, Transformations in Late Eighteenth Century Art (Princeton, 1967) 72 and 124.

49. Among the most penetrating criticisms of the composition of The Oath of the Horatii I cite L'A.R. (Robin), L'ami des artistes au Sallon (Paris, 1787) 36, E.A.R.T.L.A.D.C.S., Avis important d'une femme sur le Sallon de 1785 (n. pl., 1785) 30, and among the later critics P.A.Coupin, "Notice nécrologique sur Jacques-Louis David," Revue encyclopédique 34(1827): 40. The problem of the unity lacking in The Oath of the Horatii is analyzed extensively in Th. Crow, "The Oath of the Horatii in 1785: Painting and Pre-Revolutionary Radicalism in France," Art History 1(1978): 425-471.

50. See for instance Carol Duncan's feminist interpretation in "Fallen Fathers: Images of Authority in Pre-Revolutionary French Art," Art History 4(1981): 186-202, and compare with Elmar Stolpe who believes the painting served military propaganda. E. Stolpe, Klassizismus und Krieg: Über den Historienmaler Jacques-

Louis David (Frankfurt a. M., 1985). Jacques-Louis David 1748-1825 (Paris, 1989) the catalogue of the David exhibition held in Paris and Versailles, 1989-1990, adds little to our knowledge of the meaning of David's paintings. The catalogue must be appreciated for its invaluable complete visual presentation of David's work.

51. A. Schnapper, J.-L. David und seine Zeit (Fribourg, 1981) 70.

52. See Puttfarken (1981). O. Bätschmann also believes that David composed this painting in order to discourage a too simple interpretation. Bätschmann contends that it did not yet serve political propaganda at the time of its creation. "Das Historienbild als tableau des Konflikts: Jacques-Louis David's Brutus von 1789," Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte (1986): 145-162.

53. E.-J. Delécluze, Louis David: Son école et son temps (Paris 1855) 225-227.

54. See S. Germer and H. Kohle, "From the Theatrical to the Aesthetic Hero: On the Privatization of the Idea of Virtue in David's Brutus and Sabines," Art History 9(1986): 168-183, and 179-182 in particular.

55. Letter from David to Gros, 2nd november 1819. Cited in M.-C. Sahut and R. Michel, David: L'art et le politique (Paris, 1988) 147-149.

56. Delécluze (1855: 47-48, 52-53). The habit of making pupils take each other for their sitters when practising peinture d'expression was probably not unique to David's studio, but met a widespread demand for the depiction of individualized, complex emotion visible around 1800. See D. Johnson, "Desire Demythologized: David's L'Amour quittant Psyché," Art History 9(1986): 457.

57. Rubin (170) describes the growing dislike of the imitation of scenes from the theatre in painting

during the first three decades of the nineteenth century.

58. Mras (31).

59. One of the most important is the edition of Racine's Oeuvres (Paris, Didot, an IX, 3 vols.), which was illustrated by several important French artists, among them Girodet.

60. See H.M. Paulini, August Wilhelm Schlegel und die vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft (Frankfurt a. M., 1985) 240-241.

61. Iknayan (160).

62. Delécluze (1855: 387). Walter Scott's influence on French painting in particular was analyzed by B.S. Wright, in The Influence of the Historical Novels of Sir Walter Scott on the Changing Nature of French History Painting, 1815-1855, Thesis, California U, Berkeley (Ann Arbor, 1978).

63. In full: Cours de philosophie: Du vrai, du beau et du bien.

64. P. Bénichou, Le temps des prophètes: Doctrines de l'âge romantique (Paris, 1977) 15-73.

65. A.-C. Quatremère de Quincy, "Notice historique sur la vie et les ouvrages de M. Gros, né à Paris, le 16 mars 1771, mort le 26 juin 1835," Suite du recueil de notices historiques lues dans les séances publiques de l'Académie Royale des Beaux-Arts à l'Institut (Paris, 1837) 164. Schoch relates Napoleon's touching a plague victim in Jaffa to both the healing gift traditionally attributed to the French kings and the attitude in which plague saints were depicted. He calls attention to the blessing gesture made by the emperor in Eylau. R. Schoch, Das Herrscherbild in der Malerei des 19. Jahrhunderts (München, 1975) 76 and 78.

66. Körner (206-208) sees the influence of Bonstetten's thinking here. His ideas resembled those of

Mme De Staël. He wished to see unité créatrice in works of art and literature.

CHAPTER 2 DAVID, LESSING AND THE SEARCH FOR MIDDLE
GROUND; The Discussion on David's Drawing and
Theatricality around 1824

Introduction

Almost all critics of the Restoration period believed that history painting needed to be open to new ideas and yet hold on to its traditions if it was to maintain its position as the most important art form in France.

Most critics thought that the human figure as depicted in art should retain a certain degree of idealization. However, the literal copying of Greek statues which was central to the teaching of young painters, had become highly controversial. Although copying was practised in every studio, David's powerful influence on art teaching was blamed for the prominence which copying still had in French artists' education.

This chapter will describe the efforts made to reassess the degree of idealization and realism visible in David's drawing, particularly in the years around 1824, by critics who saw the need for a rejuvenation of French history painting and who still attached great value to David's example in drawing the human figure.

The concept of theatricality played a crucial role in this discussion.

Lessing's attack on the concept of ut pictura poesis, which also played a significant role at the time, forms part of this debate. Should artists try to depict nature at its most beautiful and therefore avoid showing intricate, deeply emotional scenes or the climax of an event, as Lessing had contended, or should they remain faithful to the French tradition of Dubos and Diderot, which had reached them partly through the work of Mme De Staël. Dubos and Diderot wanted didactic art that could move them. Critics who sympathised with Lessing's view believed that the beauty and muted expression of art should have an elevating effect. An important but until now overlooked group of critics tried to find the middle ground between these two theories and between David and the new "Romantic School". It was probably they who developed the concept of juste milieu art which achieved great importance and was vociferously attacked under the July Monarchy.

Unity and The Intervention of the Sabine Women

The discussion sketched above centres on The Intervention of the Sabine Women, (Salon of 1799; ill. 7), one of David's most famous paintings. The story

depicted is that of the Sabine women, abducted by the Romans for wives. After two years of hesitation, the Sabines finally decided to attack Rome and fetch them back. However, after initially despairing at their fate the women had resigned themselves and found happiness with their new Roman husbands and the children born from these marriages. When the Sabines attacked, Hersilia, the wife of Romulus, spoke for the women, chiding the Sabines for failing to come to their aid sooner, and told them that they were now too late. The Sabine women would remain in Rome. With this speech Hersilia managed to separate the hostile parties and persuade the Sabines to go home. David's image of woman restoring harmony did not fail to find resonance with a public weary of the Revolutionary bloodshed which had driven families apart. The painting seemed an answer to The Oath of the Horatii and Brutus, used by the Jacobins to illustrate their merciless view of duty.

However, David's beautiful figures in The Sabine Women, which were based on Greek statuary, lacked the unity of action which would have made the composition coherent. Although The Sabine Women had a clear protagonist in the pleading Hersilia, the reactions of the Romans and Sabines to her speech were thought highly incongruous. The Sabines, on the left, seem to be preparing to fight, while the Romans, moved by

Hersilia's speech, are already returning their swords to their sheaths and leading their horses away. David was accused of having depicted several moments from the action simultaneously, and of failing to relate all of the secondary figures to that of Hersilia. Only a few critics, like Chaussard, suggested that David had tried to express the moment of tension before the decision to stop fighting was reached.(1) Those defending the painting during the 1820's often repeated this contention.

As in David's other work, the isolation of persons and groups seemed an obstacle to unity. The way in which David rendered the Roman chief Romulus particularly annoyed the critics. Naked and vulnerable, he looked more like a figure on an Etruscan vase than the epitome of a Roman warrior. David seemed to have been more concerned to show his godlike beauty than to relate him to the action.(2)

As we will see, this criticism was often repeated during the Napoleonic years and the Restoration. Before going into this it is necessary to make clear David's intention in painting the naked soldiers in The Sabine Women. In his explanation of the work, the painter again demonstrates his faith in the theory that antique art reflected "les mœurs antiques", declaring his intention to paint them in The Sabine Women in such a way that

even the Greeks and Romans would attest to the accuracy of the work if they could see it.(3) He therefore took pains to master the secrets of antique art. In spite of David's explanation, some critics saw in The Sabine Women only a set of beautiful but isolated copies of Greek statues. David was even accused of being unable to paint anything from memory or imagination.

Guizot

In his Salon of 1810 and an essay dating from 1816, Guizot was the first critic to identify the copying of isolated antique works of art as the most serious flaw in David's work and that of other, contemporary painters such as Guérin.(4) Guizot, who was influenced by Lessing's theories, stated that all forms of art, not just poetry and the visual arts, differed in their aims and means. In his opinion David had shown himself unable to separate the characteristics of painting and sculpture and his work therefore possessed a highly theatrical character.(5)

Guizot identified theatricality most clearly in the depiction of single figures. He argued that gesture and expression in statues were different from those seen in paintings, because statues were not part of an action, whereas figures in paintings were.(6) Figures copied

from sculpture looked like actors assuming interesting poses. Moreover, unable to use expression to complement an event, sculptors were tempted to give their figures the kind of expression which could be understood in its own right, using the bearing of human bodies and the state of their muscles to suggest movement and gesture. Guizot also accused painters who copied works of sculpture of neglecting depth and perspective. He claimed that they copied only one side of three-dimensional statues, so that their two-dimensional figures looked like cut-outs. He charged that they were incapable of creating spatial relationships between the figures in their paintings and asserted that nudity, though acceptable in statues, was incongruous in figures which formed part of an action.(7)

Guizot proposed a drastic remedy for the flaws of French painting of his time. He advised painters to visit the Louvre to study the paintings of the Venetian School so that they might learn about aerial perspective, the effect of light and colour on surfaces, the softening of the contours of human forms through their contact with the surrounding atmosphere, and the depiction of "modern" stories and costumes. Guizot suggested Tasso and Ariosto as sources for history painters and praised artists who experimented with new kinds of history painting. He specifically pointed to

the genre troubadour, the small, sentimental, genre-like pictures of medieval and sixteenth-century history which the Empress Joséphine collected, and to Napoleonic battle-paintings. Guizot preferred small canvases for all subjects necessitating the portrayal of non-classical costume because the distortions of the human figure and the restrictions on movement it caused would be less conspicuous in small paintings.(8) He felt that a small canvas could contain a large number of small figures painted without too much "finish", while a larger painting could depict only a few persons, with all the details of their expression and costume shown.

Guizot warned painters not to imitate Greek art but to study its beauty and the artistic principles on which it was based. He thought that this would help modern artists to produce history painting for their own time, whilst staying true to the roots of their art.(9) He firmly believed that the society in which Greek art had flourished was the most perfect society which had ever existed, and that attempts to imitate its beauty in the corrupt society of his day had led to highly unsatisfactory results. Guizot was clearly a disciple of the cultural relativism of Mme De Staël and Schlegel.

Many of Guizot's critical remarks were developed further during the 1820's by critics who wished to see reform in history painting. Like David before him,

Guizot did not advocate absolute freedom in painting, but only freedom from the Academy's precepts and teaching of his time. He believed that David's once revolutionary return to Greek art had degenerated into a teaching discipline as suffocating as the one against which the painter had rebelled. Absolute freedom could not be David and Guizot's aim, because they both still believed that history painting could and should play a leading part in the life of the nation and, in view of its importance, should be the medium in which ideas which would influence the future development of the French School should be tried out. Its very seriousness would discourage a too-ardent quest for originality.

Painters who rejected David's School during the 1820's seem to have followed Guizot's advice to study the Venetian paintings in the Louvre and, flying in the face of the opinions held by Quatremère de Quincy's Academy, came to see every national School as worthy of emulation. This development was certainly not foreseen or desired by Guizot, nor was it accepted by the majority of critics writing in the 1820's. Imitating several Schools they thought would cause painters to choose technical perfection as their main aim, an approach which was not compatible with the intellectual character of French art. Indeed, even David's imitation of Greek art was increasingly criticized on these

grounds during the Restoration and later periods.(10) Nowhere in his essays did Guizot display any intention of dispensing with the three unities and the idealized depiction of the human body.

Theatricality within the French School

1820's critics were severe in their judgements on the works of David's younger pupils which were exhibited during this period. Unlike Gérard, Girodet, Gros and Ingres they were dismissed as having failed to develop their own manner, only managing to produce pale imitations of David's works.(11) Guizot's arguments against copying classical art had by now been accepted by many critics. They accused David's pupils of theatrical painting, while excepting David himself from this criticism.

During the Restoration, critics often used the term theatrical in its literal sense, whereas Guizot had mainly meant that figures in paintings based on Greek statues seemed to pose rather than to take part in an event. Critics now accused David's pupils of copying the stances and gestures seen in the theatre, while at the same time trying to persuade the public that this was appropriate for history painters.(12) As we have seen, theatricality was regarded as the main feature of the

figures in history paintings created under the influence of the Coypels, and David himself was eventually to criticize as theatrical his earlier works The Oath of the Horatii and Brutus, which were influenced by Dubos and Diderot. However, his own admiration for Greek statuary, clearly demonstrated by The Sabine Women, and his pupils' imitation of scenes from the stage would attract charges of theatricality against him and his School. During the 1820's it must have seemed that the French history painting of the preceding hundred years had a tendency towards theatricality for which even David's works had proved only a temporary cure.

Critics of this tendency argued with Guizot, and ultimately with Lessing, that for every art form there was a different way of achieving an attractive work. The realistic style of acting so vocally championed by Diderot was still rare in France during the 1820's. The oldest and most important French theatre company, the Comédie Française, still cherished many features of the declamatory acting style which Diderot had denounced. During the 1820's the symmetrical and hierarchical grouping of actors on stage and emphatic gesture were as common as they had been a hundred years earlier.(13) In fact, artists who faithfully reproduced this kind of stage composition and the limited number of gestures and facial expressions in the repertoire of the actors could

not have produced interesting paintings.

The mime and pantomime of actors was not only limited but was meant purely for the stage, not for other art forms. It was pointed out that stage gestures and facial expressions served to emphasise the text and not to replace it, as they did in painting. They would last for only a moment, while a gesture in a painting would be seen by generations of observers. Moreover, critics were inclined to allow actors a small degree of exaggeration, because their gestures had to bridge the distance between stage and audience. They insisted that this would look totally out of place in a painting, where only gestures studied from nature could work.(14) Critics particularly mistrusted the fashionable habit of contemporary actors like Talma, who were inspired by writers on classical art and would copy the stance of a famous classical statue, holding this attitude for several seconds during an important moment of the play. Attitudes were considered by the critics to be totally unsuitable for copying in paintings. Artists, they felt, would compound the fault of borrowing an exaggerated gesture from an entirely different art form with a total inability to make the figure form part of an action.(15)

On this view, David's pupils, who imitated other art forms instead of working out their own ideas within the scope and confines of painting, were not fit to lead

the French School of history painting.

Problems Caused by History Paintings with Modern Subjects

Theatricality was not the only problem facing art critics of the Restoration period. They were also confronted with a new generation of painters who tried to create history paintings without idealising the human figure. Delacroix was the most prominent example. He was criticized for his poor drawing, which left the anatomy and facial expressions of the figures shown in The Massacre of Chios (1824), The Execution of the Doge Marino Faliero (1826) and The Death of Sardanapalus (1827), ugly and difficult to understand.

It was not only Delacroix's work but also the rest of the growing tide of history paintings with modern or unconventional subjects which worried the critics. Moreover, while theatricality was despised by all of them, they were divided over the problems caused by depicting subjects from modern history. The main problem facing the critics was contemporary painters' love of anecdote. They considered anecdotal subjects incapable of inviting meditation on universal values or beauty. (16)

For the time being, we will address a problem which

had already occupied Guizot and was directly related to the triviality of history paintings with modern subjects, the need to depict modern, i.e. non-classical costume. Any costume which was not classical or directly influenced by classical dress conventions was generally considered to restrict the body's freedom of movement, and even worse, to distort its contours.(17) Modern costume was therefore seen to detract from the nobility of bearing which was traditionally demanded of figures in a history painting. This failing was attributed to all European clothing worn from the late Middle Ages until the nineteenth century. It was often thought that artists who portrayed modern European costume in their works were assailing the high standards of drawing expected of the history painter. They were mainly interested in rendering beautiful tissues and jewelry and as such their work was to be admired for its superficial beauty, the way in which the materials were depicted and much less for the representation of the human figure.(18) Moreover, modern costume limited the expression of emotions to gestures of the hand and facial expression. This in turn led to the exaggeration so despised by critics of the Rococo history painting produced by the Coypels and VanLoos. (19) The theatricality of these paintings was partly seen by critics as the inevitable result of modern dress.

Although the argument about the depiction of modern costume might seem relatively minor, it must be remembered that it rested on several deeper conflicts. These were the disagreement between Lessing's followers and defenders of Dubos and Diderot, and the related dispute, stirred up by Mme. De Staël in De l'Allemagne, centering on the contrast between classical art, the depiction of beautiful form, and Christian art, the expression of inner nature. As we have seen, most critics writing during the Restoration felt that the intellectualism and didacticism of French elitist culture would be threatened by Mme. De Staël's theories. The propagandist and didactic nature of French history painting discouraged critics of the Restoration from straying from well-marked paths. For this reason, discussion of form and expression was deliberately restricted by most critics to the relative virtues of classical and modern costume, and remained within the traditional mimetic concept of peinture d'expression. Many critics, Guizot among them, thought that history painting using modern subjects could become a worthy addition to the French School, if only painters could be satisfied by working on the small canvases traditionally reserved for genre pictures. As explained above, the reason for favouring smaller canvases was the hope that stiff gesture and grimaces and ungainly modern costumes

would not offend the eye as much when reduced as they would in a large painting. When it came to clarity of composition, painters of small canvases were allowed more freedom than those creating large works. Critics considered small-sized paintings ideal for the depiction of scenes containing many figures, because they would prevent the eye from losing sight of the overall composition. They observed that in The Massacre of Chios, a large, crowded painting, the viewer could see no further than the first row of figures, and was left to wonder as to the work's overall composition.(20)

In spite of negative attitudes towards the use of modern subjects, painters were fascinated by them. David's pupil Gros set the standard for the genre in his works celebrating Napoleon. He understood that large history paintings of events which had taken place in recent years should conform to many of the traditional standards for history painting, in order to impress contemporary and later audiences. Gros' pictures are therefore realistic only at first sight. When we look at them more closely we gradually come to appreciate the debt they owe to the Academy's theory of history painting. Napoleon Visiting the Plague House of Jaffa (ill. 8) illustrates this perfectly. Its famous subject is Napoleon touching a plague victim, unafraid of catching the disease. The Middle-Eastern setting and the

contemporary French uniforms worn by Napoleon and his officers are depicted realistically but Gros has taken great care to lead the viewer's eye to Napoleon, a heroic-looking figure in the centre of the composition. By displaying admiration and fear, those present at the scene underline Napoleon's heroism. Gros also clearly shows how he has benefited from David's drawing lessons, while at the same time developing his own manner, closer to the soft contours of the Venetian School. In his Sacre paintings David explored the possibilities of large-scale history paintings with modern subjects in his own way. Because their subjects were of national interest and because David and Gros both tried to maintain the highest standards of composition and drawing, these works were quickly accepted as representatives of a new and valuable current in French history painting. Indeed, when Napoleon established the prix décennaux in 1810, Gros' Jaffa was the first to win the prize in the category for sujets honorables pour le caractère national. The existence of this separate category indicates how difficult the position of the new genre still was. In the same year, David's Sabine Women was also awarded a first prize in the history painting category for the way in which the painter had managed to combine ideal and truth in this work.(21) The superior merit of both paintings did not go unchallenged.

Restoration critics were preoccupied with the way in which ideal and truth should be combined in history painting. Although many of them, with the exception of a few staunch royalists, were now prepared to accept Jaffa, The Sabine Women, which was seen as the most important work of the foremost exponent of the modern French School, remained a difficult case.

In fact, for critics writing during the Restoration most paintings in the new genre remained a threat because they might lead painters to neglect drawing nudes and instead to focus their attention on emphatic peinture d'expression. When, at the Salon of 1824 Delacroix, Scheffer, Sigalon and others showed how far history painting could deviate from established tradition, critics were quick to attack them. However, only a few critics were uncompromisingly opposed to a larger role for expression and modern costume in history painting. Most thought these innovations acceptable to a degree, if only painters would not lose sight of David's masterful drawing. Most of them defended classical culture as the model of perfection and harmony, after Winckelmann and Lessing. Only a few, Stendhal being the most important, championed non-classical art, which set out to faithfully reflect the feelings of the far-from-perfect human beings of modern times. A small but important group of critics chose to combine some of

Lessing's ideas with those of Dubos and Diderot, the advocates of expressive art.

A Lessing Follower: Delécluze

Delécluze was a pupil of David, a well-known member of the liberal opposition at the time of the Restoration, an art critic for Le Moniteur in 1819, and later for the Journal des Débats, a newspaper which drifted towards opposition during the 1820's. As we will see in a later chapter, Quatremère de Quincy's Platonism, which denied history painting the ability to express a subject's beau moral, slowly gained influence on his thinking. During the Restoration period Delécluze's theories were still mostly based on those of Lessing: painters should limit themselves to the celebration of the beautiful naked human body. Delécluze would always believe that most great artists had based their concept of the beauty of the human body mainly on the reality of their own time or of the past.

The Salon of 1824 confronted Delécluze with the existence of two artistic systems which were to him equally false. One was the system adhered to by David's pupils, which was primarily concerned to beautify their paintings of scenes from modern or ancient history, by emulating movements and gestures from the theatre.

Delécluze, although conservative in his views, accused them of a lack of originality and daring. Instead of searching for gestures to suit their subjects, David's pupils took the risk-free route of copying gestures already accepted by the public.

Delécluze contrasted David's pupils to those who portrayed reality without idealizing the forms or softening the horrors shown in their work. He simply could not accept Sigalon's Locuste, Delacroix's Massacre of Chios and Scheffer's Death of Gaston de Foix. The three painters, Delacroix in particular, believed they had the right to confront the public with history paintings which were the uncensored expression of their thoughts. Delécluze felt it necessary to issue a warning in the face of this growing desire for self-expression and the still-strong influence of Dubos and Diderot. Following Batteux he claimed that in history painting the artist could not communicate directly with the viewer's mind but must first enchant his eyes by softening and beautifying his subject. In his view it was the way the artist rendered his subject, not the subject itself which made an artist worthy of the mantle of the history painter. (22)

Delécluze pointed to the example of David, who had followed the Greeks in their quest for beauty like no other modern painter. However, modern France posed

considerable problems for this approach. Like Winckelmann, Delécluze believed that the Greek climate and simplicity of life and culture had resulted in nobility of bearing, restrained gesture and muted expressiveness of the body. Examples of this noble simplicity were not to be found in the France of 1824. The rich and educated classes were too civilized to behave naturally and being poor in France almost invariably meant being a victim of oppression. Needless to say, Delécluze believed that oppression bred vice and ugliness, not beauty.

During a journey to Italy in 1823, Delécluze had observed farmers and fishermen, simple people living close to nature like the ancient Greeks. At the Salon of 1824, Schnetz and Léopold Robert won his praise by depicting scenes from the life of Italian rural folk. Delécluze stated that these beautiful people were in no way idealized, adding that Italian history painters had never needed to idealize the figures in their paintings. Simply reproducing on canvas their models' appearance and behaviour yielded the results for which they were still deservedly famous. He concluded that realism in history painting, which was the rule in Italy, was impossible in France. (23)

Robert and Schnetz would remain popular artists throughout the Restoration and the reign of Louis-

Philippe. Delécluze was not the only art critic to hold up their works as fine examples of classical perfection in depicting the human body, modernized and enlivened with a strong dose of realism. The latter features made them acceptable to a nineteenth century audience used to truthful images.(24)

In his Salon of 1827, Delécluze tried to define the currents present in French painting of that time. He distinguished four, naming them after the divisions of French politics: extreme right (David's pupils), centre right (Robert and Schnetz), centre left (Scheffer, Delaroche, Devéria and others) and extreme left (Delacroix and Sigalon).(25) He was pleased to note that most artists siding with Delacroix in 1824 had heeded the critics' warnings, and had returned to less horrific subjects and more accurate drawing than were on display at the Salon of that year. Although, as we have seen, Delécluze disliked the works of David's less talented pupils as much as any critic and approved of the balance found by Scheffer and his acolytes, he could accept modern subjects in history painting only when they did not endanger the high standards of drawing imposed on the French School by David. In fact he would have preferred French painters to have resisted the temptation of painting modern subjects and costume altogether.

Being a firm believer in the theory that non-classical costume restricted free movement and expression of the body, Delécluze only grudgingly accepted some paintings with subjects from modern history whilst rejecting others completely. In 1824, Baron Gérard exhibited a large painting showing Louis XIV naming his grandson as the future king of Spain in the presence of Spanish diplomats and French courtiers. Delécluze considered Gérards impressive talent entirely wasted on this painting, which had been commissioned by the king. The protagonist could not be shown performing an interesting action, and the subject had the additional disadvantage of requiring the portrayal of seventeenth-century French and Spanish court dress, which caused bodies and faces to disappear under stiff clothes, large wigs and hats and enormous quantities of lace.(26)

Although he ultimately rejected the painting, Delécluze was for a time less critical of Delaroche's Jeanne d'Arc in Prison, which was on view at the Salon of 1824. By choosing a subject from the early fifteenth century, Delaroche was able to depict clothing which did not deform the contours of the human body.(27) For Delécluze this work illustrated the principle mentioned earlier, that in history painting, as indeed in every other art form, considerations of form should prevail

over the expression of an idea. In other words, if a subject would not show humanity at its most beautiful, painters should reject it.

Delécluze widened the scope of the discussion on form versus expression in an unpublished essay prompted by his quarrel with Stendhal in 1824, one of the most notorious of the conflicts between critics of the day.(28) In the essay he tried to define two antithetical artistic systems which ruled the classical and the modern worlds. He christened them the Homeric and the Shakespearian systems. These two concepts crop up repeatedly in his published writings of the following years.

Following Lessing and Batteux's theory on art's ultimate aim, he claimed that the aim of the Homeric system was to please and that of the Shakespearian system to instruct. According to Delécluze the Shakespearian system was designed to express ideas about the good and bad, beautiful and ugly sides of human beings, and to increase the level of knowledge about the complexities and dangers of society. It did not need to soften and beautify situations and persons, preferring to show humanity as it was, "bien peu de chose".(29) Delécluze judged Delacroix to be the most important artist of his time using the Shakespearian system, perfectly illustrating its inapplicability to the visual

arts.

The deformed and evil Richard III, depicted by Shakespeare in all his hideousness, was put forward by Lessing and Delécluze as the example of a Shakespearean stage figure not suitable as a subject for a painting or statue. Delécluze argued that during the course of Shakespeare's play the audience could get used to Richard's appearance. When seen in a painting, Richard would only shock viewers.(30) Delécluze was as aware as Lessing of the limitations of art as compared to poetry or the theatre. He believed that, since the visual arts could depict one moment only, the motionlessness seen in the simple gestures of the ancient Greeks would be pleasing in a painting.(31) To the arguments already mentioned against copying theatrical gestures and scenes for paintings, he added a very significant one.

Delécluze feared that a theatrical gesture shown out of context in a painting would lose its original association with a passing sentiment expressed by an actor in the course of a play, and would become a sign which, not unlike an Egyptian hieroglyphic, signified a person's character and mental qualities, rather than his mood. The word hieroglyphic had been used by Diderot in his Lettre sur les sourds et muets.(32) Here Diderot again proclaimed the superiority of images over words when it came to reaching the public's soul. Every form

of art had its own hieroglyphic to make emotions understood. A poet could relate an event in simple words, relying on the reader's associative powers to make their full emotional content clear. The painter, by being able to show the event itself, had even greater power over the viewer's feelings.

Diderot himself relied greatly on simple images and direct language to achieve the effects he intended. In this, and his plea for tolerating ugliness in works of art when this served the artists' needs, he was the precursor of the Romantic preference for le mot propre and for showing the uglier side of nature.

Diderot's attack on Batteux's concept of la belle nature which the latter suggested the artist should imitate was unacceptable to Delécluze. He also mistrusted Diderot's didactic purposes too deeply to believe that he would grant a viewer or reader any freedom in his interpretation of the images seen or described. Delécluze felt that this use of peinture d'expression as a sign language, like the use of modern costume would lead to the exaggerated expressiveness visible in Greuze's didactic genre paintings, so admired by Diderot. Because of the loss of artistic freedom and the calculation it involved, he believed it would degrade the art of painting facial expressions and gestures to a science.(33) As we shall see, Delécluze's

opponent Stendhal was to accuse David's School of reducing drawing to a science. While Diderot considered Greuze's work to be the embodiment of simple and natural art, Delécluze despised it as the height of theatricality and evidence for his view that painters should avoid a fixation with "messages". Study of Diderot's art criticism indeed reveals that he frequently described a gesture as characterizing an individual or symbolising a generalized feeling.(34)

According to Delécluze the artist could only discover the true principles of art, beauty and simplicity of form and expression by studying the art of the Greeks and Italians, who lived close to nature. He contended that it was this search for natural beauty which characterized the history painter, not the idea he wanted to express. Every idea or subject had to be assessed for its suitability for a history painting. The subject should not arouse horror, nor call for exaggerated peinture d'expression. At first sight it would seem that Delécluze saw exaggeration in history painting as caused mainly by the portrayal of modern costume and scenes taken from the theatre. In fact, however, he believed that, like contemporary painters' penchant for depicting gruesome scenes, it was related to the modern Shakespearian system. Delécluze believed that this system served mainly didactic, rather than

artistic purposes. In its aim to show both the good and the bad sides of human beings and life, it did not avoid unpleasant and ugly detail and used peinture d'expression to signify characters. This principle inspired Shakespeare's creation of Richard III as well as Greuze's didactic genre paintings. Delécluze saw the The Sabine Women as a perfect example of the Homeric system, which he preferred.

Stendhal

Although he was not specific on this point, we must assume that Delécluze considered the novelist and art critic Stendhal to be the most prominent modern defender of Diderot's theories. In his Salon of 1824, he contested Delécluze's every opinion. Stendhal had already made a name for himself as the author of the widely-read Histoire de la peinture en Italie and the manifesto Racine et Shakespeare (1823). In Racine et Shakespeare he expressed the opinion that art and literature should be "of their time". In his view, Romantic art served the needs of the audience of its day.

He believed that, in order to be relevant to their time, literature and theatre should try to depict historical events realistically, and should free

themselves from classical rules to achieve this. The aspect of Stendhal's theories which concerns us most here is his view that no universal standards for beauty existed in the visual arts. Like most defenders of Greek-inspired art he stated that the essence of its beauty could be traced to Greece's climate and culture. However, he believed that the Greek ideal of beauty was partly dictated by utility. Greek statuary often showed men in their forties with strong body and will, tempered by wisdom. Men needed exactly these qualities to hold their own and rise to prominence in primitive Greek society. Since women in ancient Greece had an inferior status, men did not need to develop the qualities which would make them attractive to the other sex. Classical beauty was the expression of certain qualities of mind and character that were useful in ancient Greece.(35) Therefore, the Greek canon of beauty could never be the universal and unchanging norm which some claimed.

Stendhal was even more specific, stating that in modern times the Greek ideal of beauty could be found only in the Indian warriors of the North-American plains (an example borrowed from Winckelmann), in other words, in a society totally alien to that of Restoration France. Modern society, with its social life concentrated in salons dominated by women, tended to elevate other qualities. In line with his view that art

must belong to its time, Stendhal developed the concept of the modern paragon of beauty, the beau idéal moderne, which expressed the essential qualities for any young man trying to make a career for himself in Paris, charm, wit, brilliance of mind and above all elegance.(36)

For Stendhal, beauty of form was certainly compatible with modern clothing. Indeed, fashionable, elegant costume, even dandyism were part of his beau idéal moderne. He pointed out that nudity, although accepted in antiquity, looked rather strange in nineteenth-century works of art, because it offended the modern sense of decency.(37) Although Stendhal admired David for the revolution in French art that he had brought about in the 1780's, i.e. creating history paintings which met the needs of the public of his time, that was the extent of his acceptance of David and his School. In particular, he considered the copying of statues or actors like Talma to be dangerous in paintings.

Not surprisingly, Stendhal attacked Delécluze's leading principle that nudity and motionlessness were the main elements of a beautiful work of art. He used The Sabine Women, a work admired by Delécluze, to illustrate his conviction that this concept was utterly false. Priding himself on the fact that as an officer in Napoleon's army he had seen action, Stendhal claimed

that the nudity of the Roman and Sabine warriors would be absurd to anyone with common sense, since it left the soldiers completely defenceless. Focusing his criticism on the figure of Romulus, Stendhal observed with scorn that the king, fighting for his life and his kingdom, seemed interested only in presenting his body at its most beautiful.(38) In contrast to Delécluze, Stendhal believed that in art perfect beauty could only exist as the expression of the emotions experienced by the human beings portrayed and of their place in society and history.

Stendhal also refuted Delécluze's view that painters should never try to communicate their own feelings directly to the viewer. The people of the nineteenth century were hungry for strong passion and, he noted, painters would never be able to communicate emotions which they had not felt themselves.(39) Racine's plays moved his audiences because the poet himself had had a passionate personality and was deeply moved by his subjects, and not because he had worked according to a set of rules.

To demonstrate the truth of his assertions, Stendhal again turned to David. This time he attacked David's drawing instruction in a venomous article which provoked outrage among many defenders of David's drawing, Delécluze foremost among them.

Stendhal suggested that if a prisoner, an uneducated man with no knowledge of the arts, was promised his freedom on the single condition that he must learn to draw a nude in the manner of David, he would be a free man within a few years. If, on the other hand, he were instructed to depict a person disappointed in love, he would remain a prisoner for the rest of his life. In Stendhal's view David's drawing method was no more than a mechanical exercise, a science to be learned but not, as Delécluze would have it, the example for all artists to follow in their search for the essence of art.(40) Stendhal asserted that every truly great painter since the beginning of the Renaissance had only been occupied with the achievement of realism in depicting human beings and their feelings, a realism which could only be found through trial and error, by watching people and using one's own emotional experiences. For him, expression was the most important aspect of art.(41)

Stendhal was to write that he saw not one artist at the Salon of 1824 who could paint living, breathing, feeling human beings and move him. Delacroix he singled out for praise because that artist at least managed to attract the viewer's attention, although he did so by displaying an accumulation of horrific images resembling nothing more than a plague epidemic, under the guise of

a description of the slaughter at Chios. In the end, Stendhal remained enough of a classicist to demand that art should not diminish its elevating effect by shocking its viewers too much, especially by portraying events like disease which were beyond human control. Not without irony, he advised Delacroix, Sigalon and Scheffer to learn to draw a nude in David's manner and hopefully to demonstrate their progress by the next Salon.(42)

Stendhal's favourite artist was Horace Vernet, like himself an old soldier and involved in the liberal opposition, as also was Delécluze. Vernet's Napoleonic battle-scenes, with events, weapons, uniforms and soldiers which looked and behaved as the critic had seen them appealed greatly to him. Although he thought Delécluze's epithet Shakespearian ridiculous, he believed that Vernet's realistic battle scenes were the embodiment of what Delécluze meant by it.(43) They were of their time.

For Stendhal, universal standards of beauty did not exist. Beauty could only be understood as the effect on human character and behaviour of the demands made by events and historical circumstance. Thus it was not motionlessness and nudity which made a fine work of art but the truthful expression of emotions and events, preferably those experienced by the artist himself.

David and Expression

Stendhal's Salon of 1824 dealt David's reputation a severe blow and with the passing of time, David and his School lost ever more ground. While many other critics writing in 1824 were gradually forgotten, Stendhal's devastating judgment on David's drawing instruction made a lasting impression. However, at the time Delécluze and other critics who believed in the value of David's work and teaching, took up his defence. Writing in the royalist newspaper Le Drapeau blanc, Martainville quoted Stendhal's article on David almost in full and refuted his arguments line by line.

The first question asked by Martainville was whether David's emphasis on accurate drawing precluded expression. He asserted that an artist's skill in drawing would help him to render the human form perfectly and to reproduce differences in age, climate and culture. In short, it would help to give his painting its expression générale.(44) With this statement Martainville was referring back to seventeenth-century theory, in particular to Charles Le Brun's Sur l'expression générale et particulière (1668) in which fine drawing and expression were still seen to be compatible. The particulière of Le Brun's title referred to painting the external effects of human

passions; l'expression générale was based on the theories of decorum and the modi. Every figure and object in a painting should conform to what was known about the persons depicted and the climate and culture in which they lived. This aspect of a painting should complement all the others, including expression particulière, drawing and colouring and the viewer's knowledge of the subject, to emphasise its meaning. The traditional demands placed on history painting with respect to the idealization of the human figure and costume and its emphasis on one scene or subject were also linked to this concept. Together they enabled history painting to be sublime or in the grand goût as it was known.(45)

Martainville, knowing that he had not fully answered Stendhal's criticism since form and expression had become enemies, was quick to declare that many artists showing their work at the Salon had been able to move him deeply, pupils of David and Delacroix alike.(46)

In his defence of painters who used Talma as a model Martainville emphasized the fact that the great actor spent considerable time on historical research when studying for a new role. He read chronicles, studied portraits, and had authentic costumes made. The result of all this effort was that he could almost make

historical figures come to life. Martainville claimed there was no harm in artists drawing on Talma's fabulous knowledge of history and human behaviour.(47) Again, he did not consider the practice of David's pupils incompatible with convincing and inspiring expression.

The motionlessness for which Stendhal reproached David's School was defended by Martainville with the argument that some of the greatest history paintings from the French School had shown a person at a moment of complete stillness. He cited Poussin's Testament of Eudamidas and Guérin's Return of Marcus Sextus as examples and tried to demonstrate that the motionlessness in these paintings should actually be understood as a moment of action, capturing a deeply significant instant in which ideas were formed.(48) Thus, in complete contrast to Delécluze's views, Martainville was able to define motionlessness as an important prerequisite for expressive and compelling art. The most important sources for Martainville's idea were probably Lessing and Shaftesbury. In support of his theory that artists should never depict the climax of an action, Lessing gave some examples of expressive depictions of people contriving a course of action. One of these was a work by the Hellenistic painter Timomachos showing Medea resolving to murder her children. The choice of this moment left the viewer to

imagine the horrible outcome of Medea's contemplation and to wish that the crime had never been committed.(49) Shaftesbury advised artists intending to paint the Choice of Hercules to take a moment before the hero makes his choice but which indicates the direction of his thoughts.(50)

Stendhal's caustic criticism of David's School was not Martainville's only concern. Charles X came to the throne in 1824 and, although he later became notorious for his conservatism, at the beginning of his reign he sought popularity with artists and intellectuals of all directions and as such cleared the way for the eclecticism of the July Monarchy. One of his methods was to spend extravagant sums of money buying works of art on display at the Salon and to bestow prizes and commissions freely, with no regard for the opinions of conservative critics.(51)

Since it was the policy of Le Drapeau blanc to applaud the king's every act, Martainville was confronted with the difficult task of reconciling opposites in art and criticism, as he had done in his confrontation with Stendhal. After the government had bought The Massacre of Chios, Martainville felt obliged to praise Delacroix's honesty and wave aside criticism of the painting's gruesome detail.(52) However, in the same article he advised Delacroix and his followers to

refine their drawing technique.

We must conclude that Martainville, handicapped by the king's attitude and that of the government, and recognizing the dangerous content of Stendhal's theories, tried to hold up David's art as an example, attributing to it the expressiveness which Stendhal sought in art, while at the same time defending it as the ultimate standard in drawing.

Martainville was not the only critic to take this line. P.A. Coupin and other critics of the Revue encyclopédique, a liberal magazine which aimed to report advances in human knowledge and progress towards the perfection of the social order, defended the view that David had striven to produce art which was at the same time lofty and truthful for most of his career.(53) The magazine strongly opposed Lessing's doctrine that the main purpose of art was to depict beauty. It was stressed that differences did exist between the arts but that the most important aim of all art was to express ideas and thoughts and the preoccupations of the society in which they existed.(54) Therefore, the magazine was prepared to accept a considerable degree of realism in painting. Characteristically, it praised Gérard's Louis XIV and the King of Spain (ill. 9), which Delécluze abhorred, but could not accept the willingness to show macabre detail displayed by Delacroix, Scheffer and

Sigalon. For the Revue encyclopédique, David's classicism served didactic purposes.

The Revue defended the view that David had reached the peak of his achievement in The Sabine Women, although at first sight the combination of truth and idealization was hardly noticeable in this work. Uncompromising faithfulness to nature would have spoiled the heroic and almost mythical character which later generations and Roman historians had attributed to the conflict between Romans and Sabines. It was observed that in reality the combatants had been no more than barbarians, living in marshland huts and fighting out a battle which was of little relevance to modern man. It was therefore clear that in this case realism would have yielded an unsatisfactory work of art, bound to be quickly forgotten. It was only David's feeling for the way painters, like historians, must treat their subjects, that had saved The Sabine Women from banality.(55)

According to the Revue encyclopédique, the often criticized figure of Romulus proved that the idealization of the figures in the painting could be compatible with faithful expression. Romulus' bearing would at first sight seem to be simply an elegant one but the viewer would quickly come to realize that this motionless stance indicated great tension. It enabled

Romulus to throw his javelin with greater power. David had made Romulus even more interesting by giving him an air of joyfulness.(56) Like Martainville, the critic of the Revue encyclopédique believed that moments of motionlessness in a history painting were the most expressive, because they could be charged with tension and apprehension.

In 1827, David and his School were denounced by Arnold Scheffer, defending his elder brother Ary and the other painters censured by the critics in 1824. He stated that although David had shown his profession an invaluable service by freeing it from the Academy's grip, he could not serve as an example for the generation of 1824. After all, David had only fought for the rehabilitation of heroic history painting and the acceptance of the associated drawing style. The men of 1824, Scheffer argued, demanded not the relative freedom won by David, but rather absolute freedom in their choice of subjects, genres and the Schools of painting with which they aligned themselves.(57) In literature, Victor Hugo was the greatest defender of absolute freedom. His work and Scheffer's article indicated that the advocates of artistic and political freedom became allies in the years immediately before 1830.

Refuting Scheffer's arguments, the Revue encyclopédique contended that absolute freedom had

already been achieved by David. He had rejected the Academy's "method" and had allowed his pupils complete freedom. His advice to them had simply been to go and copy beauty wherever they could find it, whether in art, nature or ordinary people.(58) This view of David and his School did the painter more justice than the exclusive admiration for The Sabine Women which we have seen until now. In fact those who admired this painting often appear to have been totally unaware of such works as The Death of Marat, the sketch for The Tennis Court Oath and David's realistic portraits. I have already discussed the originality of Gros in particular and Gérard's choice of a subject disliked by conservative critics. The critics of the Revue encyclopédique had good reason to point to the variety present within the School.

P. A. Coupin, the Revue encyclopédique's most influential critic, accused David of losing touch with idealization in Leonidas at Thermopylae, the last painting with a subject from antiquity which David finished before his exile in Brussels, and in the paintings of mythological subjects which he sent to Paris from Brussels. Although Leonidas seemed a perfect illustration of David's desire to dispel the alleged theatricality of his earlier works, the nude figures in this painting were judged infinitely more disturbing

than those of The Sabine Women, because in some the realism had become too great and was therefore unattractive in Coupin's eyes. Other critics also noted a growing tendency towards the depiction of shocking reality. In Amor and Psyche (ill.10) painted in 1817, David's Amor looked more like a working-class boy than a Greek God. His down-to-earth looks and behaviour contrasted so starkly with the perfect beauty of Psyche that it shocked the critics.(59) Even so, in 1819, Henri de Latouche, a critic on the far left of political and artistic opinion, again named David as the example for young artists, not as an instructor who could teach them a rigid set of rules, but as one who could arm them with a sound knowledge of their profession which would help them to develop their own styles. Latouche's Salon of 1819, which he gave the title Lettres à David sur le Salon de 1819, par quelques élèves de son école, was a brave challenge to the Academy's policy of using David's reputation to crush any new tendency visible in French art. Latouche believed that David would never have allowed his teachings to be misused in this way had he remained in France.(60)

Not only Amor and Psyche but also David's last work, Mars disarmed by Venus, Amor and the Graces (ill. 11), which was exhibited in Paris shortly before the opening of the Salon of 1824, seemed to widen the gap

between David's actual work and the reasons for which conservatives like Delécluze admired it. The unearthly scene, surrounded by clouds, shown in this final painting was incongruously peopled with gods who looked more like ordinary human beings.(61) In fact they were portraits of personalities from the Brussels theatres, an ironic comment on the accusation of theatricality levelled at the artist.

In his Salon of 1824, Coupin went so far as to charge David's later works with responsibility for many of the flaws visible in the paintings of the generation of 1824, i.e. a lack of beauty and idealization, vivacious colour, and desire for expression and drama.(62) Coupin suggested that David had gone too far in his continual search for renewal and had been unable to maintain his own standards. Thus he had paved the way for the innovative artists who made their mark in 1824. Coupin thought that instead of taking David's last works as their example, the young artists of the 1820's should have sought inspiration in The Sabine Women, which balanced truth and idealization.

The critics of the Revue encyclopédique saw themselves as enlightened classicists. This view they shared with the group around the magazine Le Mercure du XIXe siècle, which was also of liberal persuasion and saw art and literature as the expression of society and

its need for change.(63) It was the Mercure in particular which criticized Quatremère de Quincy in his role as the Secrétaire Perpétuel. The magazine maintained that the generation of 1824 rejected classicism because it was enforced by a repressive government and Academy. The Mercure's desire for political freedom made it accept an ever larger degree of artistic freedom. A non-repressive state would grant its citizens freedom of thought and its artists freedom in their way of depicting reality. Jal, one of its most important contributors did his best to reconcile David's work with the realism and expression sought by the younger generation of artists. He was one of the few critics to hold up Mars, Venus and the Graces as the perfect example for painters to follow, believing that it displayed the perfect match of realism and idealization.(64) Jal was also the critic to invoke Diderot's memory in many of his Salons, notably in L'Ombre de Diderot, his Salon of 1819.

Thiers

Although the public of the Restoration was probably not aware of it, the opinions of Adolphe Thiers, a young historian and journalist, would soon carry much greater weight than those of any of his colleagues. During the

July Monarchy Thiers became Minister of Commerce and Public Works and later Prime Minister. His ideas and preferences therefore played an important part in the artistic life of France under the new regime. After starting his short career as an art critic for the liberal newspaper Le Constitutionnel in 1822, he reviewed the Salon of 1824 in the magazine La Revue Européenne, Le Constitutionnel and the newly-founded newspaper Le Globe.

The latter publication quickly won its reputation as the most important platform for cultural discussion under the Restoration. Like the "enlightened classicists" of La Revue encyclopédique and Le Mercure du XIXe siècle, its contributors tried to reconcile French classicism with new tendencies in art. Following Mme. De Staël, Le Globe was deeply interested in European literature. It became an important source of information for those interested in the cultural developments taking place in Europe, and who agreed with the newspaper's policy of approving only a limited degree of realism in art and theatre. Le Globe's moderate views in both politics and art earned many of its contributors political power in 1830. Although the ideas defended by the magazine were influenced by Victor Cousin's theories, and his eclecticism was also visible in Thiers' Salons, Thiers' first priority was probably

to strike a reasonable balance, or *juste milieu*, between the opposing opinions of his fellow art critics. For this reason his arguments were often as *récherché* as those of the others and bore no direct relation to Cousin's writings. On the contrary, a thorough knowledge of Reynolds's Discourses seems to have informed his most important pronouncements on the art of his time.

The Discourses, although displaying a few idiosyncrasies peculiar to Reynolds, were admired in France as a clear summary of the most important points raised by the famous Italian, French and English theorists. French editions were published in 1769 and 1787. German theory, so intensely debated around 1824, barely influenced Reynolds. He was particularly concerned with the concept of grand goût, discussed above in relation to Martainville's writings, although Reynolds preferred to call it grand style.(65)

The most important feature of Thiers' writing on art was that in contrast to most of his contemporaries, he did not believe that idealized history painting could retain its leading position in French art much longer. The fashion was for reality, he declared in 1822, and the small easel-painting and the lesser genres would therefore gain ever more ground on history painting.(66) This did not, however, prevent him from admiring Delacroix' first attempt at history painting, Dante and

Virgil in the Underworld. The work combined a modern subject with a realistic and yet elevated depiction of the human form and echoed the Venetian and Flemish Schools.

Thiers asserted that David, the ancient Greeks, Raphael and Michelangelo, had copied the beauty of people around them and that their art therefore belonged to its time. However, this did not render it worthless as a standard for artists of other periods. Thiers still considered David to be the most important example for French artists of the 1820's. He did not base his preference for David on the oft-repeated argument that he had drawn with greater skill than members of other Schools. Rather he declared that David had mastered the grand style and grand dessin which could ennoble any subject. (67)

Like Martainville, who chose Le Brun as his inspiration, Thiers managed to close the widening gap between form and expression observable in the writing of his contemporaries. Without doubt, Reynolds' admiration for painters as diverse as Poussin and Rembrandt, or Rubens and Raphael helped Thiers to understand the need of young painters of his day to emulate a wide range of masters.

Unlike many other critics, in his Salons of 1824 Thiers praised Gérard, Scheffer and Delacroix as well as

Schnetz and Robert, Delécluze's favourites. Gérard and Scheffer in particular he praised for having found a way of rendering the ideal in subjects usually considered to be completely beyond the realm of the ideal. Gérard had demonstrated that the ideal was not exclusively bound up with Greek and Roman form and that every nationality and every historical subject had its own ideal.(68) We know that Reynolds had also invited painters to find the ideal in their subjects, to bring out their value as representatives of a species as well as the essence of their character.(69)

Perhaps the best example of the ideal shown in reality as described in Reynolds' work is his portrait of Omai (ill. 12), a native of the South Sea Islands brought to England by Captain Cook in 1774. Although Omai is clearly recognizable as a member of a different race and culture (the tattoos on his hands and forearms are accurately depicted), his long Eastern gown and elegant classical bearing bring out the "noble savage" which the British wanted to see in him. The background of mountains and tropical vegetation underlines Omai's role as a representative of the noble people inhabiting the South Pacific islands.

Thiers could accept the fact that Delacroix did not base his portrayals of modern Greeks on classical Greek art but he felt that this gifted young painter had gone

too far in his desire for originality. Far from bringing out the ideal in the faces of modern Greeks, he had made them repellent. There was no nobility of bearing in The Massacre of Chios and its colouring was completely unrealistic. Thiers expressed the hope that Delacroix would soon reach maturity in his painting and would no longer feel the need to impress the public in this far-fetched way.(70) He did consider the subject of The Massacre of Chios moving and appropriate for a history painting.

He liked Schnetz and Robert for the same quality which had prompted Delécluze's admiration, i.e. their realistic and yet beautiful depictions of simple Italians, which recalled Italian Renaissance art.

Thiers did not see ideal beauty in painting as dependent on the exclusive emulation of David's drawing and subject to unchanging norms but as a quality which must emerge from a painting's subject, which the artist was completely free to choose, and from the period and country in which it was set. A familiarity with David's grand style could help to bring out a subject's ideal character, but could never replace it.

The Search for Middle Ground

Around 1824 all debate on beauty in the depiction of the human form inevitably revolved around the work of David, which most critics still firmly believed represented the ultimate standard in drawing. Stendhal was a notable exception. He accused David of simply copying classical statues and of teaching his pupils that this was the basis of art, reducing artistic creation to a lifeless science.

Other critics agreed with Stendhal that expression of thought and emotion, and originality in drawing and composition were sadly lacking in the work of the most recent generation of David's pupils, but they wondered whether David could really be blamed for this. His older pupils, Gros, Gérard and Girodet had developed an original style and dared to tackle subjects traditionally outside the realm of history painting, while the perfect drawing they had learned from David remained the foundation of their art.

The critics' advice to artists starting their careers during the first half of the Restoration was thus straightforward to combine accurate drawing with the depiction of subjects new to history painting, particularly scenes from modern history. Only correct drawing would help them to overcome the deforming effect

of non-classical clothing on the human body and its expression. Most artists followed this advice, except Delacroix and Sigalon who consequently found themselves out of favour with the critics in 1827.

In the early years of the July Monarchy the manner of Scheffer, Delaroche and Robert remained the one favoured by both the public and the authorities although it was by now abhorred by many critics. Around that time it was given the name by which it is still known, *juste milieu* painting. Although the term was by then used in a derogatory sense, the original concept of *juste milieu* art was not.

It is curious to see how critics defending this current in art described David's achievement in drawing in a way to suit the concept of *juste milieu* art. The main problem they encountered was the theatricality caused by David's supposed copying of statues and actors' poses.

Delécluze, David's pupil and the most ardent of his defenders, followed Lessing when he wrote that the main objective of art was to depict a beauty which could only be found in the ancient Greeks who lived close to nature. Delécluze defended David against the charge of imitating the theatre and claimed that his figures instead possessed the motionlessness which he saw as central to perfect beauty. Thus, Delécluze promoted

himself as the defender of painting which showed the human body expressing the minimum of emotion, to be admired mainly for its beauty. However, the same beauty, or so he claimed, had been achieved by Schnetz and Leopold Robert in their paintings of simple Italian folk. In Delécluze's view, beauty in art was impossible without a thorough study of reality. His main argument against the use of modern costume and theatrical gestures in art was the danger of over-expressiveness. Modern costume limited the expression of the emotions to the wearer's face and hands, thus forcing him to exaggerate them. Gestures which on stage lasted seconds and indicated only a passing mood, would, in painting, with its limits on the depiction of complicated events and emotions, become the sole means of communicating a person's character and emotions. Greuze's paintings illustrated the exaggeration which this could lead to.

Delécluze's main opponent, Stendhal, stated that expression was the main aim of art rather than the motionlessness favoured by Delécluze. He observed that he had not seen any expressive or moving painting at the 1824 Salon and defended the idea that modern art should express the *beau idéal moderne*, which he typified as a young man, elegantly dressed and well-versed in the qualities appreciated in the Parisian Salons. Noble simplicity was definitely not one of these.

Other critics tried to combine the concept of beauty and motionlessness with that of expression. They believed that moments of complete motionlessness in history painting possessed the greatest expressiveness. As examples they cited Poussin's Testament of Eudamidas, which shows a man reaching a decision and Romulus in David's Sabine Women, whose seemingly posed attitude allows him to throw his javelin better.

These critics could admire the moving representation of a terrible situation in Delacroix's Massacre of Chios, but not his drawing. Although he defended Delacroix, the young art critic Thiers believed that every subject, like every nationality and every period in history could be identified with its own kind of ideal. Scheffer and Gérard had realized this whereas Delacroix had failed to do so. Thus, in his thinking on the relativity of beauty, Thiers went even further than Stendhal. He was unique among critics in believing David's greatest quality to be not accurate drawing but his sense of grand style. In Thiers' thinking nobility of bearing did not depend purely on strict adherence to David's drawing methods but was a quality compatible with any subject and manner. In this way Thiers paved the way for the acceptance of a wide variety of styles and genres. This tolerance became official artistic policy once the July Monarchy had become established.

Most critics concerned with the future of the French School in 1824 tried both to maintain the status of David's work as the standard and to harmonize Delécluze's, and ultimately Lessing's, views with those of Stendhal. They defended the School against charges of copying, motionlessness and theatricality and claimed that the study of the beauty and elegance to be found in ordinary human beings, the love of freedom, and the search for expression and tension were its strong points. These were the qualities which had won David his place as the founder of the modern French School around 1780.

Diderot and other eighteenth-century theorists had believed that accentuated mime and facial expression were the most important indicators of a person's state of mind but by 1824 these were widely condemned as unnatural. The requirement that history painting be highly expressive and sometimes didactic was now increasingly coupled to Winckelmann's and Lessing's idea that muted expression and simplicity of bearing were convincing and elevating. We must conclude that both in their views on contemporary and recent art and in their interpretations of the works of leading art theorists, many of the critics of 1824 were seeking to occupy middle ground.

NOTES

1. In Le Pausanias français (1806). Cited in Rubin (213), who supports Chaussard's theory.

2. Coll. Deloynes (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale), vol. XXI, no. 597: 756. Cited in Germer and Kohle (179).

3. In this explanation, provided for all the painting's viewers when it was first on show in 1799, the painter tries to forestall criticism of the nudity of his figures by mentioning many examples of classical works of art showing naked figures. He concludes: "...mon intention en faisant ce tableau, était de peindre les moeurs antiques avec une telle exactitude que les Grecs et les Romains, en voyant mon ouvrage, ne m'eussent pas trouvé étranger à leurs coutumes." J.L. David, "Exposition du tableau des Sabines, au palais national des sciences et des arts, celle de la ci-devant Académie d'Architecture, par le citoyen David, membre de l'Institut national," J.L.J. David, Le peintre Louis David, 1748-1825: Souvenirs & documents inédits (Paris, 1880) 358.

4. F. Guizot, De l'état des beaux-arts en France, et du Salon de 1810 (Paris, 1810), and Essai sur les limites qui séparent et les liens qui unissent les beaux-arts (Paris, 1816). Both publications were reprinted in Guizot, Etudes sur les beaux-arts en général (Paris, 1852).

5. "...dans les tableaux où domine l'imitation de la sculpture, les figures paraissent isolées, sans rapports impérieux et directs avec celles qui les entourent, et revêtues ainsi d'un caractère théâtral..." Guizot (1816, repr. 1852: 133). In Guizot (1810, repr. 1852: 13) The Sabine Women is specifically criticized for this flaw.

6. Guizot's views can be compared to those held by the Schlegel brothers. In several of his writings A.W. Schlegel took care to distinguish between the features of sculpture, classical art, and painting, modern or Romantic art, the first being preoccupied with form only, and the second with "die ganze sichtbare Erscheinung durch einen optischen Schein". Drawing, chiaroscuro and colour were the painter's tools and they made expression and composition possible. The teachings of Winckelmann and Mengs were blamed for the fusion of features from painting and sculpture in the painting of Schlegel's time. In an essay on the Salon of 1802, "Die Pariser Kunstausstellung vom Jahre XI," in the magazine Europa, ed. Friedrich Schlegel, 1(1803): 89-107, its anonymous author warned against the imitation of the theatre which he saw as one of the most important flaws of French history painting. Artists should take their subjects from life and reality, not the stage. Like A.W. Schlegel he believed that modern French painting depended too heavily on sculpture. The magazine Europa was very important for the development of art theory during the early nineteenth century.

See E. Sulger-Gebing, A.W. und F. Schlegel in ihrem Verhältnisse zur bildenden Kunst, mit ungedruckten Briefen und Aufsätzen A.W. Schlegels (1897; Hildesheim, 1976) 98 and 112.

Although Sulger-Gebing attributed the article in Europa, signed ***ch, to Friedrich Schlegel, H. Chélin, Friedrich Schlegels 'Europa', Thesis 'Europa': Une revue éditée par Friedrich Schlegel, Metz U, 1977 (Frankfurt a.M. 1981) 82, believes its author to be Ludwig Lombach, a German painter living in Paris and studying in David's workshop. He suggests that the ideas expressed in this article are close enough to those of Friedrich Schlegel to make Sulger-Gebing's mistake understandable. If the

article was really written by Lombach, this would further disprove the notion that David's School was monolithic in character, as art critics like Stendhal believed.

7. Guizot (1810: 129-141).

8. "Cette dimension, qui convient seule aux représentations d'une nature commune et naïve, convient mieux qu'aucune autre aux scènes composées de personnages d'un genre noble mais qui sont nos contemporains, vêtus de l'habit moderne, et auxquels on ne peut, à cause de ce vêtement, prêter les formes idéales et grandioses sous lesquelles les personnages de l'antiquité nous ont été en quelque sorte transmis par les artistes." Guizot (1810, repr. 1852: 77-78).

9. Guizot (1810, repr. 1852: 64-65).

10. See for example Maxime du Camp, Les beaux-arts à l'exposition universelle de 1855: Peinture, sculpture; France, Angleterre, Belgique, Danemark, Suède et Norvège, Suisse, Hollande, Allemagne, Italie (Paris, 1855) 4-5.

11. See for example P.A. Coupin, "Exposition des tableaux en 1827, premier article," Revue encyclopédique 36(1827): 526, and A. Thiers, "Direction des arts et particulièrement de la peinture en France," Revue européenne 1(1824): 36.

12. "Cette envie de faire de convenable, de trop bien arranger ses figures, a entraîné bien loin M. Colson en peignant Agamemnon méprisant les sinistres prédictions de Cassandre. Il est facile de voir dans ce tableau (...) ce qu'un appareil théâtral peut avoir de choquant dans une peinture. Agamemnon, Clytemnestre et un autre personnage placé près du trône arrondissent la scène avec un art qui fait honte aux acteurs du Théâtre Français." Delécluze, "Exposition du Louvre 1824; IV," Journal des débats 11 September 1824: 3.

13. For developments in stage composition during the Restoration see M. Carlson, "Hernani's Revolt from the Tradition of French Stage Composition," Theatre Survey 13(1972): 1-27.

14. "Les convenances et les conventions de l'art théâtral et de celui de la peinture sont complètement différentes entre elles. Le peintre doit être rigoureusement vrai dans le geste..." Delécluze, "Salon de 1822; X," Le Moniteur universel (1822): 851.

15. See Stendhal, "Salon de 1824," repr. in Mélanges d'art, établissement du texte et préfaces par Henri Martineau (Paris, 1932) 47-48. The Salon first featured in the Journal de Paris et les départements.

16. Delécluze, Les beaux-arts dans les deux mondes en 1855 (Paris, 1856) 20-21.

17. See for example Delécluze, "Salon de 1831; VIII," Journal des débats 25 May 1831: 1.

18. "...le style propre aux compositions anecdotiques et contemporaines où le luxe frivole des accessoires envahit la place que la représentation de l'homme devrait occuper..." Delécluze (1856: 8).

19. "L'habitude constante de voiler tout le corps de l'homme, a fait contracter à la longue l'habitude de ne plus chercher le beau, et l'expression des sentimens de l'âme, que sur le visage et sur les mains seulement... L'expression, dans la plupart des ouvrages des modernes, dégénère donc en grimace..." Delécluze, Journal des débats 25 May 1831: 1.

20. "...la scène (...) est tellement obstruée qu'on n'entrevoit pas la possibilité de pénétrer au-delà du premier plan." C.P. Landon, Salon de 1824, I (Paris, 1824) 54.

21. See J.L.J. David (468)

22. "C'est une grande erreur que de croire que l'art est rien, ce n'est pas par la nature des sujets

que l'on a choisis que l'on devient peintre d'histoire, mais par la manière dont on les traite." Delécluze, "Exposition du Louvre; XXII: MM.H. Vernet, Ingres, Hersent etc," Journal des débats 12 December 1824: 3.

23. Delécluze, "Exposition du Louvre; II," Journal des débats 5 September 1824: 2-3.

24. See Boime (1980: 23-25).

25. Delécluze, "Salon de 1827; XII," Journal des débats 21 March 1828: 2.

26. Delécluze, "Exposition du Louvre; III: MM Scheffer, Gérard, Mme Hersent, Delaroche, Saint-Evre," Journal des débats 8 September 1824: 2-3.

27. Delécluze, Journal des débats 8 September 1824: 3-4.

28. The dispute was analyzed by David Wakefield in his article "Stendhal and Delécluze at the Salon of 1824," The Artist and the Writer in France: Essays in Honour of Jean Seznec, ed. by F. Haskell, A. Levi and R. Shackleton (Oxford, 1974) 76-85.

29. "(Shakespeare)...m'amène de réflexion en réflexion à conclure que tout compte fait de ses qualités et de ses deffauts l'homme est bien peu de chose. Les poésies d'Homère me laissoient toujours dans l'esprit l'idée d'un type perfectionnée." Delécluze, "Résumé de l'exposition de 1824 et 1827," Ms. in Collection des feuilletons, Bibliothèque historique de la ville de Paris, no. 10708: 7.

30. "...le système shakespearien purement littéraire, est contraire au développement naturel de la statuaire, et presque toujours de la peinture. On supporte sur la scène le personnage de Richard III violent, fourbe, rusé et goguenard; on s'habitue même à ses difformités physiques, parce que la longueur d'une action théâtrale et la multiplicité des incidens distraient le spectateur de la laideur du personnage;

mais que l'on essaie de peindre Richard III autrement que sous un point de vue comique, et l'on verra ce que c'est que certaines vérités en peinture: si vous voulez vous convaincre encore mieux de ce que j'avance, faites une statue de ce héros!" Delécluze, "Exposition du Louvre; X: MM. Scheffer, Delaroche, Delacroix, Sigalon, Fragonard, Picot, Drolling, Rouget," Journal des débats 9 October 1824: 3.

31. Delécluze, Journal des débats 9 October 1824: 3.

32. D. Diderot, Lettre sur les sourds et muets à l'usage de ceux qui entendent et qui parlent (1751; Amsterdam, 1772) 78.

33. Delécluze, "Salon de 1831; IX," Journal des débats 26 May 1831: 1, and Delécluze, Le Moniteur universel (1822): 851.

34. D. Johnson (1989: 94), draws our attention to this feature of Diderot's descriptions of facial expressions and gestures in Greuze's paintings. She mentions Diderot's description of the ungrateful son in his article on The Ungrateful Son (Salon of 1765). "Le jeune libertin est entouré de l'aînée de ses soeurs, de sa mère et d'un de ses petits frères. Sa mère le tient embrassé par le corps; le brutal cherche à s'en débarrasser, et la repousse du pied." (Source Diderot, Salons II: 156) The young man's behaviour characterizes his personality.

35. Stendhal, Histoire de la peinture en Italie, seule édition complète entièrement revue et corrigée (1817; Paris, 1860) 196.

36. "...Le public sent si bien, quoique si confusément, l'existence du beau idéal moderne, qu'il a fait un mot pour lui, l'élégance." Stendhal (1860: 278).

37. "...tâchons de faire de la bonne peinture

moderne. Les Grecs aimaient le nu; nous, nous le voyons jamais, et je dirai bien plus, il nous répugne." Stendhal (1932: 21).

38. Stendhal (1932: 46).

39. Stendhal (1860: 206-207), (1932: 43).

40. "C'est que le dessin correct, savant, imité de l'antique, comme l'entend l'Ecole de David, est une science exacte, de même nature que l'arithmétique, la géométrie, la trigonométrie etc..." Stendhal (1932: 42).

41. "L'expression est tout l'art." Stendhal (1860: 90).

42. Stendhal (1932: 97).

43. Stendhal (1932: 141).

44. A.L.D. Martainville, "Exposition de 1824, à M. B...à Rome; VIe lettre," Le Drapeau blanc 29 September 1824: 3.

45. See Mai (18).

46. Martainville mentions Gérard, Abel de Pujol, Schnetz, Delaroche, Cogniet, Delacroix and Sigalon.

47. "Peut-il (the artist) espérer de trouver dans les modèles qu'il emploie dans son atelier cette expression, ces convenances, ces mouvemens que l'étude profonde des caractères, des données historiques permettent au célèbre acteur de lui retracer." Martainville (3).

48. "Pour la (the soul) frapper fortement, il faut que l'immobilité ne soit qu'une suspension de mouvement, comme dans le Marcus Sextus, de Guérin, et le Testament d'Eudamidas, de Poussin; cette suspension qui indique le recueillement, la concentration des idées, devient alors un des principaux mobiles de l'expression..." Martainville (3-4).

49. Lessing (180).

50. On the Choice of Hercules and the history of the preference for an instant before or after the climactic moment, see F.H. Dowley, "D'Angiviller's Grands Hommes and the Significant Moment," Art Bulletin 39(1957): 261-277.

51. In an official bulletin, printed in many newspapers, Charles X is praised for spending the record sum of 320,000 francs on art in 1824 alone. See for example the Journal de Paris of 19 December 1824: 3. Sfeir-Semler (73) mentions a sum of F. 156,800 spent on acquiring works of art exhibited at the Salon of that year. Other years of record spending on art were 1814 (the year in which the Bourbons returned to France) and 1831 and 1833 (the first two Salons held during the July Monarchy) (69).

52. Martainville, "Exposition de 1824; IIIe lettre," Le Drapeau blanc 6 September 1824: 2.

53. See for example P.A. Coupin, Revue encyclopédique 34 (1827): 57.

54. "Semblables à la glace fidèle, les arts et les lettres réfléchissent ce qui existe; ils sont le tableau exacte, ils sont même, pour ainsi dire, une émanation de la Société, et leur destination est de reproduire les émotions qu'ils y ont puisées." Coupin, "Notice sur l'exposition des tableaux en 1824; I," Revue encyclopédique 23(1824): 552.

55. David painted "...les circonstances extraordinaires, le grandiose, le merveilleux, dont l'avaient environné les croyances populaires des Romains, la politique de leurs chefs, le talent de leurs historiens et de leurs poètes. L'imitation servile que vous demandez à la peinture historique ne peut se rencontrer que dans les 'tableaux de genre'". J.R.A., "Quelques vues sur l'Ecole de David, et sur les principes de la peinture historique", Revue

encyclopédique 34(1827): 586.

56. J.R.A. (588).

57. "Cette réforme ne se proposait point un objet spécial et défini; elle aspirait à quelque chose de bien autrement large, à l'affranchissement de l'art de peindre, entravé par un système de lois et de restrictions arbitraires." Arnold Scheffer, "Salon de 1827," La Revue française 1(1827): 199.

58. J.R.A. (581).

59. See D. Johnson, (1986: 450-470).

60. H.O. Borowitz analyzes this aspect of Latouche's Salon in her article: "The Man who Wrote to David," Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art 67 (1980): 256-274, particularly 270.

61. "Mars désarmé par Vénus et les Grâces, tableau de M.David," Le Constitutionnel 11 June 1824: 3, P.A. Coupin, "Beaux-Arts, peinture: Mars désarmé par Vénus, l'Amour et les Grâces," Revue encyclopédique 22(1824): 771-772.

62. "Nous l'avons vu abandonner le beau idéal pour se rapprocher d'une nature plus positive, et ceux qui le suivaient immédiatement se sont également efforcés de reproduire le modèle dans toute sa vérité. Cette direction devait conduire et a conduit réellement quelques jeunes gens, jaloux de se faire remarquer, à quelque prix que ce fût, à abandonner toute espèce d'idéalité, de beauté même, et à rechercher une vivacité de couleur, une énergie d'expression, un caractère dramatique sans élévation comme sans noblesse. Nous trouverons des tableaux de ce genre à l'exposition." P.A. Coupin, Revue encyclopédique 23(1824): 558.

63. "Si la littérature est l'expression de la société, elle ne doit pas se borner à la peindre telle qu'elle est, et à retracer, seulement pour en perpétuer le souvenir, ses moeurs, ses travers et ses vices; il

faut encore qu'elle essaie d'exprimer ses besoins pour hâter le moment de changer ses espérances en réalité." Prospectus to vol. III of the Mercure du XIXe siècle (1823). Cited in Ch.-M. des Granges, La Presse littéraire sous la Restauration, 1815-1830 (Paris, 1907) 125.

64. A. Jal, "Mars, Vénus et les Grâces, par David," Le Mercure du XIXe siècle 5(1824): 382.

65. See R. Prochno, Joshua Reynolds (Weinheim, 1990) 27-28.

66. A. Thiers, Revue européenne 1(1824): 35-36.

67. "Ainsi le mot de 'grand style' caractérisa la nouvelle austérité de l'art, celui de 'grand dessin' le choix des formes. Le mot 'dessin' ne signifiait pas qu'on dessinait mieux que telle ou telle école, qu'on donnait une plus juste proportion aux parties de chaque corps, et qu'on en rendait plus savamment les détails anatomiques, mais qu'on leur donnait une grande noblesse de tournure..." Young artists should "...en conservant la même grandeur et le même style (...) mieux étudier la nature...conserver le pittoresque, l'idéal, la beauté de choix, avec tous les costumes, avec toutes les moeurs et tous les genres de sujets. Il ne s'agit pas d'abandonner la belle nature, mais de revenir à la nature, en choisissant la plus belle, et en même temps la vraie". A. Thiers, "Exposition de 1824," Le Globe 15 September 1824: 7.

68. See for example Thiers' comments on Gérard's Louis XIV and the King of Spain. He praises the work for its realism, which lets "l'idéal compatible avec le sujet" shine through. In this case it consists of "conserver des caractères connus, leur donner ce je ne sais quoi poétique, qui rend idéale jusqu'à la réalité même". Thiers, "Salon de mil huit cent vingt-

quatre; IV: Philippe V, par M. Gérard," Le
Constitutionnel 7 September 1824: 3.

69. Prochno (52).

70. Thiers, "Exposition de 1824, IIIième
article," Le Globe 28 September 1824: 28.

Introduction

In the last chapter we saw that critics involved in the form versus expression debate tried to find middle ground between the two sides. They proposed that a beautiful form was capable of expression or that a modern, realistic and expressive subject could display elevated beauty. Except for a few highly conservative critics like Delécluze, who defended form against expression and one or two progressives who claimed absolute freedom for artists, most critics saw the value of this juste milieu point of view.

For this chapter my starting point is the assumption that the discussion on art theoretical problems during the 1820's must be separated into two debates, one mainly concerned with drawing, form and expression and attempts to integrate new developments into generally established art theory, the other concentrating on composition, and barely able to contain new works showing innovative composition within existing rules. Only a few critics in the debate on composition were prepared, briefly, to accept that talented artists could find their own way of giving their work the unity

which tradition demanded.

Neither David's composition nor that of the young innovative artists who rose to fame during the Restoration seemed to fit with tradition. Critics entering the discussion on this aspect of painting had to choose either tradition or modernity. Compromise seemed out of the question. In the case of Delacroix in particular, it was almost inevitable that his work would be roundly condemned. His compositions were often thoroughly untraditional and in his drawing he refused to follow the middle course prescribed by the critics.

After a short, general description of the debate on the three unities of time, place and action which unfolded during the 1820's, I will focus on the question of modern composition in painting. It will become clear over the course of this study that the discussion on unity in painting was influenced not only by the corresponding debate on unity in drama and tragedy but also by the emergence of new media such as the panorama. Critics questioned whether painters should be allowed to find their inspiration in the panorama when relating complicated events with purely visual means. To some, the panorama seemed to embody the controversial idea that progress in art was possible but it was also seen to threaten the elevated status which history painting enjoyed among most French intellectuals.

The Debate on Unity of Action and Unity of Interest

A. W. von Schlegel and Mme. De Staël had already questioned the need for unity in drama during the reign of Napoleon. Schlegel in particular had popularised the notion that truly great artists, men of genius, did not obey rules but were guided by the possibilities offered by their subjects.(1) After Mme. De Staël the next important attack on the status quo was Stendhal's Racine et Shakespeare (1823). By 1827, when Victor Hugo published his Préface de 'Cromwell', many writers on the problem of the unities had reached the conclusion that Stendhal was wrong. Drama without some form of unity would fail to be understood and appreciated by its public. Although even Hugo attested to the need for unity, his critics noted only the lack of unity in his work.

In order to understand how this change of attitude between 1823 and 1827 came about, it is worth considering the discussion on the subject of unity in the pages of Le Globe. As we have seen, this newspaper was far from conservative in cultural matters and its well-researched and balanced articles influenced many intellectuals of the day who, like the journalists of Le Globe, wished to maintain France's cultural identity.

In its defence of modern drama Le Globe echoed

Schlegel's observation that of the three unities of place, time and action, only action was considered indispensable by Aristotle, the most ancient and greatest authority on the subject.(2) In seventeenth-century France there had evolved the system of interlocking unities which must all feature in a well-constructed tragedy. Racine's tragedies of passion were regarded as its most perfect examples and criticism of seventeenth-century tragedy was based mainly on these works.

In Racine's tragedies the action was reduced to the most basic elements. The writer chose to depict the tragic conflict of passions and only described the events leading to them. As a result, Racine's plays could not describe or depict historical circumstances. Phèdre relates the story of a queen who, thinking her husband Theseus dead, falls in love with her stepson Hippolytos. Hippolytos refuses her advances but, when Theseus unexpectedly returns, the queen sees the chance to exact revenge for her humiliation. Phèdre convinces Theseus that Hippolytos has tried to seduce her. The enraged king banishes Hippolytos from his palace, and calls down the wrath of the gods on his head. Racked with remorse, Phèdre takes her own life. Like Racine's other tragedies, Phèdre unfolds in a court setting among a small, closely-knit group of people, each displaying

one abstracted and exaggerated passion. The characters usually express their feelings only according to the strict rules of court etiquette. Events taking place in the outside world hardly seem to influence their actions, and when they do, we are only informed by means of a récit.

Even the French critics of the 1820's agreed that the intertwining unities were intrinsic to this kind of subject and that omitting one would unbalance the tragedy. They did not oppose Racine but rather the endless reproduction of his system and the consequent suffocating effect when imposed on an unsuitable subject. The audiences and critics of the nineteenth century wanted to see the realistic portrayal of events which had taken place in the near or distant past, in which the simple passions described by Racine might not feature at all. Doubts were raised about the usefulness of this system for depicting historical events.(3)

The contributors to Le Globe believed that the three unities should be replaced by unity tout court or by unity of interest (unité d'intérêt), suggested by the eighteenth century theorist La Motte. Schlegel popularized La Motte's view that the observer's attention should not be focused on a single hero, but that the subject as a whole should be of interest to him.(4) Diderot, who was also influenced by La Motte,

maintained that unity of action should spring from unity of interest but theorists of the 1820's defended the idea that a play could do without unity of action as long as its subject and protagonists were interesting. In this view, unity existed in the faithful portrayal of captivating and moving events and interesting personalities gaining and losing importance during the course of the play.(5) Unity was now seen as flowing from the story instead of being superimposed on it, a view which would certainly have been understood by Diderot. Thanks to the notion of unity of interest a playwright could recount as a whole anything from a day in the life of a family to a history of the world.(6) He could also portray his characters as complete human beings rather than the personification of abstracted passions.(7) Henri de Latouche had already used the concept of unity of interest to defend David in his Salon of 1819, so that we must assume that the concept was by then also thought to apply to painting. Influenced by Schlegel, Latouche asserted that David's Leonidas at Thermopylae (ill. 13) possessed unity of interest, the unity which only genius could find.(8) By unity of interest Latouche meant the depiction of an important historical event in all its detail, a definition which was retained in the theories which later appeared in Le Globe.

David began work on Leonidas in 1801, but had to put the canvas to one side in favour of paintings to commemorate Napoleon's Sacre in the years after 1804. Only when Napoleon's downfall was near did David return to Leonidas, a work undertaken on his own initiative. After the painting was finished in 1814 it remained in David's studio for several years, until it was finally acquired for the Royal collection in 1819, shortly before the publication of Latouche's Salon.(9)

The subject of Leonidas at Thermopylae was taken from the Persian wars. In 480 B.C., King Leonidas of Sparta and his army were trapped at a pass near Thermopylae by the Persian army under Xerxes. After some deliberation, Leonidas decided to go into battle for the last time, knowing that the Spartans stood no chance against the much stronger Persian army. The painting shows Leonidas pondering his decision and reflecting on its consequences, an isolated figure with an inscrutable facial expression, while around him his men are preparing themselves for their final battle. Incense, make-up and merry-making belonged to the Spartan's traditional preparations for battle. On Leonidas' orders a message was carved into a rock to remind future visitors to Thermopylae of the fate of the Spartan soldiers who died there for their country.

Critics were fond of the anecdote about Napoleon

who, on visiting David's studio, did not like the painting because of the attention which the painter paid to the feelings of the vanquished.(10) Apparently the Emperor only judged the painting more favourably when his own downfall had become inevitable. Viewers were taken aback both by the painting's subject and by its composition, which shows Leonidas completely isolated from the rest of the scene. As had been the case with David's The Sabine Women, critics generally failed to appreciate the nakedness of the soldiers who would soon have to fight for their lives. It should be added that David here introduced an element which had never been prominent in his work, that is landscape painting, in this case a rendering of the landscape near Thermopylae, which he assumed to be correct.(11)

David himself seems to have seen the painting as a step towards his goal of finding an alternative to contemporary history painting with its emphatic gesturing and peinture d'expression, and its obedience to unity of action. As we have seen, he wanted to express the feeling of devotion to one's country instead of depicting an action. Perhaps he wished to return to the composition of Poussin's Gathering of the Manna. This painting, which closely follows the old testament story of manna falling from heaven, shows despair, hope and finally joy when the truth of their miraculous

rescue becomes clear to the Israelites wandering in the desert. The viewer's interest is not focussed but spread over the whole painting; our knowledge of the story and the figure of Moses pointing heaven-wards in the central background, give it its unity. Unity of time and action in the sense understood by the "theatrical" eighteenth century are lacking here. Unlike the figure of Moses, the brooding, isolated Leonidas could not serve to link the different episodes and emotions shown in the painting Leonidas at Thermopylae into a whole. As a result, critics and the general public had difficulty understanding the work's meaning.

In the essay he wrote to defend the painting, Latouche recounts a fictitious conversation between an admirer of David and a critic of Leonidas. He chose an old member of the Academy to represent the critics and connoisseurs who were unable or unwilling to understand Leonidas at Thermopylae. During a visit to the Luxembourg Museum, where the painting was put on display in 1819, he discussed it with a young artist, one of David's pupils and an ardent defender of the work.

Naturally the old connoisseur objected to the painting's lack of unity of action. The outcome of the events at Thermopylae was clear from the start, he pointed out.(12) By choosing to depict the Spartans before going into battle, David robbed the painting of

all tension and the possibility of basing its composition around a main action. In the last hours before fighting began each man was shown totally absorbed by his own thoughts and activities, there was no protagonist to unite them. Leonidas' last fateful decision had already been taken.

The main object of the young artist, and we may safely assume of Latouche, was precisely to show that David had found a way of creating unity in this painting, to compensate for the unity of action which the old amateur so pointedly felt was absent. The young artist pointed out that the action shown in a history painting did not necessarily have to revolve around a protagonist for the work to be intelligible and interesting. David had proved this in Leonidas at Thermopylae by achieving a perfect unity of the human figures and the landscape surrounding them. Leonidas was a beautiful history painting because David had rendered the situation preceding the battle of Thermopylae with the utmost care and precision, including a variety of small and seemingly insignificant events.(13) The viewer could see with his own eyes that the Spartan position was hopeless and at the same time that the Spartan troops were all that prevented the Persian forces from overwhelming the Greek plains. To the young artist Leonidas demonstrated that unity of interest, which

meant showing all the details of an interesting and moving historical event, could allow the public to grasp a painting's meaning. The older man remained doubtful. He believed that too much realism in a history painting could reduce the clarity of its message.

Le Globe defended unity of interest when the debate on modern drama was still mainly at a theoretical stage. However it began to show doubt in the validity of its former theories when, after 1827, Victor Hugo, Dumas and other young Romantic playwrights began to publish and perform plays of a daring and innovative modernism. Hugo's Cromwell met with particularly harsh criticism. Its subject, Cromwell's attempt to become king of England after he had already risen to great political power, (a clear reference to Napoleon's career) was judged by Charles de Rémusat, Le Globe's leading literary critic to be unfit as a subject for a tragedy or drama, because it described only political events. In his view Hugo's wish to give a detailed account of these events had seduced him into writing an over-long and excessively complicated play. Rémusat followed Aristotle's assumption that action was the mainstay of drama and tragedy and he believed the action was weakened by the "esprit de l'observation" displayed by the young Romantic writers.(14)

Rémusat also complained that, in an attempt to

avoid the portrayal of abstracted passion familiar from classical tragedy, Hugo had combined several antithetical traits of character in the person of Cromwell. Instead of creating living, breathing and credible human characters, writers of the new School too often expected their audiences to believe that widely contrasting opinions and passions could exist within one person. (15)

In 1829 Ludovic Vitet's drama La mort de Henri III, août 1589, scènes historiques, loosely constructed as a series of anecdotal scenes, met with devastating criticism from Rémusat. This, the critic alleged, was not a drama but simply the re-telling of part of history. Interest and action were not focused, there was no dénouement, no clear ending. Vitet was advised to subordinate his historical knowledge to his imagination, to sacrifice some historical detail, and to pay more attention to the passions and greatness of character of the persons in the play. Rémusat's use of the word imagination is significant. This subjective artistic power became very important in the writings of later critics like Planche and Baudelaire but from Rémusat's article it becomes clear that critics who advocated a return to drama which obeyed the classical rules during the Restoration had already been influenced by the growing demand for self-expression in art which was also

visible in Hugo's writings.(16) By 1829 Rémusat had concluded that themes from modern history should be subjected to the laws of classical tragedy, in order to protect modern, Romantic drama against formlessness and exaggeration. This attitude recalls the critics who tried to reconcile the champions of form and expression, but despite the modernity of the wording, the tone used by Le Globe's contributors was more vehement than that heard in the form versus expression debate. They seemed to fear a total breakdown of art and literature should tendencies like those visible in Hugo's and Vitet's work be left unchallenged.

Le Globe repeatedly demonstrated its concern over the state of culture in Restoration France. It feared that most artists and writers were content to precisely copy the outward appearance of their subjects. Hugo's collection of poetry Les Orientales was attacked on these grounds in 1829.(17) New media, like the panorama and the diorama, competed with works of art and literature for the public's attention and artists and writers undoubtedly tried to achieve the same degree of illusionism as these forms of display. Le Globe increasingly came to abhor this state of affairs and placed its hopes for regeneration in the public in which it detected signs of boredom with the shallow culture of its time.(18) Interesting as they were as faithful

depictions of far-away places or historical events, panorama and diorama were in its view simply not art because they could not reach the spectator's soul but could only offer a substitute for reality.(19) A playwright who was too intent on faithful depiction of the customs of the past would step beyond the bounds of art, while a panorama or diorama painter who tried to achieve artistic effects in his work, like Daguerre in his Diorama of Paris, was censured for having ideas above his station.(20) The Diorama of Paris was condemned as totally useless because Parisians already knew the view it recreated. Worse still, Daguerre had tried to make the scene more interesting by using dramatic lighting effects, which did not belong in a panorama.

In the debate on form versus expression most critics accepted that the emulation of classical form and the modern demand for expression could go together to enrich art. The debate on unity in art and literature quickly seemed to take the shape of a defence of art against an invasion of non-art. It was considered to be art's function to make the great ideas and passions which inspired people understandable, whereas the new media only provoked the public's curiosity. Was this price worth paying for the requirement that art should belong to its time?

The Debate on Unity in Painting

We will now examine more closely the problem of unity in painting and the way in which it was affected by the invention of diorama and panorama. As we have seen, French commentators and other authorities on art theory had already tackled the problem of ut pictura poesis. Lessing's rejection of the theory won relatively few adherents in France. Most critics and theorists agreed with Dubos and Diderot that history painting should portray elevated, expressive and moving action in order to compete with poetry, even though it could only show one moment.

The critical work of Denis Diderot prompted the rethinking of the relationship between painting and poetry during the 1820's. Under his influence, artists of this period tried to overcome the limitations of painting and win for themselves the same possibilities for depicting long and complex stories that poetry already possessed.(21) Since I have already traced Diderot's thinking on the subject in the chapter on ut pictura poesis and expression before the 1830's, I will mention only the most important aspects here.

In his essays on art and many of his Salon-criticisms Diderot had shown himself to be an ardent defender of both unity of action and unity of interest.

Artists, he believed, should portray the most significant moment of an action, preferably a slightly unusual event from family life, which should reveal unity in a natural way. To make comprehensible to the viewer the context of the moment itself, the events which happened in the past and also the future, the inanimate objects and the gestures and facial expressions shown should all be highly significative. We have seen that Diderot admired the emphatic gesturing of the figures in Greuze's genre paintings whereas Delécluze abhorred it. Diderot believed that a painter could relate an entire family history in a series of paintings, so competing with poetry.

As explained above, related ideas are visible in Diderot's theory of the drame bourgeois. Its main attraction was its visual impact and a realism which he directed should emulate the liveliness of painted scenes, to make the public feel as though they were looking at a moving painting. As in painting, unity of action should coincide with unity of interest and both unities should emerge in an apparently natural way from the web of causes and events which made up the action of the play. To maintain this illusion of naturalness several persons on stage were frequently allowed to follow their own trains of thought, unconnected to those of the others. The spectator often understood more about

the true state of affairs than the drama's protagonists, who behaved like real-life people, bewildered by partially understood events and remarks. Only in the tableaux around which the drama was built, did the strands of the action come together. Like Greuze's genre paintings these were highly emotional scenes showing characters completely absorbed in the events taking place and unaware of the theatre audience's presence. The most important and emotional scenes in a drame bourgeois were of a predominantly visual nature. To Diderot this seemed to prove that an image could sometimes depict emotions far better than poetry.

As mentioned above, landscape paintings could often inspire the imaginative critic to feel as though walking through their limitless space, completely surrounded and overawed by the sublimity of nature and unaware of the passing of time.

Loutherbourg, a painter whom Diderot particularly admired, had won great fame in France as well as in England thanks to this interest in the sublime. In 1781 he managed to capture the attention of the London public with a miniature theatre, the Eidophysikon (ill. 14), which allowed the audience to witness successive scenes showing moving objects and realistic depictions of natural phenomena. Loutherbourg made use of lighting effects achieved with the help of screens, coloured

slides, reflectors and transparencies. He could for instance recreate Naples at sunset or a storm at sea complete with claps of thunder and forked lighting. The public's experience of a scene was therefore no longer tied to the depiction of one moment, as it would be when viewing a painting.(22)

Following the *drame bourgeois*, yet another new genre, the melodrama, appeared on the French stage at the end of the eighteenth century. Its main theme was persecuted innocence and its means of expression were highly emotional gestures and speech, and impressive reproductions of natural phenomena, like storms at sea and volcanic eruptions or scenes from history. During a later stage of its development it would often disregard the unities of time, place and action. Because of its dependence on visual effects and emotionalism it was regarded as unfit to be performed at the state-run theatres and was banished to the boulevard theatres, which catered for a non-intellectual public.(23)

When the panorama first appeared in France in 1799, the public was already used to overwhelmingly realistic depictions of stirring scenes which stretched its experience of time and place. The panorama went one step further. In its most common form it was an enormous piece of canvas, attached to a circular frame. The viewer, standing on a platform in the centre of the

circle, was completely surrounded by the depicted scene and so received the impression of commanding a view. (Ill. 15) Diderot's call for paintings which would make the viewer feel part of them seemed to be fulfilled here.(24) Popular subjects for panoramas were cities and landscapes, but panoramas depicting successive episodes from a well-known historical event were also shown. However the suitability of this kind of subject for depiction in a panorama was questioned. Extremely active scenes like battles would appear petrified when shown in full detail in a large panorama. Besides, the panorama painter could not make use of unity of action in order to give his work its meaning. Interpretation had to be left to the viewer.

The new invention was at first well received by French intellectuals. The Institut sent a committee which reported favourably on it. The panorama was regarded as an innovation which could inspire painters to perfect their art.(25) Not only could the panorama painter render scenery far more realistically than ordinary painters, but the technical difficulties he met with were also infinitely greater. To understand the Institut's attitude towards the panorama we must remember that its aims and principles were very different from those of the Institut of the Restoration period. The Institut of around 1800 believed in a free

and constructive exchange between scientists and artists, to enhance progress in art, science and society. The Institut of the Restoration, in contrast, kept art and science separate. Under the strict direction of Quatremère de Quincy, the Institut's Académie des beaux-arts no longer placed much importance on contacts between artists and scientists or society as a whole. Its foremost task was seen to be protecting the status of classical Greek sculpture as the ultimate standard in art.(26)

During the Restoration it was not only the Académie des beaux-arts which opposed the panorama but also many independent critics. By now it had gained the same disrepute as the melodrama and the diorama, developed from the Eidophysikon by Daguerre in 1822. Using a similar technique to the Eidophysikon it could show a three-dimensional scene which changed over time, such as a sunset seen through the windows of a building.(27)

All of these new media were accused of exploiting their public's hidden fears and love of sensation. There were many stories of people visiting a panorama showing a storm at sea and being seized by seasickness.(28) This frightening and often vulgar realism caused the new media to be seen as outside the sphere of art. As we have seen the influence which they were believed to have on the art of their time was deplored. This prompts the

question of whether the new media's influence can really be traced in the art of the Restoration. When Géricault exhibited his Raft of the Medusa (ill. 16) in Dublin after it had caused a stir at the Salon of 1819 he was faced with competition from several panoramas of the shipwreck of the Medusa. Afterwards he declared that it was impossible to beat the panorama in its realistic depictions of historical events. The artist expressed his wish to work on enormous stretches of wall (29), perhaps because only in this way would he be able to compete with the panorama painters.

The well-known story depicted by Géricault was that of the transport ship La Méduse, wrecked before the African coast in 1816, due to the incompetence of her officers. Most of them owed their commissions to their unquestioning support for the Bourbon régime. When the crew and passengers had to abandon ship, a large group of them were left to cling to an improvised raft, while the officers kept the ship's boats for themselves. After some time the raft was cut loose because it reduced the progress of the boats. It was adrift for nearly fourteen days, without food and water, before the few survivors were saved by a passing ship.

The painting itself does indeed seem to owe some of its most important features to panoramas and dioramas. Like them it makes its viewers feel they are present at

the scene. The huge ominous-looking raft, tilting backwards almost draws the spectator into the painting.(30) The effect is heightened by the small space left between the front of the raft and the painting's frame, the movement away from the viewer of many of the figures on the raft and the two dead bodies in front which seem to be touching the frame. These characteristics were noted by many critics in 1819. They suggested that Géricault should have painted the raft at a distance from the viewer, surrounded by the sea. This would have made the hopelessness and isolation of the Medusa's shipwrecked crew more obvious.(31) It would also have enabled Géricault to use a smaller canvas, as befitted a merely anecdotal subject. This implied that the scandal around the shipwreck was not a historical fact of great national importance justifying the choice of a large canvas. Since the characters in the story were not rendered as small figures, as was considered appropriate to genre and to subjects from recent history, their distress could hardly fail to move the viewer. The choice of a large canvas was also deemed unwise because the composition lacked so many of the features of history painting. None of the figures shown were well-known historical personalities, and no single character could be regarded as the most important.(32)

In 1824 Delacroix's Massacre of Chios (ill. 17) met

with similar criticism. Like The Raft of the Medusa it was based on a news story which had provoked public outrage rather than offering a beautified version of an event considered to be of great national importance. Its horrific subject was the slaughter of twenty-thousand inhabitants of the island Chios by the Turks in 1822, during the Greek War of Liberation. The figures depicted did not seem connected to one another and again there was no "hero", the only active person being a Turkish officer killing without showing emotion.(33) Nor was it clear which moment the painter had chosen. Were these Greek prisoners waiting to be killed, would they be sold as slaves, or were they dying of a contagious disease? Their strange facial expressions certainly gave no clues. Critics were positively shocked by the image of a man laughing while in agony.(34) Clearly Delacroix had taken the preoccupation with individualized expression already visible in David's teaching one step too far.

Critics also observed that the persons depicted seemed unaware of each other's presence and also that on either side of the scene some persons were shown incompletely, as if cut in half by the frame. This seems to make sense only if we take into account the painting's original title, Scènes du massacre de Scio. This indicates that the painting shows only a few representative examples of the many cruelties which had

been committed at Chios.(35) These scenes of suffering had been endlessly repeated there, the Greeks being defenceless and unable to resist their murderers. The problems caused by the painting's lack of unity of action were neatly summed up by Thiers. He believed that it was impossible for the viewer to divide his attention between a series of tragedies, each of equal importance.(36) Nonetheless, the France of 1824 was united in its indignation over the horrific events which had taken place in Greece, so that most critics did not believe the subject of The Massacre of Chios to be unfit for history painting per se.(37)

In fact there are important differences between the two paintings. Both meet Diderot's requirement that the figures should appear to be unaware of the viewer's presence, but The Raft of the Medusa seems to be influenced by Diderot in another way. Although the painting does not possess unity of action, everyone on the raft who can still move seems to be drawn to a common point of interest, the sail in the distance. The Massacre of Chios has no point of interest, being dominated by apathy and indifference. Although the two paintings have much in common, Géricault's work seems to conform more closely to eighteenth-century theory because unity within the painting is created in a natural way. The Massacre of Chios can only be said to

possess a certain degree of unity of interest because the tragic events shown prompt the spectator's compassion. Yet the critics' charge of lack of unity is also true for The Raft of the Medusa. None of the persons on the raft deserves our attention and compassion more than any of the others. It is impossible to choose between the hopeful group in the background and the apathic figures in the foreground. Although Géricault clearly intended to paint a péripétie, the painting does not make clear whether the hope of the group waving to the ship in the distance is justified. Many ships passed the raft without noticing it during its terrible voyage. In contrast, Poussin's Gathering of the Manna, which undoubtedly inspired Géricault, does not leave any doubt that salvation is finally at hand.

Many critics writing at the time when Delacroix's and Géricault's paintings were first on view recognized that they left a deep impression on the public. However, many of them wondered whether this emotion reflected the power of art or whether it was simply the shock of confrontation with harsh, unsanitised reality. (38)

Significantly, David's Leonidas again crops up in the discussion on the merits of the history paintings which appeared at the Salon of 1824, this time in a Salon review by Alphonse Rabbe. This critic had been a pupil in David's workshop around 1800, and he was also a

friend of Henri de Latouche, who had defended the painting in 1819. Rabbe's Salon of 1824 was published in the republican newspaper Le Courrier français. (39) Rabbe also pointed to the work's supposed lack of unity of action.

Rabbe, who as a republican did not feel the need to exclude David's Revolutionary and pre-Revolutionary paintings from praise, believed that all his works held great dramatic interest. David chose subjects which enabled the viewer to ponder the circumstances leading to the event depicted, and particularly on what the future held for the persons shown in the painting. Rabbe seems to use the concept of unity of interest, which was introduced by Latouche, in his discussion of Leonidas. The critic writing in 1824 believed that paintings should achieve unity and dramatic interest by evoking not only the immediate past and future through unity of action but also the historical, cultural and religious context of the event shown. It was Rabbe's conviction that the viewer could in this way feel surrounded by events which were not in themselves complete, but which formed part of a far greater whole, or "space" to use his term, which was not explicitly shown, but only suggested to the imagination. (40)

The Oath of the Horatii, Brutus and Leonidas were classified by Rabbe as "works having dramatic interest".

In his analysis of Leonidas, Rabbe defended the view that the painting possessed dramatic interest thanks to the viewer's knowledge of what was soon to happen. All of the brave Spartan soldiers would soon die, as their code of honour demanded. One had only to see Leonidas' expression and the vulnerable nakedness of all the Spartans, to realize this. Rabbe stressed that it was not the display of virtue which gave the painting its dramatic interest, but the prospect of death. In his view the painter could have achieved the same interest in a far less noble subject, that of Roman gladiators going into the arena. Such a scene would invite the viewer to ponder the way in which the gladiators would die, purely for the pleasure of "le peuple roi".

Rabbe did not identify dramatic interest in any of the paintings displayed by David's pupils at the Salon of 1824. He saw this quality only in a painting by Sigalon, a painter as controversial as Delacroix. His Locuste (ill. 18) was based on a few lines from Racine's Britannicus in which Britannicus' murderer Narcissus recounts his visit to the witch Locuste to buy poison. To demonstrate the effectiveness of the poison she gave it to a slave, who died immediately in Narcissus' presence. Sigalon depicted Narcissus and Locuste watching the dying slave fixedly. Most critics writing in 1824 still thought that this scene could only be

suitably related in a récit. Rabbe praised the painting for suggesting both Britannicus' inevitable death and the crimes of Nero, during whose reign the murder took place. (41)

Rabbe showed himself to be a defender not only of unity of interest but also of the idea that a painting which showed this unity would look like a piece taken from a larger space. Again the overwhelming experience of the panorama which refused to keep its distance from the spectator seems to have left its mark. What is even more striking in Rabbe's criticism is his readiness to do without a hero at the centre of the action. He wanted to use unity of interest to show mankind subject to historical circumstances and the demands of culture and religion. Ultimately this enabled him to accept paintings and subjects which make the observer watch with fascination the helplessness of people about to die. In these paintings even the faint hope which The Raft of the Medusa leaves us is absent. The hero as exemplum virtutis, so characteristic of eighteenth-century art and literature, no longer appealed to Rabbe. He found an alternative for its theatricality in the powerful drama of ordinary lives, in which the viewer could easily imagine himself. To Rabbe the emotional appeal of these works easily exceeded anything which Greuze had to offer.

In his compte-rendu of artistic developments during the Restoration which was published in 1831, Delécluze accused the young painters of the day of imitating the panorama in order to be free to depict a succession of ideas.(42) The artists' struggle to overcome the limitations of painting had finally been recognized by a leading critic. Delécluze did not hesitate to tie their efforts to the emergence of new media, which he and other critics were not prepared to accept. Their arguments were the same as those of theatre critics. Art should not cater to vulgar tastes by satisfying curiosity about historical detail, and at its worst, by feeding its audience on sheer sensation. Although painters did not have the same freedom as poets, they could and indeed should imitate them in making the viewer grasp the underlying meaning of an event or the heroism attached to it. To achieve this, painting, like drama and tragedy, could not do without unity of action. Apparently Delécluze believed that the didacticism which he saw as the main feature of Shakespearian art had driven artists to portray gratuitously horrific scenes, without taking the trouble to explain their essence, or the passions driving the people involved. Delécluze would never accept as valuable or meaningful history paintings which attempted no more than the realistic depiction of scenes from the endless litany of horrors

which critics like Rabbe believed history to be.

Géricault died in 1824 and it is not obvious which direction his work would have taken had he lived longer. Delacroix continued to bombard the public with history paintings judged even more overwhelming and repulsive than The Massacre of Chios, to the extent that in later years critics were apt to credit this work with idealization and unity almost worthy of a place in the best French tradition. Many felt that Géricault, had he but lived, would have become a strong and inspiring leader of the French School. Republican critics and advocates of "social" art especially admired The Raft of the Medusa. Michelet's interpretation of it as the shipwreck of French society is well known and Charles Blanc's description of The Raft of the Medusa in his Histoire des peintres français au dix-neuvième siècle (1845) is another example. This critic was unimpressed by most developments taking place in French art during the 1820's and 1830's, and did not include artists who were still alive when he wrote this book, so that Delacroix was hardly mentioned. Blanc, an ardent republican and socialist chose Géricault as the hero of modern painting. The difference between David and Géricault he believed was one of form only. Like David and every other great French artist of the past, Géricault possessed the ability to endow his subjects

with poetry and to elevate them to heroic stature.(43) The Raft of the Medusa had by now entered the realms of myth and was credited with the deep significance and elevation which could be expected in history painting. We must assume that the work came to be accorded this lofty status, not only because it recounted a significant and shameful episode in French history, but also because its claims to unity had always been greater and its place in French tradition more obvious than those of many contemporary history paintings. Géricault, who admired both David and Gros greatly, wanted to emulate the Davidian School in history painting while at the same time renewing it. He expressed deep admiration for the way in which David had depicted the human figure in Leonidas,(44) and indeed drew it well himself.

Le Moniteur's art critic Fabien Pillet had already tried to rehabilitate The Massacre of Chios during the 1830's.(45) The critic contrasted the painting with Delacroix's later works, which he believed increasingly showed bad taste, bad composition and poor drawing.

Pillet was not the only critic to note this development in Delacroix's work. Delacroix, they claimed, had taken art in a different direction to the one in which Géricault would have led it, dooming history painting to ultimately lose its clarity and meaning altogether.(46) Their only hope was that Delacroix's

apparent inability to attract talented pupils would prevent him creating a powerful, lasting new School. In order to understand this point of view we will look more closely at a few of the critical articles written on Delacroix's work during the Restoration.

The Problem of Lack of Meaning in Modern History Painting

Delacroix had his first real success as an artist with Dante and Virgil in the Underworld, (ill. 19) taken from Dante's Divina Commedia, (Inferno, Canto VIII) and first exhibited in 1822. The subject and the way in which Delacroix treated it met with wide acclaim. Although taken from modern, i.e. non-classical, literature, the subject was a lofty one. The painting was clearly centred around the two figures in the boat, and Delacroix had taken care not to overdo his rendering of the fearful scenes of Dante's underworld. His manner was based not on David's drawing but on that of various artists from colourist Schools, (for example the influence of Rubens's Medici cycle can be seen in the lost souls trying to climb into the boat), but he still managed to make the scene, the figures in it and their costume look rather classical. Indeed it was suggested that the later juste milieu artists had imitated and

vulgarized the Delacroix of Dante and Virgil.(47)

As we have seen, Delacroix quickly left the path which would have led him to undisputed fame. The Massacre of Chios attracted criticism of bad drawing, lack of unity and frightening and incomprehensible peinture d'expression. He was accused of packing so much misery into the foreground of the work that the public could hardly be expected to take it in, and of attempting mannered and unnatural-looking colouristic effects, only to present himself as the greatest innovative talent of the 1820's. Only a few critics, notably Arnold Scheffer, were prepared to defend his demand for absolute freedom in this and subsequent works.

Nevertheless, The Massacre of Chios was put on permanent show in the Luxembourg collection of modern painting, and Delacroix received commissions for subjects taken from antiquity and the Bible. It was doubtless hoped that Delacroix would mend his ways when tackling two traditional subjects for history painting. Unfortunately, he did not. Christ in the Olive Garden (ill. 20) was criticized for the figures of the two sleeping disciples on the left, hardly recognizable in the murky darkness and only half shown.(48) Its other feature which attracted criticism was the group of three angels on the right, who it was believed Delacroix had

copied from an English print, without taking the trouble to adapt them to his composition.(49)

The Emperor Justinian composing his laws, which had been commissioned for the conference room of the Conseil d'Etat, met with a mixed reception. The Death of Sardanapalus (ill. 21), another painting based on a subject from antiquity and chosen by Delacroix himself, caused uproar when it made its long-awaited appearance at the end of the Salon of 1827. This painting was based on a tragedy by Byron. It showed the Assyrian king who, having been besieged by rebels in his palace for two years decides to burn himself together with everything most dear to him. He therefore has a pyre built of all his treasures, and takes his place on top of it, calmly looking on as his women and horses are being killed by his soldiers.

Critics and public alike were shocked by this scene of undiluted horror and sensualism. Not only Delacroix' choice of subject but also the painting's composition were condemned. It was described as being so badly composed that one could hardly see where the scene was taking place. Objects and people seemed to be scattered throughout.(50) This painting was the first example in Delacroix's oeuvre of a work calculated to make a great sensual and emotional impact on its public, without any attempt at edification. This and later works led

Delécluze to accuse Delacroix of being a cynical Byronic Romanticist.

The work is similar to Leonidas, Locuste and The Massacre of Chios in that the viewer understands that the death of all the characters shown is imminent and unavoidable, and that he is only seeing part of the frightening events taking place in Sardanapalus' palace. The scene seems to form part of a panoramic continuum of time and space, in the same way as its great predecessors. However, this scene of monstrous and senseless atrocity brought home the shortcomings of Delacroix's choice of composition principles to viewers of his own time.

If a painting showed a scene of historical significance, critics observed, the fact that the work suggested more than it actually showed could serve to deepen the viewer's understanding of the event, particularly because many historical events did not lend themselves to being reduced to fit unity of time, place and action in theatre or in painting.(51) Where panorama-like effects were used in combination with insignificant subjects, they would only give the viewer the sense that the events shown, shocking and overwhelming as they were, formed part of an endless and meaningless sequence. Critics saw this as a failing in The Massacre of Chios, but felt that it was alleviated

in this painting by the subject which was of great interest to the public who sympathized with the oppressed Greeks. The Death of Sardanapalus in contrast could not play on such sympathies and was met only with disgust.

The Execution of the Doge Marino Faliero (ill. 22), a painting finished shortly before The Death of Sardanapalus and also based on a drama by Byron, may equally serve to illustrate this problem. During the nineteenth century, the death of Marino Faliero in 1355 was not, in all quarters, believed to be the result of heroic or virtuous behaviour on his part. In fourteenth-century Venice, the Doge and the common people had lost all their power to an oligarchy consisting of noblemen, whose members misbehaved scandalously. During a party at Faliero's house a young nobleman called Steno insulted the Doge's much younger wife. The powerful Council of Forty, of which Steno was one of the leaders, sentenced the nobleman to a month's imprisonment. Faliero considered this far too light a punishment for the insult to his wife's virtue but his protests went unheeded. The enraged Doge turned to the people, conspiring to increase his own power and to widen democracy in Venice. When he was betrayed, Faliero was sentenced to death and executed on the Giant Staircase where he had taken the oath of allegiance to the

Venetian Republic. Although the corruption of the Venetian nobility was not questioned by nineteenth-century accounts of the case, it was also suggested that the rage and resentment of an old man had been the main reason for the conspiracy and that political aims took second place to revenge for Faliero. Moreover, only a few months before the conspiracy the Doge had secured peace with Genoa, yet he was prepared to risk a civil war within his own war-weary city.(52)

Ludovic Vitet, who succeeded Adolphe Thiers as the art critic of Le Globe, wrote by far the most vehement criticism of Delacroix's Marino Faliero.(53) Like Rémusat's unfavourable reaction to the dramas of the time, Vitet's articles form a clear indication of the newspaper's return to a more conservative standpoint. Ironically, Vitet's dramas were attacked by Rémusat for the same flaws which the former identified in Delacroix's work. Vitet's ideas on painting were clearly more rigid than those on theatre. In this he shared the position of many contemporary critics who could not accept the artists' wish to free painting from its restrictions. Vitet complained that Marino Faliero resembled a scene by the famous writer of melodrama D'Arlincourt. The reason for this comparison was that Delacroix had given the Giant Staircase a central place in his painting, so that it resembled a stage set for a

melodrama. The white surface separates the group of Venetian dignitaries at the top from the body of the executed Doge, the public executioner, and the people being ushered in to see the body at the bottom. One of the dignitaries displays the executioner's sword to the people looking up at him, reputedly saying the words: "The sword of justice has killed the traitor".

From this original composition and Vitet's accusation we must conclude that Delacroix had imitated the overwhelming visual recreations of historical events which made melodrama so compelling and which had also inspired the last scenes of Byron's play. Instead of taking a human being, Faliero, as the painting's protagonist, Delacroix made the staircase fulfil this role. It emphasizes the distance between the executed Doge and the people of his own class who have cast him out.

But Vitet found more to say about the painting. He was particularly annoyed by the expressionless faces of the noblemen. He suggested that their apparent lack of emotion at the execution was caused by the fact that they included some of Faliero's fellow conspirators, in mortal fear of betraying their feelings. The work would have been infinitely more attractive if Delacroix had made use of the scope available to the history painter for creating contrasting episodes, which would have

served both to lessen the horrific effect of this scene and to clarify it. Significantly, Vitet proposed the addition of an old statesman, instructing his two sons on their duties to the Republic and the fate which awaited traitors.(54) This would have helped in the interpretation of this painting which showed a row of motionless, expressionless figures, looking down on one of their own who has been executed only seconds before. Although Delacroix may have sympathized with the Doge and the people, or may have meant his picture as a comment on the fate of those who refused to obey a code imposed upon them, to critics of the 1820's his interpretation of the story of Marino Faliero was not sufficiently clear.

Vitet was also upset by the fact that Delacroix had made the whole painting look like a pastiche on a work of the Venetian School. He had made no attempt to beautify the ugly Venetian faces, nor had he softened the lack of elegance and garish colour of Venetian costume. The wall paintings, escutcheons and banners in the background combined to make the painting, whose subject was taken from the Middle-Ages, look like a miniature from this period.

Vitet's essay on The Execution of the Doge Marino Faliero sums up the shortcomings of the painting as seen by viewers of the time. Technically, it was a

painstaking imitation of Venetian painting, including all its deficiencies. Although the scene seemed frightening enough at first sight, the spectator was offered no help in interpreting and reflecting upon it, so that its impression on him was bound to be short-lived. The "effect" of this kind of painting was once described as that of "a pistol fired in a cellar".(55)

During the 1820's, critics were confronted by novelists, playwrights and painters who devoted all their energy to rendering historical detail correctly, and refused to choose subjects which invited the public to reflect on the great deeds of history. Small wonder then that these observers believed that French culture, particularly the great traditions of tragedy and history painting would soon be lost in triviality, if writers and artists did not learn to bring seriousness and the ideal back into their work. Since history painters anyhow had little room to show the deeper meaning and complexity of their subjects, as compared to poets, their tendency to concentrate on the imitation of foreign Schools and historical detail would inevitably lead to paintings like The Execution of the Doge Marino Faliero, gaudy but devoid of meaning.

Paul Delaroche was the only painter to enjoy, temporarily, almost universal praise for his history paintings, only for later critics to reject them as

lacking deeper meaning and ideal.(56) This artist, part of the group which became accepted in 1827, because they had adopted a juste milieu approach, became a member of the Academy in 1832, representing the centre and left in French painting. Although his attitude was probably a significant reason for his election, no doubt the popularity of his history paintings, shown at the Salon of 1831, was just as important.

These paintings appealed to the public which had lived through the turbulent days of July 1830. Although their subjects were taken from seventeenth-century history, two of them seemed to relate to the Revolution which the French had recently witnessed. The most important was Cromwell Viewing the Body of Charles I (ill. 23), based on Guizot's account of this event in his Histoire de la Révolution d'Angleterre (1826-1827) and Chateaubriand's Les quatre Stuarts (1828). The painting depicts only two persons, Cromwell and the decapitated king, who is already in his coffin. Cromwell, representing the new, non-aristocratic regime, is roughly and carelessly dressed while the dead king is still wearing some of the finery of a nobleman. As a sign of his defeat Charles I is not lying in state, his simple coffin rests on two chairs. Cromwell surveys the body with an impassive look, behind which many thoughts may lie hidden. It was reported that the only thought

which Cromwell expressed was that the king might still have had a long life ahead of him, his body being robust and strong.(57)

This motionless and almost expressionless scene was believed to represent the drama in the confrontation of the vanquished old regime with the new.(58) Another of Delaroche's paintings was admired for a similar reason. Cinq-Mars is based on Alfred de Vigny's novel of the same title. Its subject is the struggle of the French nobility against Louis XIII, who like his son tried to rob them of their independence and power. Against the background of a beautiful summer evening the painting shows the two noblemen Cinq-Mars and De Thou, captives of Richelieu, who are being brought to prison for execution in a boat attached to the vessel of the cardinal. This simple scene was seen as containing a whole history or novel.(59)

The Children of Edward IV (ill. 24) shows an episode from fifteenth century English history, although Delaroche was inspired more by Shakespeare's version of it in Richard III than by historical fact. Richard, Duke of Gloucester has schemed his way to the throne after the death of his brother, Edward IV. To rid himself of Edward's sons he has them locked in the Tower and murdered. The painting shows the two princes, who have been reading a prayerbook, clinging to each other in

their dark cell whilst a ray of light shining in through the partly open door announces the arrival of their murderers. As in Cromwell, the simplicity of the scene links the painting to genre, while its size is more typical for a history painting. In 1831 this and Delaroche's other works received acclaim because, by simply showing an event as it happened, they made the public feel almost that they were actually present at the scene.(60) This was seen as the most perfect way to make the public understand the lessons to be drawn from history.(61)

However, as euphoria over the July Revolution faded, so did interest in Delaroche's paintings. The artist's status as a history painter was questioned because his work was seen to lack inspiration and thought.(62) Delaroche was also attacked over his exact renderings of historical costume and furniture. These were given so much emphasis that critics accused Delaroche of attaching the same importance to them as to the human beings shown.(63)

Delaroche's fall from grace with the critics was hastened by his Execution of Lady Jane Grey (ill. 25), first shown in 1834. King Edward VI, who died childless in 1553, named Lady Jane Grey as his successor. After a reign lasting only a few days, Jane was defeated and charged with high treason by Mary Tudor, who as Edward's

sister had a greater right to the throne and was supported by the people. The painting shows the young, attractive Jane Grey kneeling before the executioner's block, beautifully dressed, surrounded by ladies-in-waiting as perfectly dressed and as distressed as she, and by the male representatives of power. Although the painting appealed to the public greatly, many critics such as Planche, Gautier and Laviron did not like it. Their criticism of Delaroche implied criticism of the *juste milieu* attitude in politics as well as in art. They believed that Delaroche owed his success to the beautiful historical costumes, the over-neat depiction of this horrible event and, above all, to the implausibly pitying and courteous attitude of the men, including the executioner.(64) They wondered whether Lady Jane Grey really bore some guilt or was simply the victim of her power-hungry relatives. Was Delaroche on her side or did he favour Mary, the legitimate queen? Delaroche's painting with its weak heroine certainly did not make this clear.(65) Although the conflict still going on between the Orléanist and the Bourbon (legitimist) parties may have influenced this judgment, the critics apparently thought the subject no more than an excuse to show a sentimental and sensational scene, in which a beautiful young girl is victimized.

To Delaroche's critics this piece proved that a

history painting could not do without a hero, whose inner life was made visible, and must induce viewers to reflect on the deeper truth underlying the scene. No display of historical knowledge could compensate for a lack of elevation.

The Société libre des beaux-arts and the Saint-Simonists

Although most critics writing during the 1820's would have been indignant about artists seeking inspiration in melodrama, panorama and diorama, a few had high hopes of artists who had studied the latter two media.

Throughout this period the liberal journalist Charles Farcy maintained that the decline visible in the art of his time was caused by artists' lack of technical knowledge. In his magazine Le Journal des artistes, founded in 1827, he attacked the general sloppiness in the execution of work by the young, innovative artists of the day. Delacroix's Christ in the Olive Garden and The Death of Sardanapalus were subjected to vicious criticism on this count.(66) Over the years, Farcy managed to attract enough supporters to found an organization to further his ideas. His Société libre des beaux-arts came into being shortly after the Revolution of 1830, and set about seeking favour with the new

government.(67)

The membership of the Société did not include the most famous or controversial artists of the day. Abel de Pujol, who became a member of the Académie des beaux-arts in 1835 was probably the best-known of the painters who supported the Société. Like most members, he defended classicism in more or less modified form, and tried to honour David's memory. Other relatively well-known members were the panorama painter Daguerre, Paillot de Montabert, writer of an important handbook on painting, the Traité complet de la peinture, Lenoir, the antiquarian and founder of the Musée des monuments français, and the architect Hittorf, who redesigned the Place de la Concorde during the 1830's, and who also ran a panorama-building. Many of the Société's members, including Abel de Pujol and Paillot de Montabert, had been David's pupils.

The Société's aim was to further progress in art and the well-being of artists through a free exchange of ideas between artists and amateurs and by experimenting with new inventions and techniques in the field of the arts.(68) In other words, it tried to keep intact the ideals of the Institut's early years and hoped to act as a counterweight to the rigid post-Napoleonic Academy, which saw the emulation of classical Greek art as its only aim. The Société therefore not only blamed the

younger generation of artists but also the Academy for the loss of quality which it observed.

Like many contemporary critics, the members of the Société echoed Musset's complaint that the end of the Napoleonic wars had caused many young men to seek a profession who formerly would have made careers in the army or would have died young on the battlefield. As a result of this, artists' workshops were flooded with new pupils, many of whom had neither the talent nor the dedication to perfect their art. The heavy competition drove many to specialize in small, sketchy genre paintings, made according to unchanging formulas which attracted buyers.(69) The Academy exacerbated this tendency by establishing a sketching competition. Artists were allowed to submit their first sketches of history paintings rather than only finished compositions. Moreover, since the Academy prescribed the copying of Greek statuary as the main pillar of an artist's education, art students no longer learned to finish a painting, to draw groups of interacting figures or, most importantly to draw them in correct perspective. One of Farcy's first victories was the reintroduction of exams in perspective drawing at the Academy-controlled Ecole des beaux-arts in 1827, and the exclusion from competitions of all pupils who possessed insufficient knowledge of this discipline.(70) Farcy's

criticism of contemporary artists is borne out by the fact that most nineteenth century painters were unable to produce linear perspective in their works themselves and had to hire specialized artists to draw the perspective lines on their canvases before they could begin work. Indeed, David himself had had to call on the services of the set painter Degotti to ensure that the perspectives of his Sacre paintings were correct.(71)

Like the commission which reported on the panorama in 1800, the Société believed that studying the art of the panorama painter would help painters to perfect their command of this essential element of their profession. It supported the development of technical aids for perspective drawing, many of which appeared on the market around 1830. The Société was also deeply interested in other technical developments which increased the possibilities of art, like lithography, although it preferred technical means which merely assisted the artist to those which took over the work from him. It was feared that the latter would diminish the individuality and originality of the work of art, an opinion which was common in the nineteenth century. This attitude did not prevent the Société from, in 1839, giving an enthusiastic reception to the daguerréotypie, which it saw as nature portraying itself, the true solution to all perspective problems.(72)

To emphasize its concern for classical values the Société repeatedly stressed its opinion that perspective drawing was a much less recent addition to artist's skills than the importance attached to the recent inventions might lead the public to think. In fact it was a lost art, invented by the Greeks to make it easy to create unity within a work of art. Among later artists Dürer and Abraham Bosse, one of the few French art theorists of the seventeenth century to be interested in perspective, were the last to fully understand this ancient knowledge.(73) Significantly, neither looked down on the camera obscura, the use of which was also recommended by the Société to nineteenth-century artists. Together with the diorama, the camera obscura was the basis of daguerréotypie.

Despite the rarity of talent, the Société recommended that the profession of artist should be open to everyone wishing to enter it. Academies, museums and art schools should be opened in Paris and the provinces. In this way artistic education would gain in quality and a public interested in art would develop in the provinces. Less talented artists, who could not survive in Paris would find employment there.(74) The Société applauded the institution of an annual Salon by the new government in 1831. Young artists would be helped by this yearly chance to exhibit their work and have it

judged by the public and a competent jury.

The Société libre des beaux-arts was much more concerned with the basic technical knowledge which all artists should possess, than with the few artists with rare talent to whom most critics looked as the only possible saviours of the French School. This attitude prevented its ideas from finding favour with the important art critics of the July Monarchy.

Ideas related to those of the Société libre des beaux-arts gained popularity among a larger group of people, many of them without much knowledge of the arts, once the Saint-Simonist movement began to attract large numbers of people after 1830. At that time Le Globe was abandoned by many of its former contributors, some of whom took up careers in politics, others rallying round a new magazine, La Revue des deux mondes, which took over Le Globe's former policy of cautious acceptance of new cultural developments. Le Globe's director, Pierre Leroux, had turned the newspaper into a mouthpiece of Saint-Simonism shortly after the July Revolution, making any further association with contributors who did not belong to this movement impossible.

Saint-Simonism became popular because many people became disappointed with the new regime once it had become established. They had expected that the July Revolution would grant artists and intellectuals freedom

to propagate their opinions and work for the further perfection of society and that a new world would be born. Instead of this, money, utility and industry were seen to become the new regime's idols, and it seemed to favour political compromise above true reform. It treated art as an expensive luxury, without utility.(75)

Saint-Simonism presented itself not as a political movement but as a religion, promising a new society in the future, in which industry and money would benefit everyone, and artists, scientists and intellectuals could work together for the good of all. (76) In this ideal situation it would be logical for artists to make use of the technical knowledge of other trades where this would help to make their message clearer. Again, the skill of the panorama painter was presented as a formidable aid to artists. It would help them to create a realism in their paintings which would draw even the least interested person to them.(77)

Because the public's interest in the movement soon waned, Le Globe did not survive long as a Saint-Simonist newspaper. It is interesting to note that the ideas defended by Le Globe in its Saint-Simonist phase were diametrically opposed to those held by the newspaper shortly before 1830. The "old" Globe refused to accept that the panorama could play a role in art. Whereas art moved and intellectually stimulated people, the panorama

satisfied only their curiosity. Artists should never take the panorama for an example. The "new" Globe believed that artists who wanted to reach the people could choose no better example than the panorama.

NOTES

1. A.W. Schlegel, Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst und Literatur, II, Kritische Schriften und Briefe 6, herausgegeben von Edgar Lohner (1809-'11; Stuttgart, 1967) 109.

2. E. Egli and P. Martino, Le débat romantique en France, 1813-1830: pamphlets, manifestes, polémiques de presse, I, 1813-1816 (Paris, 1933) 89.

3. O. (Prosper Duvergier de Hauranne), "Des unités II: M. Manzoni," Le Globe 7 January 1826: 34.

4. Schlegel interpreted La Motte's theory as follows: "De la Motte, ein französischer Schriftsteller, der gegen die sämtlichen Einheiten geschrieben, will an die Stelle der Einheit der Handlung die Benennung 'Einheit des Interesse' gesetzt wissen. Falls man das Wort nicht auf die Teilnahme an den Schicksalen einer einzigen Person beschränkt, sondern wenn Interesse überhaupt die Richtung des Gemüts beim Anblick einer

Begebenheit bedeuten soll, so möchte ich diese Erklärung die befriedigendste und der Wahrheit am nächsten kommende finden." Schlegel (1967: 20). On the need for realism, and propaganda for the unité d'intérêt during the Restoration see also Iknayan (140-141).

5. "Nous aussi nous demandons l'unité d'intérêt, pourvu toutefois qu'on ne veuille attacher à ce mot un sens trop restreint. Pour étendre son horizon, il suffit de se placer dans une situation plus élevée. Alors ce que l'on apercevait distinctement s'efface; mais d'autres objets se découvrent: ce qui était principal devient accessoire; mais l'oeil distingue de nouvelles masses qui deviennent principales à leur tour." O., "Des unités; I," Le Globe 24 December 1825: 6.

6. "...c'est ainsi qu'il peut y en avoir autant dans une histoire du monde que dans la journée d'une famille, dans l'immense composition du Jugement Dernier que dans la Vierge à la chaise..." O., Le Globe 24 December 1824: 6.

7. "...or l'homme est-il complet quand, pendant la durée d'une action théâtrale, il n'a qu'une manière de sentir et de parler? ...Dans la vie, les pleurs et la joie, le sérieux et le plaisant, le noble et le familier, sont sans cesse à côté l'un de l'autre." O., "Du mélange du comique et du tragique; I,

"Le Globe 6 May 1826: 309.

8. "L' unité d' intérêt, Monsieur! il n'appartient qu'au génie de le concevoir, et quand il l'a trouvée, il est libre de briser le joug et de s'affranchir de toute entrave; il donne lui-même une nouvelle théorie de l'art, car il est créateur." H. de Latouche (H. Thabaud de Latouche), Lettres à David sur le Salon de 1819 par quelques élèves de son école (Paris, 1819) 243.

9. For a thorough analysis of the painting and its genesis the reader should consult Th.W. Gaehtgens, "Jacques-Louis David: Leonidas bei den Thermopylen," Ideal und Wirklichkeit der bildenden Kunst im späten 18. Jahrhundert (Berlin, 1984) 212-251. More detailed information on the critical fate of Leonidas during the Restoration can be found in my article "David's Léonidas aux Thermopyles in the art criticism of the Restoration," Frankreich 1800: Gesellschaft, Kultur, Mentalitäten, hrsg. G. Gersmann und H. Kohle (Stuttgart, 1990) 49-63.

10. The most important source for this anecdote is Delécluze (1855: 231, 356). It was also mentioned by numerous other art critics writing during the first half of the nineteenth century.

11. Delécluze tells us that David's depiction of the pass of Thermopylae was based on a perspective

drawing, which Delécluze made with the help of a topographical map of the Thermopylae region. Delécluze (1855: 233).

12. Latouche (244)

13 . " ... La scène est entre des rocs escarpés qui forment un passage étroit d'où l'on découvre au loin la plaine, le rivage et la mer; un temple est sur les flancs de la montagne, dans laquelle est pratiqué le sentier par où s'éloignent les esclaves et les chevaux chargés de bagages, désormais inutiles, car l'heure de mourir est venue. Ce défilé, n'est-ce point celui des Thermopyles? Ces guerriers ne sont-ils pas les trois cents Spartiates? Tous les traits d'héroïsme qui signalèrent cette mémorable journée ne sont-ils pas rendus avec l'énergie qui commande un semblable sujet?" Latouche (246).

14. "...l'intérêt dramatique est faible par lui-même, et que de plus il succombe étouffé par la multiplicité des détails, l'étendue des scènes, le volume de l'ouvrage. Voici encore une des difficultés du théâtre romantique. Comme l'esprit de l'observation y joue un grand rôle, la conception principale, celle de l'action, peut en souffrir..." C.R. (Charles de Rémusat), "Cromwell, drame, par Victor Hugo; II," Le Globe 2 February 1828: 173.

15. C.R., 2 February 1828: 171.

16. "...avec un tel talent, pourquoi ne pas aborder hardiment l'oeuvre du poète dramatique? Que faudrait-il pour cela? Donner pleine carrière à son imagination, sacrifier quelques détails historiques, donner davantage à l'effet du style, à la peinture des passions, à la grandeur des caractères..." C.R., "La mort de Henri III, août 1589, scènes historiques, faisant suite aux Barricades, et aux Etats de Blois par L. Vitet," Le Globe, 6 June 1829: 359. For the use of the word imagination around this time see Iknayan (188).

17. "...sa monotonie, ses descriptions minutieuses sans proportion avec l'ensemble de chaque composition, l'absence trop fréquente de sentiments profonds, un luxe tout extérieur, vous blessent: c'est de la poésie pour les yeux." "Orientales par M. Victor Hugo," Le Globe 21 January 1829: 42.

18. S.-B. (Ch.-A. de Sainte-Beuve), "Le public a besoin et surtout avant peu de temps aura besoin de poésie; rassasié de réalités historiques, il reviendra à l'idéal avec passion; las de ses excursions éternelles à travers tous les siècles et tous les pays, il aimera à se réposer, quelques instants au moins, pour reprendre haleine, dans la région aujourd'hui délaissée des rêves..." "Review of Victor Hugo's Odes et ballades," Le Globe 2 January 1827: 322. In Sainte-Beuve's thinking, as well as in Rémusat's (note 16) traditional and new

ideas seem to merge.

19. L.V. (Ludovic Vitet), "Diorama, Vue du village d'Unterseen, par M. Daguerre, Vue intérieure de l'abbaye de Saint-Vaudrille, par M. Bouton," Le Globe 30 September 1826: 111.

20. L.V., "Le Musée Cosmopolite de M. Mazzara: le Diorama, le Néorama," Le Globe 30 May 1830: 416.

21. For a related view on the relationship between poetry and painting see David Scott, Pictorialist Poetics: Poetry and the Visual Arts in Nineteenth-Century France (Cambridge, 1988) 6. "A painting such as Delacroix's La mort de Sardanapale (1827), for example, in inviting the eye to range over a dynamic composition spread over a vast (395 x 495 cm) canvas, rather than to focus on a carefully constructed central complex of figures or images, represents an implicit criticism of Lessing's conception of pictorial art." George Levitine has pointed to the use which Girodet, a painter from the Davidian School, made of peinture d'expression to overcome the limitations of painting and to create an illusion of passing time. Levitine also mentions the influence of the panorama on this preoccupation. G. Levitine, Girodet-Trioson: An Iconographical Study, Thesis, Harvard U, 1952 (New York, 1978) 42-49.

22. See R. Hyde, Panoromania! The Art and Entertainment of the All-Embracing View, intr. by Scott

B. Wilcox (London, 1988) 109.

23. For a sketch of the main features of the melodrama see J.-M. Thomasseau, Le mélodrame (Paris, 1984).

24. See Diderot's criticism of Joseph Vernet's Vue du port de La Rochelle, prise de la petite rive, Salon de 1763. "Regardez le Port de la Rochelle avec une lunette qui embrasse le champ du tableau et qui exclue la bordure, et oubliant tout à coup que vous examinez un morceau de peinture, vous vous écrierez, comme si vous étiez placé au haut d'une montagne, spectateur de la nature même: 'Oh! le beau point de vue'." Diderot, Salons, I: 229.

25. Dufourny, "Report on the panorama, 28 Fructidor an 8, (Lundi, 15 septembre 1800)," Cited in H. Buddemeier, Panorama, Diorama, Photographie: Entstehung und Wirkung neuer Medien im 19. Jahrhundert, Untersuchungen und Dokumente (München, 1970) 169.

26. J. Laurent, Arts & pouvoirs en France de 1793 à 1981: Histoire d'une démission artistique (Saint-Etienne, 1982) 25-26, 37.

27. See Hyde (112).

28. As a critic in L'Artiste 4(1843): 230 put it: "Ce sont là de ces voyages comme le bourgeois de Paris aime à en faire. Pour le prix de quatre courses en omnibus, il avait, dans la vallée de Goldau, assisté à

un éboulement qui l'avait fait trembler d'effroi."

29. See W. Kemp, Der Anteil des Betrachters: Rezeptionsästhetische Studien zur Malerei des 19. Jahrhunderts (München, 1983) 108-109.

30. Kemp (45-46) describes the need felt by painters and writers during the nineteenth century to compose their work around the standpoint of the viewer or reader. Later on he cites Delacroix's first reaction to seeing The Raft of the Medusa. The painter remarked that the painting made its viewer feel as though he had one foot in the water (106).

31. See for instance Landon's comment. "En resserrant son sujet dans de moindre proportions, M. Géricault se serait ménagé les moyens de lui donner plus de développement. Au lieu de couper par la bordure, comme il a été obligé de le faire, les deux extrémités du radeau, il aurait pu le présenter en entier, l'isoler de toutes parts au milieu d'une vaste étendue de mer, agrandir l'horizon, et montrer, par l'éloignement des secours humains, toute la grandeur d'un péril inévitable." C.-P. Landon, Salon de 1819: Recueil de morceaux choisis parmi les ouvrages de peinture et de sculpture exposés au Louvre, le 25 août 1819 II (Paris, 1819) 66.

32. Landon (1819: 67).

33. "...le guerrier tire son sabre avec un

horrible sang-froid. On voit qu'il est rassasié de meurtres, et qu'il va immoler encore de nouvelles victimes sans plaisir comme sans regrets..." Le Moniteur universel (1824): 1226.

34. A. Thiers, Le Globe 15 September 1824: 8.

35. Landon made this point in his Salon de 1824, I (Paris, 1824) 53. "Mais il est probable, que frappé des horreurs d'une revolution qui peut-être est loin de toucher à son terme, M. Delacroix en a retenu ou imaginé quelques traits plus ou moins vraisemblables, et qu'il les a réunis..."

36. In Le Globe 28 September 1824: 27. Thiers' criticism can be related to the concept of unité de l'âme developed by Quatremère de Quincy. In a violent polemic against Romanticism the theorist claimed that the soul was simply not capable of taking in too many impressions at a time. This implied that the traditional unities should be obeyed and also that artists should remain strictly within the scope of their chosen medium and genre (unité d'imitation). Painters should not make use of the possibilities of the bas-relief nor, we must assume, of those of the panorama. A.-C. Quatremère de Quincy (1823: 42-45). See Körner (230-232).

37. Nina Athanassoglou discusses the popularity of the painting in liberal circles during the Restoration in her article: "Under the Sign of Leonidas:

The Political and Ideological Fortune of David's Léonidas aux Thermopyles under the Restoration," Art Bulletin 63 (1981): 633-649.

38. See for instance La Revue encyclopédique 4(1819): 527 and Le Moniteur universel (1824): 1226

39. A. Rabbe, "Beaux-Arts," Le Courrier français 29 August 1824: 4.

40. "...qu'il emporte l'imagination à la fois sur une double frontière d'où elle découvre une espace plus grand."

41. "...je vois un avenir d'horreurs, et ma pensée sortant de cette nuit mystérieuse de l'ancre de l'empoisonneuse, découvre la mort de Britannicus et presque tous les crimes de Néron."

42. "Il y a quinze ans environ que quelques jeunes artistes de talent se sont trouvés décidément mal à l'aise et gênée en peignant sur une toile plate et bornée par un cadre. Ces hommes, dominés par le désir de rendre surtout la suite de leurs idées, y ont sacrifié le détail des formes. A leur insu ils étaient poursuivis par l'effet de l'horizon circulaire du panorama, sur lequel la pensée se promène, tourne et complète un cercle immense des idées, dont elle se sent invariablement le centre." Delécluze, "Ouverture du Salon," Journal des débats 1 May 1831.

43. "Mais, je le répète, la forme seule a

changé; le style est nouveau, les moyens d'impression viennent d'ailleurs, le fond est toujours le même. C'est toujours le génie particulier à cette nation, qui a fait planer sur un désastre vulgaire l'immense poésie qui l'élève aux proportions héroïques d'une Odyssée ..." Ch. Blanc, Histoire des peintres français au dix-neuvième siècle, I (Paris, 1845) 437.

44. See L. Eitner, Géricault's 'Raft of the Medusa' (London, 1972) 49-50, Borowitz (269-270).

45. F. Pillet, "Musée du Luxembourg," Le Moniteur universel (1836): 1694.

46. Delacroix's constant opponent Delécluze wrote in his important criticism of the World Exhibition of 1855, where many of Delacroix's works were shown, that however hard he had tried over the years, he had never been able to understand the pensée principale of many of Delacroix's most important works. Delécluze (1856: 223).

47. See Gustave Planche, "Salon de 1831," Etudes sur l'école française (1831-1852): peinture et sculpture, I (Paris, 1855) 21. This publication will be cited as Etudes.

48. Journal de Paris 8 November 1827: 3.

49. "...ne dirait on pas qu'ils ont été copiés sur quelque vignette, quelque gravure anglaise, et placés là tels que l'original les a donnés?" A. Béraud,

Annales de l'école française des beaux-arts: Salon de 1827 (Paris, 1827) 74.

50. "Donnerons-nous le titre de composition à cet amalgame incompréhensible d'hommes, de femmes, de chiens, de chevaux, de bûches, de vases, d'instrumens de toute espèce, de colonnes énormes, de lit démesuré, jetés pêle-mêle, sans effet, sans perspective, et ne posant sur rien?" Béraud (74).

51. As an example of this O. mentioned the conspiracy of Catiline which "se trame en divers lieux et dure plus d'un jour". O., Le Globe 24 December 1825: 6.

52. Alfred de Lacaze accuses Faliero of almost delivering the Venetian Republic "aux horreurs de la guerre civile" in his short biography of the Doge in Nouvel biographie générale depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à nos jours, sous la direction de M. le Dr. Hofer, XVII (Paris, 1856) col. 53. Earlier, Sismonde de Sismondi had remarked on Faliero's excessive jealousy in everything concerning his wife. See Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne ...rédigé par une Société de gens de lettres et de savants, XIV (Paris, 1815) 131-132.

53. L.V., "Exposition de tableaux en bénéfice des Grecs; II: M. Delacroix," Le Globe 3 June 1826: 372-374, reprinted: Ludovic Vitet, Etudes sur les beaux-

arts: Essais d'archéologie et fragments littéraires
(Paris, 1847) 189-196.

54. "...ne peut on pas dans un coin du tableau montrer un vieux sénateur serrant entre ses bras ses deux jeunes fils, l'un blond et l'autre brun, selon l'usage, et leur montrant le cadavre du doge coupable, comme pour leur enseigner à bien aimer la République?" Vitet (1847: 192).

55. "...c'est l'effet du coup de pistolet dans une cave, de l'éclair dans une nuit obscure." Journal des artistes (1827):493. For the history of the concept of effect in painting and theatre and its equation to shallowness see Martin Meisel, Realizations: Narrative, Pictorial, and Theatrical Arts in Nineteenth-Century England (Princeton, 1983) 69-87.

56. See Norman Ziff, Paul Delaroche: A Study in Nineteenth-Century French History Painting, Thesis, New York U, 1974 (New York, 1977) 117. Ziff gives an account of the critical reception of every one of Delaroche's paintings mentioned here.

57. "C'était là un corps bien constitué (...) et qui promettait une longue vie." Henri de Viel-Castel, "Salon de 1831," L'Artiste 1(1831): 268.

58. "C'était un magnifique et beau spectacle, que cette dernière entrevue du vainqueur et du vaincu, l'aristocratie et la réforme, le pouvoir absolu et le

régime démocratique.(...) Ce drame, d'un si haut intérêt, est à peine indiqué dans l'histoire..." It.

59. "Ce tableau contient toute une histoire, un roman entier." Viel-Castel, L'Artiste 1 (1831): 186.

60. Viel-Castel, L'Artiste 1 (1831): 185-186.

61. For an account of the impact of both The Children of Edward and Cromwell Viewing the Body of Charles I in 1831 and their relationship to recent political developments see Meisel (230-232).

62. "...qu'en produisant Cromwell, les Enfants d'Edouard et Jeanne Gray, M. Delaroche a cru peut-etre peindre l'histoire, il n'a fait que des tableaux de genre; pourquoi? parce qu'à son avis aucune de ses compositions n'est complète et que toutes, excepté peut-être les Enfants d'Edouard, sont dépourvues d'inspiration et de pensée." "Salon de 1834" in La Gazette de France, paraphrased in L'Echo de la jeune France (1834): 23.

63. See for instance a remark on Delaroche by the critic Laviron: "...il voit un homme par les plis de ses manchettes et les cordons de ses souliers." G. Laviron, Le Salon de 1834 (Paris, 1834) 70.

64. "...c'est bien habile à M. Delaroche d'avoir inventé un bourreau qui ne fait pas peur du tout aux femmes à vapeurs, qui a les mains si blanches, le peau si délicate et les manières si avenantes, qu'il doit vous tuer un homme sans lui faire le moindre mal."

Laviron (1834: 76).

65. "Mais qu'est-ce que tout cela signifie? que pense M. Delaroche? est-il pour Jeanne Gray, est-il pour Marie?" L'Echo de la jeune France (1834): 23.

66. Delacroix's paintings are labeled "...ébauches grossières admises par le jury avec une si funeste complaisance..." Journal des artistes (1827): 779.

67. Annales de la Société libre des beaux-arts, depuis son origine, mises en ordre par M. Miel, l'un de ses membres, années 1830 et 1831 (Paris, 1836) 15. The only modern author to mention the Société libre des beaux-arts is Sfeir-Semler (195). She believes it to have been a conservative organization, but this description fails to do justice to the Société's interest in painting technique and its possibilities, which was far greater than is visible in the writings of Delécluze and Quatremère de Quincy for instance. The Société libre's role in the artistic life of its time would reward further study.

68. "Le but de cette Société est de concourir au progrès des beaux-arts et au bien des artistes,

Par des conférences sur des questions spéciales d'art,

Par la publication de Mémoires dont l'impression serait ordonné par la Société,

Par des séances publiques et des expositions d'ouvrages de ses membres,

Par l'examen des inventions et procédés nouveaux relatifs aux beaux-arts..." Annales de la Société libre des beaux-arts (1830-'31): 4.

69. Vautenet, "Travaux courants, Conférence sur ces deux questions: 1. Que sont les arts en eux-mêmes? Quel est leur but? 2. Est-il avantageux ou nuisible à la gloire et à l'honneur des arts qu'il y ait un grand nombre d'artistes," Annales de la Société libre des beaux-arts (1835): 72-73. A. Sfeir-Semler (348) indicates that during the nineteenth century the profession of painter was becoming very fashionable and held the same high status as other academic professions. In contrast to their standing in the eighteenth century, artists of the 19th century certainly no longer brought shame on their families.

70. Journal des artistes (1827): 578.

71. Kemp (42). On the connections between David's Sacre, Degotti and the panorama see S. Germer, "'On marche dans ce tableau': Zur Konstituierung des 'Realistischen' in den Napoleonischen Darstellungen von Jacques-Louis David," Frankreich 1800: 81-103, particularly p. 100-101.

72. "Quel moyen perspectif pourra jamais se comparer à ce merveilleux instrument, où la nature fait

elle-même son portrait!" Milon, "Rapport sur l'ouvrage de M. Thénod, intitulé: Traité de perspective pratique pour dessiner d'après nature," Annales de la Société libre des beaux-arts, années 1839-'40 (Paris, 1840) 152.

73. Dreuille, "Rapport sur le Traité complet de la Peinture de M. de Montabert," Annales de la Société libre des beaux-arts, année 1841-'42: 113.

74. Bidaut, "Des moyens de propager en France le goût des beaux-arts: Au directeur du Journal des artistes," Journal des artistes (1832): 318.

75. "De l'avenir des Beaux-Arts dans les gouvernements à bon marché," Le Globe 28 June 1831: 719-720.

76. R. Martinus Emge describes the aims of the Saint-Simonist movement as follows: "Die neue Gesellschaft muss von wissenschaftlichen Geist durchdrungen sein und die Ergebnisse der positiven Wissenschaften anerkennen und nutzen. Sie muss auf die Zukunft hin orientiert sein und an eine bessere Zukunft glauben. Sie muss willens sein, aus der ständige Krise herauszukommen. Sie soll sich als grosse Produktionswerkstatt verstehen, in der jener an seinem Platz beim Aufbau mitwirkt. Sie muss schliesslich ihre Eliten anerkennen, sofern es wirklich Leistungseliten sind. Dazu gehört freilich dass sich diese Führungsschichten um das Wohl der armen und unterpriviligierten Schichten

sorgen und bemühen.

This ideology lacks "die moralische Grundlage und Durchschlagkraft. Deshalb müssen sie zu einer quasi-religiösen Glaubenslehre verschmolzen werden. Deren Basis glaubt er im frühen Christentum wiedergefunden zu haben. Es ist der Geist der Brüderlichkeit". R. M. Emge, Saint-Simon: Einführung in ein Leben und Werk, eine Schule, Sekte und Wirkungsgeschichte (München, 1987) 137.

77. See "Le Salon; I," Le Globe 12 May 1831: 531 and "Le Salon, II," Le Globe 11 June 1831: 649-650.

CHAPTER 4 **THE EIGHTEEN-THIRTIES**

The critics of Le Globe were not alone in concluding the débâcle of the July Revolution had denied artists an opportunity to contribute to social change, although at first they had expected that the new regime would allow them to do so. After a short period of enthusiasm for the July Monarchy, typified by Delacroix's Freedom Leading the People, artists were increasingly accused by the critics of losing interest in the political and cultural questions of their time and of creating banal works.(1)

Delacroix, who had long been suspected of painting only to imitate other Schools and of producing history paintings which did not prompt deeper reflection, was one of the most important victims of the commentators who considered French art to be in crisis. Freedom Leading the People and the sketch for Boissy d'Anglas at the Convention were both created to meet the government's demand for art to celebrate the recent Revolution. The latter work in fact also paid tribute to those who had preached moderation during the Revolution of 1789(2). However, after completing these two pieces Delacroix seemed to abandon the use of recent political developments as subjects for his works. His next great

success was The Algerian Women, shown at the Salon of 1834, in which he used material gathered during his recent journey to Morocco. Although the painting was admired for its beautiful colouring, critics did not consider it to be the most important painting of the Salon. Their preoccupation was still mainly with the future of history painting, although the new government's eclectic attitude led it to support every genre.

Ingres and Delaroche, two other painters of whom critics had high hopes, also failed to convince them that they had the stature to lead history painting into a new era. The Execution of Lady Jane Grey met with a mixed response, and Ingres' painting The Death of Saint Symphorian (ill. 26) met with icy rejection from the critics and jury despite its strict adherence to the Academy's precepts.(3) The painter refused to send works to the Salon after this.

In the same year such disparate works as Granet's Death of Poussin and Decamps' Defeat of the Cimbri (ill. 27) were acclaimed as important experiments in history painting. Granet's work was conceived as a visual elegy for the great French artist and Decamps' work was a large sketch for a history painting celebrating Marius' victory over the Cimbrian armies near Aix-en-Provence in 104 BC which saved France from invasion by barbarians. Some aspects of its composition must have reminded the

public of The Raft of the Medusa and it was thoroughly influenced by the fashion for showing no real hero in a history painting, instead depicting the confrontation of two mighty armies. It also satisfied the public's taste for vivid colour and thick impasto which had characterised the works of Restoration Romantics.(4)

Gros, once hailed as France's most promising painter was seen as retreating slowly into the Academy camp.(5) His Hercules and Diomedes met with such harsh criticism in 1835 that the unfortunate painter drowned himself. Around this time, Léopold Robert also died by his own hand. Many of the most important painters of the day, finding the government more sympathetic than the Salon jury and the critics, lost interest in the Salon altogether.(6) Government commissions and the art trade offered them plenty of opportunities to earn money and leave their mark.

The Salon, by now an annual event, gradually ceased to be the arena for those wishing to influence the development of French art which it had been during the Restoration.

As the bigger names retreated, young artists like Decamps tried to gain entrance to the Salon with small sketches, hoping to win commissions for fully worked-out history paintings based on them. Landscape and genre came to dominate the Salon, as artists realised that the

pre-eminence of the history painter was over and that art would in future cater for the market.(7) The worst fears of Charles Farcy and his Société libre des beaux-arts, and indeed of many critics, seemed to come true once the July Monarchy had become established.

Critics deemed the theatre of the 1830's to be as insignificant as the painting of the time. Instead of heeding the warnings of critics before 1830, the great Romantic playwrights, among whom Victor Hugo was still foremost, seemed to turn their work into a caricature of itself, exaggerating all the aspects which had always disturbed the critics. Again they used the analogy of the panorama, observing that Romantic drama was characterised by the same visual attractiveness but also by the complete absence of artistic quality and deeper meaning they saw in this medium.(8)

During the second half of the 1830's interest in classical French tragedy grew. Its austerity and seriousness were seen as an antidote to the spirit of the time, characterised by commercialism, superficiality and loss of ideals.

Not only had artists and writers lost their interest in working for the future of the French School, the government no longer seemed concerned about the School either. Although the Académie des beaux-arts was still charged with guarding the classical foundations of

French drawing, art did not seem to be foremost in the government's mind. Whilst no critic could deny that the king and Minister Thiers in particular instigated many projects which gave work to artists, it seemed to those who did not accept eclecticism that this was often their only aim. Instead of protecting the few really important artists who could have preserved the great reputation of French painting, the government handed out commissions to artists of great and minor talent alike.(9)

Critics deplored the disappearance of the role which previous French kings had played in artistic life. Their personal tastes, or their competent advisors, had enabled them to identify and patronise the most important talents of their time. The liberal critic Jal put forward the view that absolutism allowed art to thrive, whilst constitutional monarchy, which aimed to satisfy citizens preoccupied with their own material well-being, made the maintenance of high standards in art almost impossible.(10) Although Louis-Philippe and Thiers also had their personal favourites, commissions were usually financed from the Budget des Musées Royaux, itself part of the liste civile and subject to parliamentary approval.(11) Jal believed that this funding arrangement made the government feel obliged to make as many artists as possible benefit from it. The facts seem to support this view.

According to Jal, the state should patronise only the few truly great artists and had no obligation towards others.(12) Whether artists supported the traditional aims of French art or reacted against them hardly seemed to matter in the government's award of commissions. The government was increasingly accused of not supporting a unified French School and this view was borne out by the government newspaper Le Moniteur universel. Fabien Pillet, its art critic, did not disguise his view that the only viable French School was one which embraced artists of many different talents and opinions.(13)

This attitude was visible not only in the government's impartiality between artists representing the various directions in French art but also in the Musée des Etudes of the Ecole des beaux-arts, founded by Thiers. It was intended to house copies of Renaissance masterpieces and to grow into a figurative history of art, with the most important works marking the different stages in its development. Thiers commissioned copies of works as unrelated as Michelangelo's Last Judgement and Raphael's Stanze, respectively from Sigalon and the Balze brothers (supervised by Ingres). Thiers' crowning achievement was the Hemicycle, the decoration of the Ecole des beaux-arts' auditorium by Delaroche. The work was a celebration of the most important artists

representing the existing Schools in art.(14) Its semi-circular form made it look like the panoramas which so many critics who were disgusted with the government's attitude to art also disliked. The admission of Delaroche and other juste milieu artists into the Academy during the Restoration must have slowly undermined the influence of Quatremère de Quincy, although he did not give up his post as Secrétaire Perpétuel until 1839, when he had reached very advanced years.

Fabien Pillet defended the freedom of French artists in Le Moniteur while at the same time praising the example of Delaroche. He believed that the emergence of a new Romantic School had been very important for the future of French art. David had been a great innovator but his work lacked the vivacity and interest in contemporary events which his pupils Gros and Gérard had introduced to French art. As before, David's less gifted pupils were accused of dogmatizing his teachings while the most talented ones were held up as original artists. Even so, Pillet believed that French art needed more action, more boldness and more contrast than they could give it. These qualities were provided by the generation of 1824, notably by Delacroix.(15) Unfortunately, the defenders of David's School and those who championed the School of 1824 were not intent on reconciliation but

used their principles to attack each other.

Pillet praised Paul Delaroche for breaking through this conflict between Schools, drawing on the valuable insights of David while at the same time developing "piquant" new ideas. In this way Delaroche had proved his individuality and originality.(16) In contrast to many critics, Pillet still believed that the juste milieu could be reconciled with innovation and creativity. After periods of experimentation, he believed, artists would always return to the principles of Greek art and incorporate them into their works, because not even the least conformist of them could deny that all truly great art was based on these principles.

Probably inspired by Thiers' Musée des Etudes, Pillet saw the development of Italian sixteenth-century art as proof of his assumptions. Although the description "Italian School" was commonly used, the term "School" he considered misleading, since Italian art owed its greatness to each pupil's urge to establish his individuality in relation to his master. It therefore displayed enormous diversity without straying from the path set out by the Greeks. French artists should likewise reject slavish allegiance to their masters in favour of the exploration of new styles and genres.(17)

Pillet did not judge works of modern artists according to a universal standard of perfection but

rather in relation to their own earlier and later works. He considered Dante and Virgil in the Underworld and The Massacre of Chios to be the highlights of Delacroix's career, whilst he thought that Delaroche was at his best in Cromwell and The Execution of Lady Jane Grey and that Ingres had reached his peak with The Vow of Louis XIII (1824; ill. 28). Pillet's individualized standards of perfection allowed him to admire artists with widely differing aims and concerns, Ingres as well as Delaroche, David as well as Delacroix, seeing them all as important to the development of French art. Pillet seems to have taken to their limits Cousin's eclecticism and the related ideas developed by Restoration critics, notably Thiers.

One of the most important commentators to support Pillet's views was Louis Peisse, art critic of Le Temps and between 1841 and 1844 of La Revue des deux mondes. Significantly, he was curator of the collections of the Ecole des beaux-arts. The important art magazine L'Artiste also took a position of complete impartiality. Other critics were less than enthusiastic about Pillet's solution to the problems facing French art, although they also remembered the rivalry between the Schools and systems of the Restoration, for which a *juste milieu* attitude had then seemed a perfect solution.

Perhaps the most revealing criticism of the *juste*

milieu attitude of the 1830's came from Jal, particularly since he had himself been an ardent defender of the juste milieu during the 1820's.(18) Jal had always believed in the value of naturalism in art to allow it to truly serve the needs of its time. We find a similar attitude in the writings of other critics, notably the two republicans Laviron and Galbaccio, anticipating the later emergence of Realism as a direction in art.(19) In 1831 Jal no longer seemed to believe that the juste milieu was a solution for the problematic condition of French art. He reserved his strongest criticism for Delaroche. He suggested that Delaroche had found it profitable to take from both the old School and the new. Despite being an artist of talent he had invented nothing and took no risks, his only aim being to please the public.(20)

Of course Jal also had his favourite artists in whom he placed his hopes for the future, Delacroix becoming the most important after the July Revolution. The attitude of the 1820's is still evident in Jal's criticism of his work. Delacroix, he asserted, was an artist who put the expression of his thoughts before all else. In 1824 Jal had judged The Massacre of Chios to be the most beautiful painting of the Salon because it was the most expressive.(21) He would later add that if only Delacroix would improve his drawing technique the public

would understand his thoughts better, but after 1830 he could not name a contemporary artist whom Delacroix might use as his example. He saw through the slickness and superficiality of Delaroche's style and also did not believe that Ingres offered a viable alternative. He accepted that Ingres's "resurrection" of Raphael's manner inspired artists to study their drawing but regretted that, unlike his master David, Ingres neither wanted nor encouraged artistic freedom. He had gathered around him a group of fanatics, who merely copied him in everything and were for this reason useless for the development of French art.(22)

Since the government clearly devoted far more energy to the development of commerce and industry than to art, many critics came to see artists occupying an enclave outside the realm of public interest, in which they could amuse themselves in complete freedom but also without playing an important social role.(23)

Saint-Simonist art criticism, which had envisaged a great social role for art, did not remain without successors. As resentment over the July Monarchy grew, social and humanitarian art criticism gained in importance. During the 1830's the great names were Decamps, Haureau, Laviron, Galbaccio and Victor Schoelcher. After 1840, Thoré, Charles Blanc and the Fourierist Pelletan came to the fore.(24) Many of these

critics were unable to rise above the didacticism and deference to absolute standards of beauty which had characterized much of the art criticism of the 1820's. Others defended realism in art. Many of these critics admired David's Revolutionary works as well as Géricault's Raft of the Medusa.

Only a few observers were able to combine their humanitarian beliefs with a deep interest in the subjective artistic imagination, which might give social art the spiritualism which people who lived through the July Monarchy wanted to see.(25) Alexandre Decamps, brother of the painter, was one of them, but far more important was Théophile Thoré, who had already made a name for himself during the 1830's, and who would remain one of the most important French art critics from the 1840's until 1868. His taste in art was eclectic, and he was a great admirer of Delacroix. He praised the artist for possessing a deeply sensitive and impressionable soul which enabled him to share in life's universal secrets and harmonies. Above all, Delacroix possessed a great feeling for "l'idéalité moderne"(26) which allowed him to identify the beauty and expression of modern subjects. While adopting Stendhal's ideas, Thoré was far more able than that critic of the 1820's to accept the profoundly personal and original expression of an artist's feeling for his time. Baudelaire would follow

him in this during the 1840's. It is in Baudelaire's writing that we find the most enthusiastic arguments proposing music as the most expressive of the arts and the most powerful means of communication between sensitive souls.

In Thoré's view David had been the first French artist with a genuine interest in depicting the problems and preoccupations of his time. However, he had been unable to find a new form to convey his thoughts, that was an honour reserved for Delacroix. In 1837 the young critic heaped lavish praise on Delacroix's Massacre of Chios, proclaiming it to his knowledge the most beautiful thing in art. The beauty of the painting depended entirely on the artist's ability to make the viewer experience the horror and misery of this event, not on his perfect drawing. Thoré saw in this work "tout un nouvel art, fond et forme, sentiment et expression".(27)

Nonetheless, Thoré was as disturbed by the purposelessness of the art produced during the July Monarchy as other critics who opposed this regime. He clearly saw that even Delacroix no longer seemed interested in subjects with great humanitarian interest. Thoré observed this flaw in most art from the Renaissance and later periods. In modern times artists and the people no longer shared the same ideas and emotions. The

Renaissance's emancipation of the individual personality led to the creation of an art which was too individual to be accessible to the masses. Modern artists made l'art pour l'art. Only an earnest attempt to share again the emotions of the common people could save their work from total insignificance. Towards the middle of the 19th century it became quite common for art critics to reflect on art's loss of function and purpose since humanism's emancipation of the individual and the growth of doubt about long-accepted religious truths after the Reformation.(28) This theme also played an important role in the writings of Delécluze, which will be considered in the next chapter.

Many critics shared Thoré's fears about the ruinous influence of the l'art pour l'art movement which had come into being at the beginning of the 1830's. In the preface to his novel Mademoiselle de Maupin (1834), its leader Théophile Gautier had made known his disgust at the spirit of commercialism and utility which seemed to pervade society during the July Monarchy, and at the ideology of the Saint-Simonists.(29) In this manifesto of the l'art pour l'art movement he argued for art which served no purpose whatever and which could be appreciated for its own sake. Although this first phase of the l'art pour l'art movement did not survive long, Gautier himself perpetuated its ideas in his novels and

his critical writings on art, literature and the theatre. His attitude can only be understood by taking into account the difficulties which faced the young Théophile Gautier as the son of a notorious supporter of the Bourbons after the dynasty's fall from power. Neither the governing party nor the opposition wished to accept him as an ally, so that most careers were virtually closed to him.

After causing a stir with his art criticism in small avant-garde magazines, Gautier in 1836 became a contributor to the new newspaper La Presse, and remained in its employ for many years. The critic, who had received training as an artist, was given to filling his articles only with remarks on the technical prowess of artists, embellishing his prose with the terms he had learned in artists' workshops. His views on art were thoroughly eclectic, therefore fitting in perfectly with the policy of La Presse, which aimed to please a wide readership with unbiased information. It was indeed Gautier's stated aim to guide his public through the beauty on show at the Salon, instead of criticizing artists for real or imagined flaws, as other critics were accustomed to doing.(30) He did so in an evocative style, reminiscent of that used by Diderot in his Salons.

The Second Empire perpetuated the eclectic view of

art held by the July Monarchy.(31) Unsurprisingly, Gautier in 1854 became the art critic for Le Moniteur, the position once held by Fabien Pillet.

Although Gautier considered himself to be a Platonist his thought bore little relation to that of the more traditional Platonists with whom we will be concerned in the following chapters. Gautier developed the idea of the microcosmos, meaning that the ideal lived in the individual artist's mind and could only be understood and used to beautify the outside world by the artist himself. Heinrich Heine had already proposed a similar idea in his important Salon of 1831, published in France in 1833 in De la France. In his defence of Decamps, who was accused by other critics of being unfaithful to nature in his drawing, Heine declared himself to be a "surnaturaliste", believing that the most remarkable images depicted by a painter were not found in nature but instead were revealed to him in his own soul.(32)

Gautier admired Ingres as well as Delacroix. His assessment of the essential qualities of Ingres' art represented an unusual mixture of the wish to see sensualism and a beau idéal.(33) Delacroix's complete lack of consistency in his choice of style did not bother Gautier. He did detect unity in the painter's work, a unity achieved by confronting every subject and

manner he chose with reference to the microcosmos in his mind.(34) Every work by Delacroix bore the stamp of the painter's individuality. Although he shared Thoré's interest in the subjective artistic personality, the humanitarian interest which Thoré prescribed for art was far from Gautier's mind. Indeed it may be asked whether the views held by Gautier and those of the government were very far apart. Gautier presented his views in a newspaper which was not tied to a political party and was designed to reach a large, non-intellectual readership as uninterested in the social role of art as was the government.(35)

Critics were unlikely to trust the disheartened and uninspired artists subscribing to Gautier's or similar ideas to pull themselves out of the depths into which they were seen to have sunk. Delécluze and Planche, the two great critics of the 1830's whose work will be discussed in the last two chapters of this book, knew they were fighting a desperate battle against apathy, shallowness, lack of meaning and loss of unity within the School. As disintegration set in their tone became more embittered, until they had earned themselves a reputation for being inflexible and slightly ridiculous conservatives, criticizing the art of their time but unable to suggest a way out of the crisis they described, unlike Thoré, for instance.

In the case of Delécluze, artistic conservatism, combined with a great fear of the Revolutionary tendencies visible in such movements as republicanism and Saint-Simonism, led to a growing acceptance of Quatremère de Quincy's Platonism. Planche tried to maintain the juste milieu attitude of Restoration critics, who had strongly believed in mimetic art. His work shows the conflict between this attitude and his great interest in the Platonism of Victor Cousin. Needless to say, Cousin's impartiality only annoyed the defenders of humanitarian and social art.

NOTES

1. See Saint-C., "De la poésie et des beaux-arts dans notre époque, II" L'Artiste 4(1832, 2e sem.): 177-179.

2. See Marrinan (94-98).

3. See N. Schlenoff, Ingres: Ses sources littéraires (Paris, 1956) 208.

4. D.F. Mosby, Alexandre-Gabriel Decamps, 1803-1860, thesis Harvard U, 1973 (New York, 1977) 113 and 116.

5. See J. Tripier le Franc, Histoire de la vie et de la mort du Baron Gros, le grand peintre, rédigée sur de nouveaux documents et d'après des souvenirs inédits (Paris, 1880) 503.

6. Sfeir-Semler (216-217). She assumes that

"avant-garde" painters like Delacroix were more dependent on being noticed at the Salon than painters who had "arrived" like Ingres and Delaroche. For this reason the latter were more likely to boycott the Salon after receiving a refusal.

7. "Les beaux-arts cessent alors d'être une haute spéculation de l'esprit, pour devenir une branche de commerce; l'artiste se transforme en ouvrier, travaillant à ses pièces, et le Salon, qui doit être une arène ouverte aux honorables combats de l'imagination n'est bientôt plus qu'un marché, dans lequel se font principalement les articles toiles peintes et bordures dorées." Desains, "Aperçu sur l'état actuel des arts en France," Annales de la Société libre des beaux-arts (1830-'31): 199. Sfeir-Semler (113) suggests that the government supported this tendency through rewarding landscape and genre painting with many medals while bestowing only a few on history painting.

8. Gustave Planche, "'Lucrèce Borgia,'" La Revue des deux mondes 15 February 1833: 392.

9. Gustave Planche, "Le Salon du Roi par M. E. Delacroix," La Revue des deux mondes 15 June 1837: 767.

10. Auguste Jal, Salon de 1833: Les causeries du Louvre (Paris, 1833) 104-105.

11. Sfeir-Semler (73).

12. "Ce n'est pas beaucoup d'artistes qu'il faut encourager; c'est quelques-uns. Qu'importe à la France qu'il y ait deux mille peintres ou sculpteurs? Ce qui lui importe c'est qu'il y ait deux ou trois hommes supérieurs dans chaque faculté." A. Jal, Salon de 1831: Ebauches critiques (Paris, 1831) 73.

13. Fabien Pillet's Salon de 1841 in particular can be read as an "anti-School" manifesto, although this attitude is already visible in his earlier Salons. Le Moniteur universel (1841): 454.

14. Boime (1980) 25, 29.

15. "Il est bon sans doute de ne pas oublier les principes de l'Ecole qu'a produit David et Girodet, mais il faut encore aujourd'hui de l'action, de la hardiesse, des oppositions fortes et tranchantes; quelque peu de bizarrerie même ne laisse pas de plaire au public. C'est pour cela principalement que le nouveau tableau de M. E. Delacroix attire les regards de la multitude. Le sujet en est tout romantique." The painting in question was The Murder of the Bishop of Liège. F. Pillet, "Salon de 1831," Le Moniteur universel (1831): 1218.

16. "Comme tous les hommes dont le talent ne peut être contesté, M. Delaroche est alternativement réclamé par les deux écoles, qui se disputent aujourd'hui les suffrages du public. Les peintres, qui tiennent au culte exclusif de l'antique, ne considèrent point cet artiste comme un incorrigible schismatique, parce qu'il ne dédaigne pas de dessiner purement, et qu'il n'affecte dans ses ouvrages ni le goût de la nature triviale, ni l'abus des procédés fantasmagoriques. Les romantiques de leur côté, lui pardonnent d'être correct, élégant et soigneux, en considération des idées neuves et piquantes, et de son juste éloignement pour les formes académiques. M. Delaroche enfin a voulu être lui-même, c'est-à-dire libre et indépendant entre deux systèmes opposés, et son exemple ne peut manquer d'avoir une heureuse influence sur la direction future de notre école." F. Pillet, Le Moniteur universel (1831): 968.

17. F. Pillet, "Salon de 1839," Le Moniteur universel (1839): 454.

18. During the Restoration Jal's advice to young painters was as follows: "Montrez-nous qui vous voudrez, Turcs, Vénitiens, Français, Grecs, mais que ce

soient des hommes. Que vos personnages soient assez bien indiqués dans leurs formes pour que nous puissions supposer qu'ils marcheront autrement que des bossus ou des boiteux." A. Jal, "De la nouvelle école de peinture," Le Mercure du dix-neuvième siècle 13(1826): 550.

19. G. Laviron and B. Galbaccio, Le Salon de 1833 (Paris, 1833), G. Laviron (1834). See P. Grate (63-64).

20. "Son style procède un peu, il me semble, de celui d'Horace Vernet, de celui de l'école nouvelle; il n'a rien bien individuel, de puissamment original; sa couleur le place aussi entre les deux systèmes de telle sorte, qu'avec toutes les brillantes qualités dont il est pourvu, M. de Laroche ne peut être compté parmi les hommes de génie. C'est un peintre de grand talent qui n'a rien inventé, mais qui a profité de toutes les inventions. Sa manière est très-agréable, elle plaît aux artistes et surtout aux amateurs; ses ouvrages sont populaires; ils obtiennent un succès fort générale." Jal (1831: 277).

21. A. Jal, L'artiste et le philosophe: Entretiens critiques sur le Salon de 1824 (Paris, 1824) 95 and 47.

22. Jal (1833: 29).

23. See P. Mainardi, Art and Politics of the Second Empire: the Universal Expositions of 1855 and 1867 (New Haven, 1987). In chapter 2, "Building the Temple of Industry", Mainardi describes the causes of this attitude. She first identifies it around 1798 when the French government realised that the downfall of the aristocracy also meant a drop in the demand for hand-made luxury goods, the mainstay of the economy. As Mainardi sees it, from then on the strategy of all French governments was to upgrade the status of

industry, producing for the mass market (les arts utiles) and to relegate to "les beaux-arts" the role of an expensive luxury which France could ill afford. (12-21).

24. Grate (151).

25. Grate (150) blames Victor Schoelcher and Laviron in particular for their lack of interest in this matter.

26. Thoré used the term "idéalité moderne" in his article "M. Eugène Delacroix," Le Siècle of 24 February 1837.

27. "Quant à moi, je ne connais rien de plus beau en art que ces jeunes Grecques du Massacre de Scio, demi-nues et foulées au pied des chevaux; rien de plus inspiré que leurs figures, rien de plus souple que leurs mouvemens, rien de plus velouté que la peau de ces femmes, rien de plus ardent que leur désespoir. En présence de ces cadavres meurtris, de ces chairs palpitantes, de ce sang et de ces larmes, de ces douleurs, de ces résignations, de ces abattemens ou de ces rages, devant cette foule où les enfans pressent le sein de leurs mères expirantes, où les soeurs s'embrassent, où les amans sont séparés violemment de leurs femmes; devant cette confusion éblouissante de lumière, de poignards à pierreries et de riches étoffes; devant ce contraste entre les splendeurs du ciel oriental, le calme de la nature et ces inexprimables angoisses de l'homme, entre l'horreur et la beauté, entre la mort et la vie, on est ravi dans le monde poétique; car il y a là tout un nouvel art, fond et forme, sentiment et expression."

28. Grate (158). For the background of the ideas expressed by Thoré see F.S. Jowell, Thoré-Bürger and the Art of the Past, thesis, Harvard U, 1971 (New York, 1977) 332.

29. In his preface Gautier asked ironically: "Comment, au lieu de faire la grande synthèse de l'humanité, et de suivre, à travers les événements de l'histoire, les phases de l'idée régénératrice et providentielle, peut-on faire des poésies et des romans qui ne mènent à rien, et qui ne font pas avancer la génération dans le chemin de l'avenir? Comment peut-on s'occuper de la forme, du style, de la rime, en présence de si graves intérêts." Th. Gautier, Mademoiselle de Maupin (1834; Paris, 1927) 18.

30. "Notre critique différera de celle des autres journaux, nos frères en Dieu ou en diable en ce que, loin de s'étendre longuement sur les défauts et de les mettre curieusement en relief, elle s'attachera plutôt à faire ressortir les beautés. Nous ne comprenons guère la critique autrement. La critique est une espèce de cicerone, qui vous prend par la main et vous guide à travers un pays que vous ne connaissez pas encore." Th. Gautier, La France industrielle April 1834. Cited in R. Snell, Théophile Gautier: A Romantic Critic of the Visual Arts (Oxford, 1982) 225.

31. Snell (195) notes that although he was the Second Empire's "official art critic", the regime's lack of artistic principles had already started to worry Gautier during the eighteen-fifties. Eclecticism seemed to him to have led to uniformity.

32. "En fait d'art, je suis surnaturaliste. Je crois que l'artiste ne peut trouver dans la nature tous ses types, mais que les plus remarquables lui sont révélés dans son âme ..." H. Heine, "Salon de 1831," De la France, Säkularausgabe: Werke, Briefwechsel, Lebenszeugnisse, vol. XVIII (1833; Berlin, 1977) 123.

33. Snell (101).

34. Snell (76-77).

35. In Du Romantisme au Réalisme: Essai sur

l'évolution de la peinture en France de 1830 à 1848
(Paris, 1914), L. Rosenthal defended the view that
Gautier's ideas and the government's lack of principle
in artistic matters had much in common.

Introduction

Etienne-Jean Delécluze (1781-1863), whom we have already met in chapter two as a follower of Lessing, was the subject of an important thesis by Robert Baschet in 1942. Baschet shed further light on this major figure in French nineteenth-century intellectual life by publishing the diaries he kept during the 1820's.(1) They give a lively and often surprising account of the social and intellectual life in liberal circles during the Restoration. Unfortunately, no other in-depth research has been carried out on Delécluze, so that our knowledge of his life and thinking has barely increased since Baschet's time. The main reason for this is no doubt that Delécluze was an inveterate conservative in artistic matters. The loathing which a younger generation of artists and critics had for him is still well remembered.(2) In this chapter we will examine Delécluze's writings on art.(3) It will become clear that Delécluze maintained an independent viewpoint on most of the artistic, intellectual and political questions of his age and that these three areas were strongly inter-linked in his thinking. We will gradually come to

understand the reasons for his fear of modernism in art and for his unflagging defence of form in the form versus expression debate. This chapter will end with a discussion of his views on David, expressed in his book Louis David, son école et son temps (1855). We will focus on his criticism of "theatricality" aimed at David's history paintings of the 1780's. This will lead us to the conclusion that this criticism is the result of a loss of faith in the art, culture and society of his time, which induced Delécluze to embrace the religiously-inspired Platonism of Quatremère de Quincy.

Delécluze was born into a wealthy Parisian family which originally supported the Revolution but became disillusioned with it at the start of its radical phase. During the Terror the Delécluzes fled to their house in the country. In later years Etienne would recall the scenes of violence seen in Paris and even in the country during these bloody days.(4) They appear to have shocked the child deeply and perhaps traumatized him for life. His meeting with Mme De Noailles in David's workshop in 1796, was significant in this respect because it triggered off memories of the execution of her father, M. de Laborde de Méreville, a court financier, and fantasies about the execution of the beautiful young woman herself.(5)

During the closing years of the eighteenth century

Delécluze became a pupil in David's workshop. Over the years the relationship between him and the master became ever more friendly, and David had faith in his pupil's talent for painting. However, Delécluze's career as an artist was short-lived. Although his paintings were well-received at the Salons of the Napoleonic era, Delécluze understood that if he remained an artist he would only be able to earn a living by consenting to play his part in the Napoleonic propaganda machine. He disliked Napoleon for his autocratic style of government and aggressive foreign policy and deplored the way in which he had tied artists and intellectuals to him. Many of them, including David, had been searching for a new ideal after the débâcle of the Revolution. They rallied behind Napoleon when he reformed the Institut and started his programme to promote history paintings of modern subjects.(6) Along with his memories of the horrors of the Revolution, the sight of France's intellectual and artistic elite slavishly serving the Jacobins and later Napoleon because higher, lasting spiritual aims had disappeared from society, appears to have been critical in forming Delécluze's ideas on art by the time of the July Monarchy.

When the Bourbons decided to employ the attractive features of Napoleonic history painting for their own purposes after Napoleon's downfall, Delécluze's decision

was clear. He simply had not the talent needed to maintain himself as an independent artist and, not wanting to sacrifice his freedom, he chose a different career.(7)

Delécluze gave drawing lessons for several years, using his free hours to read and study, particularly in the field of art history and theory. Whilst still in David's workshop he already stood out from the other students because of his knowledge in these matters. During the 1820's he was finally able to lead a comfortable, settled life. After 1822 the income from his position as art and theatre critic for the important newspaper Le Journal des débats, under the directorship of his friend Bertin, together with rent from a house he owned brought in enough money to free Delécluze from financial worries for the rest of his life. Instead of trawling for government jobs, Delécluze decided to settle for the life of a scholar, pursuing his intellectual interests and gathering around him the younger members of the liberal opposition. He became a driving force behind the development of a moderately innovative current among young liberal intellectuals, notably the group around Le Globe.

Le Journal des débats supported the Bourbon regime as long as it respected the civil rights and freedoms granted in its Charter but would withdraw its support

for the Bourbon government when it began to harrass even this rather mild newspaper.(8)

Shortly after 1820, a small group of young people - would gather weekly at Delécluze's home to study the works of Shakespeare. It must be remembered that French resentment over Napoleon's downfall, in which the British were instrumental, was still so great, particularly in liberal circles, that English actors performing Shakespeare's plays in Paris were often jeered off the stage.(9) Their visit was seen as a shameless British attempt at the cultural colonization of France. Delécluze, who did not share the blind admiration for Napoleon felt by many of his political allies, considered himself free to make his own judgment on Shakespeare and encouraged others to do the same.

From the small gatherings at Delécluze's home grew a weekly Salon, frequented by the journalists of Le Globe and other members of the liberal elite.(10)

Stendhal's idea that French theatre should try to depict events from modern history and shed many of its old rules on composition to do so was hotly debated here. As we have seen, after a period of enthusiasm for these innovations, doubts on their value prevailed. Although Delécluze supported Mérimée's attempts to create a completely new kind of drama for the French stage (in Le théâtre de Clara Gazul 1825-1830), he was

in the end strongly opposed to French writers seeking inspiration in the works of Shakespeare. His reasons for this were partly based on his belief in the superiority of classical culture, which was not lessened by his wide knowledge of more recent cultural developments. In his diary he also paraphrased the ideas defended by Mme. De Staël. Delécluze did not seek to deny that different countries and periods could develop their own, valuable cultures, but he did not believe that foreign elements could successfully be grafted onto French culture. Precisely because French was a Romance language and French culture was based on that of classical antiquity, it would in his view be almost impossible to adopt the language and poetry of Shakespeare. French language and culture were preoccupied with form. This meant that writers had to adapt their thoughts to the opportunities for expression allowed by their rigid language. Northern cultures were preoccupied with the expression of the inner self and with original thought. English and German were for this reason enormously elastic languages, adapting themselves to every thought their user wanted to express. (11)

It is worth restating Delécluze's life-long belief that the first task of art was to enchant the eye and that it should therefore portray mankind in an idealized form, at its most beautiful. Only when this essential

condition had been met would the subject and message of a work of art penetrate the viewer's consciousness. He defended the view that imitation of the classical nude was the only possible foundation for serious art, and always praised his master David as the modern artist who had returned French painting, and indeed that of the whole of Europe, to this principle.

When a retrospective on European art of the nineteenth century was held at the World Exhibition of 1855, David's art came under heavy attack from the young Realist critic Maxime Du Camp. It was Du Camp's contention that David had been the first French artist to be solely occupied with copying archaic styles, whilst hardly bothering about the subject he wished to depict or its relevance to the public of his time.(12) Du Camp believed David's attitude to have subsequently characterized almost all French artists of the first half of the nineteenth century, who based their art on study of the Schools of the past. Du Camp, a believer in Realism, could neither accept Delécluze's Lessing-based views nor Gautier's l'art pour l'art.(13)

Du Camp's attack provoked Delécluze into one of his last ardent defences of David for his own review of the World Exhibition. His arguments resembled those used by David's followers of the 1820's in response to Stendhal's devastating attack on David and his School.

Delécluze did not deny that the great painter had been the first of the conscious archaïstes in French art. However, like other defenders of David, he believed the painter had sought to distil the essence of Greek art, and not merely to imitate it.(14)

Delécluze accused Géricault of being the root of archaism for its own sake in French art. The critic considered Géricault's drawing to be quite acceptable. He suggested that the artist still made use of the nude in his Raft of the Medusa because it was functional in this work and in fact his nudes were rather good. Although the painting's subject was unpleasant at best, Géricault could not be accused of setting out to deliberately frighten and shock his public more than was necessary. However, The Raft of the Medusa as a whole contained little to commend it as an innovative and rejuvenating addition to French art. Delécluze believed that Géricault had been inspired by the works of Jouvenet, a painter belonging to the decadent French School which David had denounced all his career. Therefore, Géricault had in his view caused French art to regress rather than to advance.(15) Delécluze's view of Géricault's work seems to echo the opinion of Charles Blanc. Blanc placed the composition of the Raft of the Medusa in the great French tradition, instead of stressing its innovative aspects. It is quite likely

that Delécluze chose Géricault as his target precisely because he had become the beloved modern painter of leftist intellectuals like Charles Blanc and Michelet, who had supported the Revolution of 1848.

During the 1820's the great diversity in styles imitated from the past, which Du Camp attacked in 1855, was already becoming visible. Delécluze, who was deeply worried by the phenomenon, believed that the only possible explanation for this manifestation of young artists' desire for artistic freedom was their utter lack of a common faith or aim which would have guided their efforts. Indeed, the younger talented artists did not even try to form groups anymore, instead they all set about developing their own ideas of beauty.(16) The painters who flourished after Napoleon's downfall no longer even had a false god to believe in. Instead they made little gods of themselves and the painters they imitated. Such aimlessness had never been a feature of David's emulation of Greek art.

In 1824, Thiers had already found a pragmatic solution for both the growing eclecticism visible in French art and the issue of the use of modern subjects and costume. He thought it permissible for artists to choose any subject and to work in any style, as long as they took care to follow David, not in his drawing, but in the noble bearing of the figures in his paintings. In

this way, artists could benefit from David's achievements without copying him. Other critics adopted this relaxed attitude towards David's School. Delécluze's staunch defence of the classical nude made him an honourable but isolated defender of an outmoded point of view. However, the views of critics defending eclecticism and the juste milieu must have sounded just as old-fashioned, at least to Du Camp.

Delécluze and the Juste Milieu

During the first years of the July Monarchy Delécluze supported many artists regarded as belonging to the juste milieu. Delaroche and Scheffer were the most important of these and the critic never lost his long-standing admiration for Léopold Robert, who had found classical beauty in contemporary Italy. Although extremely conservative in many respects, Delécluze had never been one to resist all development within the French School. His opposition to the rigid hierarchy of genres was always quite outspoken. This attitude enabled him to class Robert's paintings, for instance his Fisherman from Naples Improvising (1824: ill.29), showing large, noble figures, as history painting.(17) According to Delécluze, Robert had understood better than any of David's pupils the master's ability to

poeticize, even though Robert took his subjects from reality whereas David had used scenes from history and prose literature as his inspiration. Like Ingres, Delaroche, Scheffer and Schnetz, Robert had done his share to lead artists back to the laws of reason and good taste.(18)

Although the words Homeric and Shakespearian, conspicuous in his writing of the 1820's, gradually disappeared from Delécluze's vocabulary, his belief in the existence of two opposing artistic principles in classical and modern times remained undiminished. Delécluze would always abhor Delacroix's extremes of realism and expression which he considered cynical. He also criticized Delacroix throughout his career for the increasing sloppiness in his drawing which became apparent after Dante and Virgil, and the painter's impetuous habit of trading one painter for another as his model. His lack of patience, Delécluze felt, would prevent him from ever studying seriously enough to become a truly great painter.(19)

Delécluze only grudgingly accepted that Shakespearianism would have a lasting influence on French art, expressing a preference for Delaroche and Scheffer as the representatives of this current. He believed them both to have been influenced by the historical realism of Walter Scott's popular novels,

which he considered rather innocent compared to that of Delacroix. Delécluze admired Delaroche's Cromwell because, in his view, the painter possessed the qualities of an observer and a thinker(20) and had not resorted to the superficiality typical of artists interested in the realistic depiction of scenes. While abhorring Delacroix's peinture d'expression Delécluze would always admire that of Scheffer, once the radical phase of the artist's career had passed and he had won acclaim with The Women of Souli in 1827.

According to Delécluze, Scheffer, who was a native not of France but of the Low Countries, wished to depict the emotions of the people involved in a historical event. His ability to depict human feeling remained his most important quality throughout his career. In his assessment of Scheffer's work Delécluze again followed Mme De Staël's analysis of the main differences between Northern and Southern cultures. Many other critics saw his ability to depict his subjects' inner life as Scheffer's most important quality and Baudelaire ridiculed him for it.(21) Although Delécluze had criticized Scheffer's Gaston de Foix in 1824 for its depiction of clumsy armour which forced the viewer to focus on the facial expressions, he later came to see Scheffer's talent for peinture d'expression as an important contribution to French art, from an artist

whose background and disposition had destined him to be a painter of sentiment.(22) In Scheffer's case interest in the expression of emotions was not based on the need to shock and be noticed. On the other hand, Delécluze did not recommend that French artists should emulate the particular talent of this Northern artist.

Besides Léopold Robert and Schnetz, who also chose Italian peasants as his subjects, Ingres would be the artist in whom Delécluze placed the greatest faith for the regeneration of French art. After the Salon of 1834 had shown French art to have completely lost its direction, Delécluze was one of the few critics to praise Ingres' Saint Symphorian. With this painting Ingres proved that he was the only history painter displaying his work at the Salon who, like David, adapted historical events and characters in order to poeticize and beautify them.(23) His deep interest in the work of Raphael led him to choose religious subjects, hardly popular with the modern public, and to concentrate on form instead of on expression.

In his Salons of the 1830's Delécluze stated that it was Ingres' example which had inspired Delaroche and Scheffer to attempt to revive history painting, sadly in decline after David's disappearance from the scene and the rise of the disastrous influence of Géricault and Delacroix. In order to do so they consciously abandoned

the rather sloppy painting technique which they had shared with Delacroix and set about developing a painting style more appropriate to their lofty ambition. This purpose was particularly visible in the religious paintings which they exhibited in 1837. Scheffer embraced the School of Raphael in his Christus Consolator (ill. 30), and Delaroche's Saint Cecilia was influenced by Byzantine and Italian primitive art.

Although he was usually opposed to painters copying styles from the past, Delécluze admired Delaroche and Scheffer for their brave move. They had made a conscious choice for the School which best suited their aims, renouncing some of the qualities which had won them favour with the public. Delaroche in particular risked alienating the public. By returning to the Byzantine tradition an artist could hardly show the expression, life and emotion which the modern public wanted to see. This was particularly clear in Saint Cecilia.

In fact, Scheffer in particular had gone to great lengths to please his public. His liberal sentiments were well known and in Christus Consolator he demonstrated his pity for the oppressed of the world. The painting illustrates the words of Christ (Luke IV, verse 18): "...he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty

them that are bruised..." It shows Christ breaking the chains of a dying Pole, while a Greek, a negro slave and other victims of oppression and cruelty are depicted around him. (24)

We must conclude that Delécluze only fully accepted Delaroche when he appeared to abandon his historical realism and *juste milieu* attitude, and followed Ingres' example in choosing a religious subject and adopting a School which put form before expression. In Delécluze's view, Scheffer's ability for communicating sentiment only gave him the status of a great talent but not a place in the French school, however hard he tried to better his painting technique. The appearance of a religious dimension in his work and its consequences for the choice of examples among painters also won him great admiration from the critic. As we will see however, the deliberate imitation of the art of another, simpler and more religious era, was never quite accepted by Delécluze.

In Delécluze's thinking, the beauty of Robert's work was quite separate from the decadence which plagued French art during his lifetime. He saw in it the hallmark of a painter who like the artists of ancient Greece and the Renaissance had managed to create works which were pleasing and understandable to every layer of society. Robert's works thus served a purpose comparable

to those of Raphael and other masters of the Renaissance, while his avoidance of overtly religious painting prevented his becoming estranged from his public. Similar ideas on Robert's work may be found in the writings of other art critics, notably Heine.(25)

However, it would appear that by 1837 the need for spiritual regeneration visible in many paintings of the period and pointed out in the writings of other critics had also become of overriding concern to Delécluze. It caused him to rethink the role of expression in art, to seek inspiration in Quatremère de Quincy's theories and to embrace unreservedly the Platonism which had been only a minor influence on his writings during the Restoration. Then Delécluze had been as opposed as any liberal to the enormous influence exercised by the church on state affairs. After the Revolution of 1830, and the periodic rebellions against Louis-Philippe's regime during the 1830's, Delécluze began to long for the bond of religion which he believed had united the people of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

Politics and Culture in Delécluze's Thinking

Whilst at David's studio Delécluze had learned to see Renaissance Italy as the heir of ancient Greece. He was well-read on the subject of Renaissance and pre-

Renaissance Italian art and travelled in Italy soon after starting his career as an art critic. Delécluze would never agree with Quatremère de Quincy that the depiction of the human figure in both Ancient Greece and Renaissance Italy was based more on the need to express abstract truths than on the imitation of la belle nature. However, neither could he agree with Paillot de Montabert, who has already been mentioned as the writer of an important handbook for artists and a distinguished member of the Société libre des beaux-arts.

In his handbook Paillot de Montabert stressed his opinion that the superiority of ancient art over modern art could be understood only with the knowledge that the Greeks had possessed a sound theoretical basis for their art even before the creation of the great works of sculpture for which they were justly praised.(26) His faith in a theory based on the laws of geometry and knowledge of perspective distinguished Paillot de Montabert as a member of the Société libre. He was much more concerned to teach artists the basic knowledge they needed than with individual genius. Also typical of the approach to art seen in the writings of Société libre members was Paillot de Montabert's interest in medieval art. Contrary to accepted opinion he did not believe that the artists of Renaissance Italy had rediscovered the principles of classical art. He contended that these

principles had never been entirely forgotten, and that gifted artists of the Middle Ages had made use of the geometrical knowledge of antiquity. Raphael was not the instigator of a great new period in the history of art but simply one of the last artists to still possess this ancient knowledge. (27)

The later Florentine School, which numbered Michelangelo among its members, had introduced a tendency for dramatic, complicated composition which had not been present in previous art and which had spoiled even Raphael's late works. The Renaissance of the sixteenth century, always considered to be the generative and most important phase in the history of modern art, became in Paillot de Montabert's writing the period in which the decadence of art began. Raphael, Dürer, Bosse and Poussin were the last artists in whose work the direct influence of ancient art was visible. From this De Montabert concluded that not their works but the classical sculptures on which they were based should be the sole standard for judging modern works of art. (28) Although Paillot de Montabert's interest in the panorama was small compared to that of other members of the Société libre des beaux-arts, he also saw its importance for artists wanting to study perspective, in particular those attempting large wall and vault paintings.

Delécluze apparently could not accept a theory whi-

ch reversed the relative importance of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance for the development of art. Time and again he stated that although everything which was important in art had already been known to the Greeks, it had had to be re-invented by the artists of the Italian Renaissance. They gradually learned to depict nature convincingly but never achieved the level of technical perfection to be seen in the works of Delécluze's contemporaries. Even their best works displayed clumsiness and uncertainty. In contrast to modern artists, the painters of the Renaissance were guided by their thoughts and sentiments, their efforts culminating in the work of Raphael.(29)

Delécluze agreed with Paillot de Montabert that decadence had set in after Raphael's death and that it was visible in the moves towards expression, drama and complicated composition of the sixteenth century and later. However, the totally pragmatic approach to art which was one of the most important features of both the Société libre des beaux-arts and the handbook written to serve its aims were totally alien to Delécluze. While Paillot de Montabert believed in making simple knowledge available to everyone, Delécluze preferred to see the history of art as being created by isolated artists of genius, who had triumphed in their struggle to make their hand serve their thoughts. It is quite likely that

Delécluze believed Paillot de Montabert had written his book expressly to serve the needs of the superficial, slick artists of the day, whom Delécluze abhorred. In opposition to this superficiality he put forward the image of the artist as a lonely seeker of truth, which gained ever more currency during the nineteenth century.

Delécluze's belief in the importance of individual genius for the regeneration of art is particularly visible where he describes the work of the isolated and tragic painter Eustache Le Sueur (1617-1655) who, being extremely poor, had no opportunity to travel and study Italian art in Italy itself. He was guided in his efforts by prints after Raphael and other important painters.(30) David himself was also described by Delécluze as an artist who spent half his life toiling on the same path which Poussin and Le Sueur had trodden before him. Delécluze thought David's success the more surprising since the state of civilisation in David's time did not appear to permit the appliance of the system used by Raphael and the artists of antiquity. Religion, which had guided Raphael's attempts to rediscover the principles of ancient art, had already lost much of its grip on society by the years before the Revolution of 1789.

Like many liberals, Delécluze was obsessed with the problem of religion, in itself a force with unifying

powers, in a society which had lived through the French Revolution.(31) Many of them flirted with the ideas of Chateaubriand and the Neo-Catholics, others with Fourierism and Saint-Simonism, movements which held up science as the new unifying force in society. Delécluze probably shared the opinion held by Chateaubriand towards the end of his life, i.e. that the leading role of the Catholic church in society was temporarily over but that the church would take up this role again after a few centuries.(32) For this reason he abhorred the primitivism of A.F. Rio whose De l'art chrétien was published in four volumes between 1836 and 1867. Rio believed that the Catholic faith could be revived in modern society through the propagation of religious paintings based on those of the most primitive phases of Italian art. He despised Raphael's naturalism and believed the art of the Trecento and Quattrocento to be more purely Catholic. Incidentally, Delécluze was also highly suspicious of the Nazarenes' use of Raphael and early German art.(33)

Delécluze settled for less lofty solutions to the problem posed by the lack of a unifying faith. He believed that a more worldly principle, that of constitutional monarchy, offered the only short-term means of holding the French nation together and therefore supported Louis-Philippe.(34) Delécluze was

thus a man who supported the government of the day, the only option for the degenerate times in which he lived, while privately dreaming of a simple, religious society although he could no longer share its beliefs.

Delécluze believed that the painters of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance had fully supported the church. During this period religious ideas and habits were familiar to every class of society so that artists were simply conforming to accepted theory and poetics. This permanency of taste, based on faith, was an enormous advantage for the artists of the Renaissance. Instead of having to search for a subject, like a modern painter would have to, they could choose from a limited range of subjects which everyone would understand.(35)

Delécluze endorsed Chateaubriand's view that the religious thoughts and sentiments which guided the artists of the Renaissance also informed their efforts to overcome technical difficulties, whilst restricting their interest in the technical possibilities of their art and their search for knowledge in the field of art history. Renaissance artists could hardly distinguish between different artists, periods and styles. In their enthusiasm they confused them, turning their works into curious "macédoines" of different periods in classical art. In addition to its clumsiness, this characteristic of Renaissance art also contrasted markedly with the

vast knowledge about art history and the technical aspects of painting which Delécluze observed in his own time.(36)

Although Delécluze rejected many aspects of Paillot de Montabert's theories he probably shared his views on the simplicity of expression and composition visible in the works of the artists of classical antiquity and those who had truly understood their principles. This point is of extreme interest for our understanding of the conflict which set David, and ultimately Delécluze, apart from the Barbus, the group of young painters who used their primitivism to counter the teachings of their master around the time he completed The Sabine Women.

David's new preference for the art of Raphael and Greek and Etruscan sculpture probably did not go far enough for the members of the Barbu sect. Delécluze mistrusted them not only because of their interest in primitive art but also because of their supposed wish to found a new society, based on principles similar to those of Saint-Simonism.(37) The sect of the Barbus believed the ideal society would be based on one which existed in the remote past and of which even Greek society was only pale imitation. The interest in extending the technical possibilities of art shown by some of the Barbus who also deeply admired primitive art can perhaps be understood if we take into account the

faith some of them expressed in the level of sophistication which primitive civilization had achieved.(38)

Delécluze named Paillot de Montabert as the art theorist whose views were closest to those of the Barbus, about whom little else is known.(39) The conflict was probably sparked by David's interpretation of the examples best followed for their simplicity of expression and composition. Although the master and Delécluze both admired the nascent naturalism and simple but impressive expression visible in the works of Giotto and Masaccio, and noted the debt which Raphael owed them, this was the limit of their admiration for the more primitive phases of the Renaissance.(40) True believers in primitivism like Paillot de Montabert experimented with encaustic and tempera painting, enabling them to achieve flatness and linearity, while David and Delécluze remained fascinated by the greater technical possibilities of oil painting. This would always make individual figures look round and soft and gave Raphael's figures the illusion of reality.

Nonetheless, Delécluze shared the Barbus' and Paillot de Montabert's sense of estrangement from modern society.(41) In Renaissance paintings he saw well-known and easily recognizable subjects, with the figures shown clearly separated and communicating through restrained

gestures. The drama and contrast in both grouping and lighting which David had struggled to overcome were not visible anywhere in these paintings. Their beauty of form and simplicity of expression would enchant the contemporary and later viewer. These qualities were enhanced by the fact that the human figures took up nearly all of the paintings' available space. The backgrounds were clearly subordinated to them and demanded little of the viewer's attention. The most perfect of Renaissance art was, like that of ancient Greece, simple, showing restrained expression, and without features which would distract the viewer's attention from the human figures. It was an art of great public importance and at the same time, almost inevitably, an art of simplicity and beautiful form.

Unlike Paillot de Montabert, Delécluze tried to explain the growing interest in drama and expression beginning in the early sixteenth century, by pointing to the religious doubt felt throughout Europe during this period. There had been no successors to Raphael's simple devotional paintings. Paintings which showed the emotional response of many people to an event had replaced the more austere and idealized, and probably more genuinely religious works of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. The sixteenth century saw the rise of the battle painting, with painters keen to show

the climax of hostilities and the violent emotions of the people involved.(42)

Another new phenomenon was the growing prominence of landscape in art. Sometimes, particularly in realistic depictions of battles, the background dwarfed the human figures shown. Delécluze was deeply worried by this development, since the public's response to landscape was purely emotional and it could not address the mind as religious painting had done.(43) The last step on the road to decadence identified by Delécluze was the rise of the trading nations of the North. Self-interest was the most important motive for all their citizens' actions. Not only were their public activities selfish but in private life they also sought only their own pleasure. Here Delécluze showed his mistrust of much of eighteenth-century philosophy, which had favoured a society based on self interest, which it did not consider to be at odds with the common interest, over a society based on Christianity. Influenced by Rousseau, Delécluze believed that the pursuit of personal interest, particularly the desire to accumulate riches, had caused the great social inequality which he saw in the modern world. Self interest and common interest could only coexist without conflict in the most primitive of societies. Where there was no accepted principle completely outside the personal sphere, the

pursuit of one's own happiness would sooner or later destroy the happiness of others. (44)

Delécluze saw the growing individualization of artistic pleasure, first visible in the sixteenth century, as a symptom of the decadence around him. The amateur's cabinet was the most conspicuous manifestation of this trend. Rich art lovers began to admire artists for their depiction of nature and the lesser genres, landscape and genre painting pleased them more than the elevated religious painting of the past. What they admired most in paintings was the artist's manner.(45) A gap appeared between the artistic needs of the common people and those of the amateurs. When he observed that poor people were not interested in paintings which showed scenes from their difficult daily lives Delécluze took a stand against the aims of Realism. The poor wanted to see religious paintings or works illustrating the great events of history.(46) To the rich, spoiled by the luxury in which they lived, these subjects no longer appealed.

Since large, elevated paintings were apparently no longer needed by those who had formerly paid for them, artists began to cater to the amateur's taste. Once they had honed their technique they tried to develop a personal manner to distinguish them from every other painter. After the enormous services rendered to

painting by the artists of the Renaissance, technical improvements were hardly possible and artists made use of the knowledge of their predecessors in a mechanical, uninspired way. Art was technically perfect but the life had disappeared from it and very quickly, artistic standards fell. In order to stand out from the crowd artists began to display the sketchy, mannered, brilliant colouring still dominant at the beginning of David's career. They neglected their drawing and as a result beautiful form and clear expression disappeared from painting. The disappearance of a common faith, forming a bond between all men, had ultimately caused the decadence which David had tried to resist.

To Delécluze, French art and society of his time seemed as an echo, or perhaps more correctly a continuation of the situation which had existed in Europe since the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. People were no longer the same as they had been in ancient Greece and Renaissance Italy. Life had become complicated, people behaved in a less natural way and religion had lost its hold on them. The gap between rich and poor had widened and the rich were now interested mainly in their own material well-being. Even the great inherited estates, which until the eighteenth century had enabled the French nobility to patronize the arts, had disappeared. The entrepreneurs of modern times

wanted art only when it served their own interests, or could be used to decorate their homes. Portraits, landscapes and genre-scenes were present in every well-to-do household, whilst elevated history painting was neglected. The simplicity so conspicuous in the life and thoughts of Raphael, Poussin and Le Sueur was nowhere to be found in Delécluze's own time. The only aim of young artists was to share in the luxuries of the rich. They were therefore no longer ready to embark on long and arduous studies.(47) Instead they specialized in one genre and manner which brought in easily-earned money. Art had become one of the many industries which had sprung up in France in Delécluze's time, and which enabled people to acquire fortunes within their lifetimes.

Delécluze therefore saw that David's reform of painting had yielded no lasting results in France. The master himself only found an ideal outside his personal sphere which inspired him to works of great and lasting importance when the Revolution began and more particularly when Robespierre came to power. The Death of Marat, The Intervention of the Sabine Women and The Coronation of Napoleon were the highlights of David's career. The artist's new idealism was still visible even in the last two of these paintings, made after Robespierre's downfall.

Unfortunately, during Delécluze's lifetime many political and religious movements led painters to choose the style which seemed to serve their purposes best, examples being "neo-Catholic" and "humanitarian" art. Delécluze judged it impossible to predict which road French art would take in the future, he saw only chaos.(48) Art which united the people had become a thing of the past.

Louis-Philippe and and the Regeneration of Art

Delécluze believed that Louis-Philippe's activities as defender of the arts could help to lead art back to its legitimate place at the heart of the nation. He greeted with enthusiasm the monarch's plans of 1833 to create a Historical Museum at Versailles. The Historical Museum would commemorate the great deeds and figures of French history. Past works of art which touched on the history of the French nation would be assembled here and the king personally commissioned a series of paintings celebrating important battles fought by the French from the most important artists of his day. Naturally, it was not the latter aspect of the Museum which interested Delécluze most.

Prompted by Quatremère de Quincy, Delécluze compared the Museum to one of the great Italian monu-

ments, Pisa's Camposanto. Here, the men who had contributed to this city's glory were buried in holy earth from Palestine and honoured by Pisa's citizens. The walls of the building were decorated with religious paintings in which the faces of famous Pisans could be recognized.(49) The Historical Museum, he hoped, would become a monument of equal importance. Works of art would be assembled at this gallery and appreciated because of their historical importance and didactic value rather than their technical quality. Minor works of art could become of great interest.(50) The Museum would enable the viewer to feel part of a great nation with a heroic past. Louis-Philippe's Museum, designed to inspire patriotic feeling, would therefore never radiate the sterility which Delécluze believed characterized the Louvre.

Delécluze again followed Quatremère de Quincy in deriding museums other than the Historical Museum. Quatremère de Quincy had made his criticism of the museum as an institution clear in a book on the Musée des monuments français in 1815.(51) Quatremère de Quincy utterly disliked this Museum whose founder Alexandre Lenoir, another member of the Société libre des beaux-arts, had gathered copies of Mediaeval monuments there, in this way bringing this under-valued period in the history of art to the attention of the French public.

Quatremère de Quincy's main objection to the museum concerned the way in which objects of art were displayed. Because they were taken out of their original context it was almost impossible for the viewer to experience the emotions which the maker had intended him to feel. He could now only admire the objects for their creator's technical brilliance and would be annoyed by apparent mistakes in works which, when shown in their intended setting, would be understood and even admired. (52)

Delécluze added to this that 19th century museums, particularly the Louvre, served the new idol of science. The main aim of its directors was to complete the Louvre's collections of works by individual artists and Schools. Their attitude towards art was purely - scientific, they classified works of genius under a number just as persons of genius could be classified under the heading "mammals". (53) The Louvre had lost all contact with the ideas and values which in the past had been shared by artists and the community to which they belonged. In his critical essay on the Musée des monuments français Quatremère de Quincy spoke of the esprit de critique which had inspired the founders of the museum, the mentality of the philosophes who had lead French thinking and society to the Revolution. (54) Quatremère de Quincy, Chateaubriand, Bernardin de Saint-

Pierre and other conservative thinkers strongly objected to analytical method when applied to the study of art or nature and to the doctrine of schooling artists according to a sound, universally valid method, which was propagated by the Société libre des beaux-arts. Quatremère de Quincy asserted that art was ruled by imagination and not by reason.(55) The importance which he attached to imagination in artistic creation betrays the relationship existing under the surface between his thinking and that of Romantics of the Restoration period, like the young Hugo.

We must conclude that subsequent events and fear of the Revolutionary potential of the "scientific" philosophers and sects of his own time drove Delécluze, who was reasonably progressive in his politics during the Restoration, to copy the arguments of Quatremère de Quincy and other conservatives who rejected reason as the basis for collecting and studying works of art and for artistic education.

In his later years Delécluze increasingly came to link his criticism of the museum with his unwavering mistrust of modern history painting. Perhaps his relative carelessness as to genre hierarchy can be partly explained by this mistrust. In his book on David published in 1855 he stated that the concept of history painting was a relatively new one. It had appeared

around 1700 when the old religious art had completely lost its function.(56) Although the idea that art should be elevating still existed, the stock of simple, universally understandable subjects, which had functioned so well for such a long time, was now no longer sufficient. His criticism was probably aimed at the grand style which theorists from this period increasingly looked for in the depiction of national history as well as in scenes from classical or Biblical history. This requirement robbed the most important subjects for a painter of the last vestiges of sacredness they still possessed. Religious painting was quickly reduced to one of the possible kinds of history painting instead of a lofty genre with higher aims than any other. The growing demand for authenticity in the depiction of scenes from the past and the eighteenth century's use of painting technique for dramatic purposes also did much to undermine the special character and function of religious painting.

Delécluze's opinion on the moment at which history painting appeared in France and its function differs greatly from that held by most of his contemporaries and indeed by most modern art historians. They believed that Poussin was the first great history painter in France and that the French government had attempted to revive his art around 1750, to counter the decadence of rococo

art.(57) Delécluze's remarks implied that this revival affected only purity and clarity of form and that attempts to restore the great public significance which art had enjoyed in former times were either pointless or not pursued with enough dedication to have effect. Art had become a commodity traded on a free market. The Salons had not yet existed in Poussin's time. They became a feature of the French art scene during the period which saw the revival, or in Delécluze's eyes the beginning, of history painting.(58)

Delécluze opposed those who believed that freedom from the demands of the institutions, churches and monastic orders who had previously commissioned works of art had brought great improvements in the position of artists. In fact, Delécluze pointed out, painters working for the market had to arouse the public's curiosity with new subjects. Although drawn from respectable sources these subjects were often *recherché* and difficult to understand. The need to draw attention to their work also drove artists to choose ever larger canvases. He observed that the works which made David famous, The Oath of the Horatii and Brutus, although thought to celebrate the values of the ancient Romans, were hard to understand and completely out of place in the public buildings and royal palaces of the Ancien Régime, whilst their sheer size made them unfit for

smaller residences. Their sad fate was inevitable. They remained in David's workshop for many years until they were purchased by the government in 1802. From then on their place was in the only building which could house them, the storehouse called the Musée du Louvre. Modern history paintings were works of art for which no real need existed. For this reason they were destined to end up in the "poor-houses of art", as Delécluze liked to call museums. (59)

Delécluze and the Problem of Expression

We have already seen that Delécluze did not like the considerable popularity which Diderot's artistic principles had won among the painters of the eighteenth century, notably Greuze, and artists of his own time. Delécluze must have seen the destructive influence of Diderot's theories everywhere. A whole generation of artists were demanding absolute freedom and exploring the possibilities of dramatic subjects and expression.

During the 1820's Delécluze still saw the problem in rather simple terms. The disappearance of classical costume and the simple way of living which accompanied it he believed had been superseded by the far more complicated culture and dress of modern times, which forced people to wear clothes which covered most of

their bodies and hampered their freedom of movement. As a result the tortured and exaggerated expressions of the face and hands, so characteristic of modern times, came into being. Diderot, defending drama and emphatic expression, was dismissed as a typical modern critic, mistaken in all his assumptions.

In later years Delécluze seems to have been increasingly influenced by Quatremère de Quincy's thinking on expression. The latter preferred to see works of art as expressions of abstract ideas with great value for the society whose needs they served. His familiarity with Quatremère de Quincy's writings also prompted Delécluze to compare the role of expression in classical and Renaissance art with its function in modern history painting. The great artists of classical antiquity and the Renaissance preferred simple compositions with few figures, while later painters who followed the Academy's precepts loved complicated scenes with many figures. They also introduced massed groups of figures, dramatic contrast and lighting to the painter's array of weapons with which to bombard his public's emotions. (60)

Delécluze's criticism of modern history painting was far more outspoken than Quatremère de Quincy's. He disliked the very concept of an obscure tale taken from classical or modern sources, allegedly reminding its

viewers of their duties as citizens. Quatremère de Quincy's criticism of modern history painting was directed at one painting in particular, Poussin's Testament of Eudamidas. He used it as an example to support his opinion that modern history painting, like every other genre in painting, was tied to the depiction of reality, and could not make the viewer understand the subject's beau moral.

Delécluze observed of Poussin that at a certain point in his career he had turned away from mythological and allegorical subjects and had found a new source for his work in reality.(61) Delécluze surely had The Death of Germanicus and The Testament of Eudamidas in mind when he wrote this. He probably meant by his remark that traditional allegory and mythology had enabled painters to express a beau moral in an effective and simple way. The story or allegorical theme was well-known to the public and the figures shown in paintings were not ordinary human beings but the personification of abstract ideas. A human being making obscure gestures in the context of a story hardly known to the viewer could never communicate such ideas. This flaw was visible even in the works of the great Poussin.

Although Delécluze admired David greatly he could not help agreeing with other critics on his lack of clarity of composition and meaning, notably in The Oath

of the Horatii and Brutus. He tried to understand why David later condemned these successes of 1785 and 1789 for being theatrical.(62) Delécluze, citing David, probably used the word theatrical to indicate that the facial expressions and gestures visible in these paintings did not and indeed could not help to make their beau moral understood. Peinture d'expression was therefore empty and meaningless here. The painter had chosen an interesting subject, not often depicted by other painters, which appealed only to his intellect and imagination.(63) The anti-intellectualism of conservative circles surfaced again in Delécluze's writing when he suggested that only David's later deep involvement with his subjects had inspired him to explore the simplicity and nobility of form used by the Greeks to make their elevated ideas understood. The Oath of the Horatii demonstrated the faults of modern peinture d'expression even more than Poussin's Testament of Eudamidas. It could be used to express emotions but never to express a painting's beau moral, and would illustrate little more than empty theatricality if it attempted to disguise the absence of a beau moral.

Delécluze felt that not only The Oath of the Horatii but also the body of David's work displayed a variety of ideas and subjects which had a bewildering effect on the viewer. This complete lack of direction

was visible not only in David's work but also in that of most of his contemporaries because they lived in an age without faith.(64) David and his most talented pupils were artists in the Poussinesque mould. Their strength was their ability to poeticize reality.

It was Raphael's good fortune that he never felt moved to criticize the institutions governing the society in which he lived and that he was guided in his work by a deep and simple faith.(65) In his book of 1824 on this most perfect of all painters, Quatremère de Quincy had praised his mastery in the field of expression.(66) It was indeed accepted by most art theorists writing on Raphael that although the painter's command of all aspects of his art was astonishing, he achieved his greatest results in expression. Hegel, whose ideas seem to be related to those of Quatremère de Quincy, praised Raphael's Madonnas for the way in which they suggested pious and humble motherly love.(67) Even Stendhal, a believer in peinture d'expression pointed to Raphael as the greatest master in this field.

Quatremère de Quincy considered Raphael's Madonnas to be his greatest achievement and the summary of his artistic development. Raphael's great love for his subject enabled him to express in the relationship between Maria and her Child the reserve, respect and diffidence appropriate to the holiness of the

subject.(68) Delécluze saw this quality not only in the Madonnas but also in Raphael's more complicated compositions. These works were masterpieces not because they showed a dramatic scene which linked all the figures but because they showed figures which were almost isolated from each other, connected more through thoughts than through attitudes and expression. This almost complete separation of the figures in Raphael's work enabled the viewer to admire every one of them for their individual perfection. In this way Raphael's paintings first engaged the viewer's eyes and then conquered his soul. This feature of Raphael's work enabled the viewer to experience the profound religiousness which he wished to express. Here, expression and beau moral were inseparable, whereas modern peinture d'expression could only arouse the viewer's passions.(69) Raphael's emotional involvement with his subjects also gave them their incomparable charm. His faith inspired his deep love for the beauty of the idealized human form. Indeed, it could also be said of Leonardo da Vinci that he painted his figures with love.(70) Delécluze felt that this love and charm almost disappeared from art after Raphael's death. One of the few artists able to recapture it had been Léopold Robert, although his inspiration was no longer religious. He was inspired by the simplicity of the life and faith of others. Ingres'

Vow of Louis XIII was in Delécluze's view the only painting by a nineteenth century artist to match the simplicity and elevation of Raphael's Madonnas.

Delécluze wrote grudgingly that the first painting to show the originality of David's talent to the full was The Death of Marat from 1793. It was a work of much greater quality and appeal than David's pre-Revolutionary paintings because he had finally found an ideal uniting him with his public. The Intervention of the Sabine Women still showed the results of this new emotional involvement with his subjects. Now David had learned to see the deficiencies of his works of the 1780's. He renounced both the methods he had used in the past and the goal of imitating the methods of other great masters and concentrated on the noble and truthful imitation of nature. He learned to appreciate the nobility and simplicity of expression in the figures of Raphael and realized that the great painter from the Renaissance had come nearer to understanding the principles of Greek art than he. Delécluze saw the perfection of each individual figure in The Intervention of the Sabine Women as an achievement directly influenced by Raphael. Moreover, although the painting lacked the dramatic unity demanded in modern times, viewers, especially those who had witnessed the Revolution which had torn families apart, would be

instinctively drawn to the group of soldiers on the verge of combat, separated by the women casting their children between the two armies, as he put it.(71) Charm and simplicity of form served the expression of a simple beau moral which could appeal to the public's deepest feelings.

This quality was completely absent from The Oath of the Horatii and Brutus, as it was from almost all of David's works created after The Sabine Women. Like other critics, Delécluze saw in Leonidas at Thermopylae the beginning of the decline of David's artistic powers. Originally, David intended this painting as a continuation of the principles so brilliantly demonstrated in The Sabine Women. Again he refused to indulge the modern wish for expression, lighting effects and dramatic grouping and again he chose to depict human beings so that they could be admired individually.

Delécluze recounts the difference of opinion which arose between him and his master over the choice of the moment to be depicted. The critic believed that the painter should have chosen the moment when Leonidas led his men into battle for the last time. As Delécluze put it, David had begun to paint his work in a lyrical mode when he should have chosen a dramatic one.(72) He wished to depict the thoughtful atmosphere before the battle as the Spartans meditated on their sacred duty towards

their country and on their inevitable death in the battle to come. Unfortunately, the painter found it almost impossible to express this beau moral. He painted the Spartan soldiers busying themselves combing their hair, putting make-up on their faces, tying their sandals and making wreaths of flowers, whilst he could not decide on the attitude and expression of Leonidas. Surely the danger threatening the Spartans should have been more visible in this painting.(73)

Delécluze implied that if David had chosen the dramatic mode he had suggested, the painting would have been immediately attractive in the same way as The Sabine Women, with the group of women casting their children between the warriors. The realistic depiction of the Spartan's preparations for the battle would hardly lead 19th century viewers to meditate on patriotism because the aspect of Spartan culture depicted here was no longer understood. The more dramatic moment favoured by Delécluze would serve this purpose much better and still give the painter an opportunity to make the beauty of each individual figure stand out. Lessing's rule that the depiction of the climax of an event should be avoided, would still be obeyed. Like the emotions of the Sabine women, the feelings depicted in Delécluze's imaginary Leonidas would be immediately and universally understood. Form

and expression would once again melt into a perfect whole. As it was, David was going back to the obscurity of his pre-Revolutionary works.

Work on the Sacre paintings delayed David in finishing his Leonidas. The painter wanted these paintings to be a realistic portrait of Napoleon's coronation. He therefore developed a far more naturalistic manner than the one used in The Sabine Women and Leonidas, which served this purpose admirably. After abandoning the Sacre-project David again took up work on his Leonidas. Delécluze suggested that during this period David still sympathized with Napoleon, but was increasingly worried by his authoritarianism and his aggressive attitude towards other nations. He did not suggest that this different attitude had anything to do with David's difficulties in finishing the painting, but he made clear that during this second period of work on Leonidas David was unable to recapture the mood he was in when starting. Leonidas had originally been a poetic painting but when finished it was a prosaic one and the more naturalistic manner developed for the Sacre paintings was now also visible in it.(74) Delécluze saw this demonstrated in the figures finished last, in particular in the figure on the right (left for the viewer) of Leonidas. Here realism resulted in shocking banality. The manner in which the figure of Leonidas was painted

formed an uncomfortable half-way house between that of The Sabine Women and the second stage of the work on Leonidas.(75) The realism for which Rabbe and Latouche admired Leonidas was for Delécluze reason enough to assign it only secondary importance within David's oeuvre.

Of the four planned Sacre paintings only two were finished, and Delécluze believed that only the one showing the coronation of the Empress Joséphine (ill. 31) was a truly good painting. He believed it to be one of David's greatest works, and indeed the only one of his later paintings to match The Sabine Women. Apart from the splendid realism of the portraits of each of the persons involved in this great event, the painting's main attraction was David's master stroke of choosing the moment when Napoleon crowned his wife, instead of that in which he crowned himself. Delécluze related Napoleon's enthusiastic reaction to the painting. He congratulated David on depicting him as a French knight.(76) Here Delécluze indicates that David had been moved by an interest in the Middle Ages inspired by Chateaubriand and the genre-troubadour paintings in which David's pupil Fleury Richard excelled.(77)

This choice of moment enabled David to create a scene which aroused the same immediate interest as The Intervention of the Sabine Women. Instead of depicting

Napoleon as an autocrat, David portrayed him paying homage to his wife, thereby demonstrating one of the greatest virtues of the Christian French nation and the great ideal of courtly love. Admiration of womankind, a feeling essential to Romanticism, appears to have encouraged both Delécluze's love for Raphael's Madonnas and his appreciation of the most important quality of David's Sacre and Sabine Women. Expressing this appealing virtue would enable the Sacre, this beautiful painting, to make the significance of the coronation understood by future generations. In the Sacre, David had found the only possible way to give a painting of a modern subject the same timeless interest as that evoked by Raphael's Madonnas. It expressed a simple, universally understood idea, and for this reason Delécluze saw it as one of the few great works of art of the Napoleonic era. For him the two others were probably Gros' Jaffa and Eylau, showing Napoleon demonstrating the healing gift which the French kings were believed to possess.

Conclusion

Delécluze believed that David had ultimately proved unable to insulate himself from the increasingly prosaic art of the nineteenth century. His lack of faith had

betrayed him and he had strayed from the road explored in The Sabine Women. The same lack of faith also caused many of his works to have an obscure meaning. For this reason Delécluze considered them unfit to be placed in a public building or in a palace. They remained in the painter's workshop until they finally went to the Louvre.

The post-Napoleonic generation in France had lost all hope and faith. In Delécluze's view, however, history painting was still the most important genre, so a painter wishing to impress the public and prospective buyers and patrons would naturally still choose this genre to make his mark. Only a few artists, of whom Ingres and Léopold Robert were the most important, were able to achieve harmony between form and expression in their paintings in order to communicate with the public.

Most artists were unable to find subjects interesting both to them and to the public. To compensate for this they tried to impress the public with large but insignificant paintings and imitations of Schools from the past. These works were no more than accumulations of unimportant detail and illustrated events often of no interest at all to the public.

Delécluze could never accept that the expression advocated by Diderot and Stendhal was a valuable new development, helping art to belong to its time. Instead

he saw it as a sign of modern decadence. The time of truly great expressive art was over, he felt. This art could exist only where all members of society shared the same faith, and artists gradually learned to make their work express simple ideas understood by all. Greek artists and those of the Italian Renaissance had reached this stage of perfection but their expression had nothing to do with that which Diderot and Stendhal wished to see. It was not in any way theatrical, but was achieved by illustrating the most universal feelings and human relationships. For this reason, the Greeks and Raphael were great artists. Even a modern painter like David could emulate them in this when the ideas he wished to communicate were simple and understood by the whole nation. In such cases the artist invariably combined simplicity of ideas and of form to achieve this goal.

NOTES

1. R. Baschet, E.-J. Delécluze: Témoin de son temps, 1781-1863 (Paris, 1942).

E.-J. Delécluze, Carnet de route d'Italie (1823-1824): Impressions romaines, texte inédit publié avec une introduction et des notes par R. Baschet (Paris, 1942).

E.-J. Delécluze, Journal 1824-1828, texte publié avec une introduction et des notes par R. Baschet (Paris,

1948).

2. The most scathing comment on Delécluze's life and opinions was delivered by the landscapist Paul Huet in a letter from 1862 to the critic Sainte-Beuve. "...cette larve, posée sur les feuilles des Débats (qui) a de sa bave taché, flétri, sali tout ce qui était en fleur, tout ce qui pouvait être un fruit." Cited by Grate (20).

3. The most complete listing of these can be found in Baschet (Témoin).

4. See particularly Delécluze's haunting description of the scenes of carnage he witnessed in September 1792 from the family's country house in Meudon. Delécluze, Souvenirs de soixante années (Paris, 1862) 8.

5. Delécluze (1855: 41-42).

6. In fact all French régimes of the nineteenth century followed Napoleon in using artists for their political legitimation. Ennobling artists, a thing unheard of under the Ancien Régime, was one of the ways to reach this aim. Sfeir-Semler (24-25). Gros and Gérard both became barons under the Restoration.

7. Baschet (Témoin: 42).

8. The outlook of the Journal des débats was initially royalist. Louis Bertin had himself been a royalist during the Revolution. However the journal chose to oppose the government as early as 1823, when Chateaubriand fell from favour. The enmity between the government and the Journal des débats grew rapidly. Bertin himself ended up in prison when his newspaper printed an article by E. Bequet, criticizing Minister Polignac. It ended with the words: "Malheureuse France! Malheureux roi!" In 1830 the Journal des débats sided with the Orleanist party, to which it would remain faithful. "Bertin, Louis-François (Bertin aîné)," P.

Larousse, Grand dictionnaire universel du XIXe siècle, II (Paris, 1866) 620. Because he could not at first agree with the Journal des débats' political views, Delécluze had doubts about accepting the post of art critic there. Only Bertin's assurance that he would be left in peace in his "petit royaume des beaux-arts" made him decide in favour. Baschet (Témoin: 64).

9. A. Delaforest, theatre critic of the Gazette de France, a royalist newspaper, expressed his great annoyance at the public's behaviour and felt no doubt as to its political inspiration. A. Delaforest, Cours de littérature dramatique, I (Paris, 1836) 6-14.

10. Of the staff of Le Globe, Duvergier de Hauranne, Ludovic Vitet, Rémusat, Prosper Mérimée and P.-F. Dubois are known to have been regular visitors of Delécluze's Salon. Other visitors included the botanist Adrien de Jussieu, Mignet, Nicolas-Louis Artaud, the naturalist and voyager Victor Jacquemont and Jules Taschereau. Many of the visitors published regularly in liberal newspapers and magazines. Baschet (Témoin: 101-102).

11. Delécluze, Journal, 29 sept. 1827, cited in Baschet (Témoin: 118).

12. "(David) voulut aller chercher dans l'étude exclusive de l'art antique un point de départ nouveau; il ne s'inquiéta ni des hommes ni des événements qu'il voyait, il remonta maladroitement le courant des siècles et s'éprit d'une admiration sans borne pour des costumes, des attitudes, des moeurs qui n'avaient plus leur raison d'être." Du Camp (4).

13. Although Du Camp's ideas were almost diametrically opposed to those of Delécluze, they both felt a deep mistrust of l'art pour l'art. Du Camp accused Delacroix of being a typical l'art pour l'art painter: "L'humanité et l'histoire, qu'il semble avoir

vues à travers un kaleidoscope immense, n'ont été pour lui qu'un motif à association de nuances bien choisies." Du Camp (89).

14. "...et c'est dans ce temps et à son premier voyage en Italie (...) (qu')il se mit à étudier les statues et les bas-reliefs antiques, non pas comme d'autres convertis inintelligents, qui ne faisaient qu'une transposition de formes matérielles, mais cherchant toujours à découvrir le principe de l'art antique pour en faire l'application à l'art de la peinture moderne." Delécluze (1856: 177).

15. "...forcé d'envisager ici son Radeau de la Méduse comme représentant une doctrine mise en opposition à celle de David, on ne peut plus y voir qu'une rénovation de l'école et de la manière de Jouvenet, en sorte que l'on est amené à conclure que l'effort de ce jeune peintre fut dirigé dans un sens rétrograde, et qu'il est loin d'avoir fait avancer l'art, comme on l'a cru pendant quelque temps." Delécluze (1855: 384).

16. Delécluze, Journal des débats 11 September 1824.

17. On seeing Robert's Fisherman from Naples Improvising Delécluze asked himself and his readers the following question: "Ce tableau est charmant d'accord; mais est-ce un tableau d'histoire, ou de genre? Pour moi, je n'en sais rien, et cela me seroit fort égal, si je ne me trouvais pas engagé à dire mon avis sur l'exposition..." After this he declares that such a noble figure can never belong to genre. Journal des débats 5 September 1824: 2.

18. Delécluze, Journal des débats 5 September 1824, and (1855: 392).

19. "Cet homme a trop d'idées et trop d'esprit pour avoir jamais la patience de devenir un bon pein-

tre." Delécluze (1856: 216).

20. Delécluze "Salon de 1831; XIV," Journal des débats 2 July 1831: 3.

21. "De M. Ary Scheffer et des singes du sentiment." Ch. Baudelaire, "Salon de 1846," Curiosités esthétiques, nouvelle édition (Paris, 1889) 166. See Boime (1980: 48).

22. Delécluze (1855: 388).

23. See Delécluze (1855: 392), Journal des débats 5 March 1834: 1.

24. Delécluze, "Salon de 1837, deuxième article, peinture: MM Bendemann, Paul Delaroche, Ary Scheffer," Journal des débats 8 March 1837.

L. Ewals, Ary Scheffer: Sa vie et son oeuvre, thesis, Nimwegue, 1987, 79 and Ziff (164) both disagree with Delécluze's assumption that the paintings were badly received, because of the public's lack of interest in and understanding of subject and style. While Scheffer's Christus Consolator was a huge public success, because of the preoccupation with both the spiritual and the liberal-humanitarian which it showed, Delaroche's sudden attempt to tackle spiritual painting met with a mixed response from the critics but his serious intentions were not doubted.

25. "Je ne m'aviserais pas d'établir un parallèle entre Robert et le plus grand peintre de la grande époque catholique; mais je ne puis m'empêcher de reconnaître leur parenté. Ce n'est à la vérité qu'un air de famille, tout entier dans les formes matérielles, mais non dans l'esprit. Raphael est tout imbu de christianisme catholique, religion qui exprime le combat de l'esprit contre la matière ou du ciel contre la terre, qui a l'oppression de la matière pour objet, appelle péché toute protestation de cette dernière et voudrait spiritualiser la terre ou plutôt la sacrifier

au ciel. Mais Robert appartient à un peuple chez lequel le catholicisme est, sinon mort, du moins très avancé dans son agonie. (...) Robert est Français et, comme la plupart de ses compatriotes, obéit à son insu à une doctrine encore voilée qui ne veut pas entendre parler d'un combat de l'esprit contre la matière, qui n'interdit pas à l'homme les jouissances certaines d'ici-bas, et lui promet en même temps des joies célestes dans l'azur de l'infini, qui veut au contraire béatifier l'homme dès cette vie terrestre et regarde le monde sensible comme aussi sacré que le monde spirituel. Les Moissonneurs de Robert ne sont donc pas seulement purs de tout péché, mais ils ne savent même ce que c'est qu'un péché. Leur travail de tous les jours est leur pitié; ils prient donc continuellement sans remuer les lèvres, sont bienheureux sans paradis, réconciliés sans sacrifice expiatoire, purs de toute tache originelle, saints et archi-saints." Heine (131).

26. J.-N. Paillot de Montabert, Traité complet de la peinture, I (Paris, 1829-1851) 184.

27. Paillot de Montabert, I (8).

28. Paillot de Montabert, I (54).

29. "...l'incertitude des procès et la maladresse même de la main se laissent apercevoir (...) on voit que la pensée et le sentiment de l'artiste ont toujours dominé sa main..." Delécluze, "Exposition de 1842; III" Journal des débats 25 March 1842.

30. Delécluze (1855: 411).

31. Bénichou (18-19).

32. Letter from Chateaubriand to the poet Nicolas Martin of 19 May 1836, cited in Bénichou (119).

33. In his second article on Rio in the Journal des débats of 9 September 1838, Delécluze betrays his mistrust of the forced combined regeneration of Catholicism and art, advocated by Rio. In his view,

now that religion had disappeared as a leading force in society, only the efforts of a few individual, gifted artists could help bring about the regeneration of art. See B. Foucart, Le renouveau de la peinture religieuse en France, 1800-1860 (Paris, 1987) 5-31, for the gap separating Rio from theorists like Delécluze. The latter betrays his dislike of the Nazarenes in the Journal des débats of 8 March 1837.

34. The solution was indeed purely pragmatic. Delécluze was honest enough to admit that eclecticism, particularly that of Le Globe, was a seductive but rather vague doctrine, which could not really put an end to the doubts of sceptics. Delécluze (1862: 265). He believed the separation of state and spiritual power, and the institution of constitutional government to have been inevitable and blamed Joseph de Maistre and Lamennais for wishing to impose religious ideas on eclectic liberalism, so weakening it still further. Theocratic and constitutional government could not in his view be combined (401).

35. "A cette dernière époque, les idées et les habitudes religieuses étant familières à toutes les classes de la société, les sujets qui en dérivent étaient compris et accueillis de tout le monde. Les artistes trouvent une théorie et une poétique consacrées par un long usage, s'y conformaient sans réflexion, comme on obéit à une loi établie depuis longtemps. Or, rien n'est plus favorable au développement du talent des artistes que la permanence du goût fondé sur des croyances sérieuses, et l'on ne fait pas assez d'attention à l'immense avantage qu'ont eu les peintres de la Renaissance en n'éprouvant pas, ainsi que ceux de nos jours, l'embarras que causent incessamment la recherche et la choix des sujets de peinture." Delécluze (1855:402).

36. Delécluze (1855: 407-408).

37. Delécluze (1855: 73).

38. Many of those who dreamed of the Primitive World believed in the existence of a superior Atlantean-like human race of true philosophers, inventors and creators. G. Levitine, The Dawn of Bohemianism: The Barbu Rebellion and Primitivism in Neoclassical France (University Park, 1978) 97. Levitine's is the most extensive study to date on the Barbu movement. For eighteenth century artistic primitivism in general see R. Rosenblum, The International Style of 1800: A Study in Linear Abstraction, thesis, New York U, 1956 (New York, 1976).

39. These ideas were, however, refined by Paillot de Montabert's calm and methodical mind. Delécluze (1855: 97).

40. Delécluze (1855: 219-220, 227).

41. Levitine poses the problem of early nineteenth-century artists' wish "to secede from their own historical era".(132). Delécluze's attitude in particular can be understood as characteristic of the aesthetic crisis which Levitine sees emerging in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, reacting against the oppressive cult of popular science and the immense popularity of panorama and diorama.

42. Delécluze, "Salon de 1837; VI: Peinture (batailles), MM Delacroix, Schnetz, Scheffer etc," Journal des débats 6 April 1837.

43. Delécluze (Résumé de l'exposition de 1824 et '27: 3).

44. According to Rousseau, man had to subordinate his own will to the general will, with the public interest and patriotism as his highest goals. God did not speak to persons individually, but only through their collective conscience. The concept of God had

always to be related to the collective life of a society. B. Groethuysen, J.-J. Rousseau (1949; Paris, 1983) 323-324. Vyverberg draws our attention to Rousseau's condemnation of the "coldness of a ubiquitous rationalism" and corrupting modern society. H. Vyverberg, Historical Pessimism in the French Enlightenment (Cambridge Mass., 1958) 57.

45. Delécluze's ideas on the growing individualization of taste after the disappearance of ideals which prevented people from pursuing their personal interests too much, can be compared to those described by Barrell.

46. "...ce ne sont jamais les scènes familières et humbles, telles que les intérieurs de ménages pauvres, d'habitations d'artisans, et les détails d'une écurie ou d'une crèche qui attirent l'attention et excitent l'intérêt des pauvres gens qui vivent journellement au milieu de ces misères; ce qui les frappe (...) ce sont au contraire les peintures représentant des sujets qui réveillent de grands souvenirs religieux ou historiques." Delécluze (1856: 6).

47. "Mais par une singularité propre à notre époque, et résultat fatal et inévitable de cette fièvre industrielle qui nous mine depuis vingt ans, les hommes qui sont forcés de commencer leur fortune, qui auraient besoin de consacrer toutes les heures de leur vie à un travail opiniâtre, et qui naturellement seraient portés à vivre avec le plus de simplicité et d'économie, ne peuvent le faire." Delécluze, "Salon de 1840; IV," Journal des débats 10 April 1840.

48. "Pour mon compte, je déclare que je ne voyage qu'avec peine et avec une sorte de répugnance à travers ce chaos d'idées où l'on sait jamais bien où l'on est ni où l'on va." Delécluze (1856: 253).

49. Delécluze, "Salon de 1836: II," Journal des débats 11 March 1836. A.-C. Quatremère de Quincy, Histoire de la vie et des ouvrages des plus célèbres architectes du XIe siècle jusqu'à la fin du XVIIIe, accompagnée de la vue du plus remarquable édifice de chacun d'eux, ed. J. Renouard (1830; New York, 1970). Quatremère de Quincy describes the Camposanto and mentions that Queen Christina of Sweden "donnait (...) à ces intéressantes galeries le nom de Museum" (40). Besides the works of art gathered here he believes the most important aspect of the Camposanto to be "cette réunion d'hommes célèbres dont la république de Pise a consacré, sous ces portiques, les fidèles images, ou conservé sur le marbre les noms et la mémoire" (42).

50. "Outre son intérêt historique, cet établissement aura un but moral et politique. On n'en sortira pas sans avoir éclairé son esprit, meublé sérieusement sa mémoire et reçu de graves enseignemens. Beaucoup d'ouvrages médiocres y figureront!" These works become meaningful again "...par la place qu'ils occupent, par le siècle ou le jour dont ils rappellent les souvenirs... Tel portrait faible, que l'on ne regarderait s'il était isolé, prendra par le nom et la date écrits sur sa bordure, un intérêt très réel". Delécluze, Journal des débats 11 March 1836.

51. A.-C. Quatremère de Quincy, Considérations morales sur la destination des ouvrages de l'art ou de l'influence de leur emploi sur le génie et le goût de ceux qui les produisent ou qui les jurent, et sur le sentiment de ceux qui en jouissent et en reçoivent les impressions (Paris, 1815).

52. "On ne s'occupe plus qu'à comparer dessin avec dessin, couleur avec couleur. On calcule des beautés et des défauts, on fait une balance pittoresque (...) De là une habitude pernicieuse, celle de ne plus

rien estimer, qu'en raison d'une perfection abstraite, de ne point vouloir des défauts, de ne pas tenir compte des raisons qui excusent, et quelquefois légitiment ce qu'on prend pour une erreur et ce que les lieux, les circonstances et la faveur des considérations qui s'y rattachent, auraient fait regarder avec admiration." Quatremère de Quincy (1815: 43).

53. "La science, comme on le voit, est très envahissante de sa nature, et elle est parvenue à emprisonner dans ses classifications rigoureuses jusqu'aux plus admirables chefs- d'oeuvre de l'art que renferme le vaste Musée du Louvre. Que l'on établisse de l'ordre dans cette immense collection, rien de mieux; mais si l'on inscrivait les oeuvres du génie sous un numéro d'ordre comme on pourrait à la rigueur ranger Bossuet, Pascal et La Fontaine dans le classe des mammifères..." Delécluze, "Le Louvre," Journal des débats 3 February 1838.

54. See H.-W. van Helsdingen, Politiek van de dood: Begraven tijdens de Franse Revolutie, 1789-1800. (Amsterdam, 1987) 127-128.

55. Considérations sur les arts du dessin en France (Paris, 1791). He objects to "l'esprit de calcul et de système, l'empire des règles et de l'enseignement". His ideas differed greatly from those of the Société libre des beaux-arts.

56. Delécluze (1855: 403).

57. E. Mai, "Poussin, Félibien und Lebrun: Zur Formierung der Französischen Historienmalerei an der Académie Royale de Peinture et Sculpture in Paris," Historienmalerei in Europa: Paradigmen in Form, Funktion und Ideologie, hrsg. von E. Mai unter Mitarb. von A. Repp-Eckert (Mainz. a. R., 1990) 9-25. Th. Kirchner, "Neue Themen, neue Kunst? Zu einem Versuch die Französische Historienmalerei zu reformieren,"

Historienmalerei (107-120).

58. Delécluze's mistrust of history painting seems to be backed by the findings of Crow (1985). He believes that far from uniting the French nation, history painting fell victim to the needs of several political pressure groups within the French nation during the eighteenth century, while the artists themselves were violently opposed to history painting around 1750, because they feared that their established clientèle would not be interested. Although he did not share Delécluze's belief that history painting originated only around 1700, Heine (126-127) wrote that when religious painting, originally the only form of history painting, lost its function the term history painting was used to designate paintings of scenes from mythology, Biblical, Ancient and later modern history, in order to distinguish it from genre, the painting of ordinary life. This seems to have been the more common view.

59. "...un de ces hôpitaux de la peinture auxquels on donne le nom fastueux de Musées." Delécluze (1855: 403). Géricault had similar problems to those experienced by David when he exhibited The Raft of the Medusa in 1819. The painting was first hung too high and then too low. Kemp (109) concludes that the enormous size of the canvas and the devices used by Géricault "to draw the viewer into the painting" served to demand the viewer's attention and to push aside the painting's rivals. The increasing size of paintings and the need to manipulate the viewer visible in the work of David and others were thus the direct result of art losing its traditional function and becoming an object of trade.

60. Delécluze (1855: 220).

61. "Déjà vers la moitié de sa carrière, le Poussin, renonçant à l'emploi des symboles et de

l'allégorie, s'attachait à la réalité." Delécluze (1855: 412).

62. Delécluze (1855: 120).

63. The Oath of the Horatii and Brutus must be understood as "des nobles jeux de son esprit et de son imagination". Delécluze (1855: 405).

64. "Enfin il a manqué à cet homme, ainsi qu'à tous ceux dont il était entouré une foi quelconque fixe et inébranlable. De là cette diversité dans les sujets; de là l'inutilité, l'inopportunité de la plupart de ces productions, fort remarquables sous le rapport de l'art, mais qui distraient les esprits au lieu de les captiver et de les instruire; qui font diverger les idées au lieu de les ramener à un centre unique, et dont en somme l'incohérence et la multiplicité affaiblissent promptement le souvenir." Delécluze (1855: 324).

65. Delécluze (1855: 410).

66. A.-C. Quatremère de Quincy, Histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de Raphaël (Paris, 1824). For the deep interest in Raphael's art in nineteenth century France see Foucart and Raphaël et l'art français, exhibition catalogue (Paris, 1983).

67. "Was hat nun nicht gar Raffael oder irgendetwas anderer der grossen italienischen Meister aus der Madonna und dem Christuskinde gemacht. Welche Tiefe der Empfindung, welches geistiges Leben, welche Innigkeit und Fülle, welche Hoheit der Lieblichkeit, welches menschliches und doch ganz von göttlichen Geiste durchdrungenes Gemüt spricht uns aus jedem Zuge an." G.W.F. Hegel, Aesthetik, II, 2nd ed. by H.G. Hothos (1842; Berlin, 1965) 178. Later on, (200) Hegel remarks: "Die höchste, eigentümlichste Form dieser Liebe ist die Mutterliebe Marias zu Christus, die Liebe der einen Mutter, die den Heiland der Welt geboren und in ihren Armen trägt."

68. "...Raphaël a toujours gardé, dans les rapports de soins et de caresses entre la mère et l'enfant, une mesure de réserve, de respect et de pudeur, qui contribue plus qu'on ne saurait le dire, à produire le caractère de sainteté que le sujet exige." Quatremère de Quincy (1824: 136).

69. "...la Dispute du Saint-Sacrément, l'Ecole d'Athènes, la Vierge de Foligno, la Sainte Cécile, de l'immortel Raphaël, sont des chefs-d'oeuvre, non pas parce qu'ils présentent une scène bien dramatiquement enchaînée, mais seulement parce que chaque personnage, placé presque isolement et se rattachant aux autres plutôt par une pensée que par une attitude et une expression, soumet peu à peu les yeux et l'âme, au lieu de s'attaquer aux passions." Delécluze (1855: 220-221).

70. Delécluze (1855: 408). The source of this remark may be German. Hegel, citing Rumohr, praises late fifteenth and early sixteenth century Italian art for its "fleckeloser Seelenreinheit und gänzlicher Hingebung in süßschmerzliche und schwärmerische zärtliche Gefühle," Hegel (252). The quote comes from Italienische Forschungen, II: 310. "Love" was for the Platonist Hegel the most important quality visible in Romantic, i.e. Christian, painting and his admiration for Raphael's Madonnas was based on the notion that they expressed the highest form of love. (See note 67).

71. "Si le sujet des Sabines ne réalise pas cet ensemble et cette unité dramatique que les modernes exigent si impérieusement, cependant la vue de ces guerriers près de combattre, mais séparés par des femmes jetant entre eux leurs enfants, présente une scène si simple, que le spectateur, sans s'inquiéter de ce qui précède ou de ce qui suivra, peut y prendre intérêt instinctivement." Delécluze (1855: 338-339).

72. "Ce qui nuit donc le plus à l'effet

général de cette scène est sa nature, qui la classe au nombre des sujets dramatiques, tandis que David l'a traitée originairement dans un mode lyrique." Delécluze (1855: 339). Art historians are unsure of the exact meaning of this remark, because it is not quite clear during which stage of the creation of Leonidas David wished to paint in a lyrical mode. Neither is it clear which meaning Delécluze attached to the word lyrical. Did he only mean Leonidas' meditative pose, or the lack of dramatic composition visible in the painting as a whole as well? See G. Stemmrich, "David's Leonidas bei den Thermopylen: Klassizistisch vollzogene Kunstautonomie als 'Patriotisme sur la toile'," Frankreich 1800 (1990) 67.

73. "La position critique de Léonidas et de ses guerriers inquiète trop ceux qui en sont instruits, pour que le peintre n'ait pas fait quelques efforts afin de la rendre intelligible." Delécluze (1855: 339).

74. "Dans ce dernier temps David, ramené par ses travaux intermédiaires du Couronnement et des Aigles a une imitation de la nature plus exacte, finit en prosateur le tableau, qu'il avait entrepris en poète." Delécluze (1855: 339).

75. Delécluze (1855: 340).

76. "C'est bien, très-bien David. Vous avez devinée ma pensée, vous m'avez fait chevalier français." Delécluze (1855: 313)

77. Rubin (349-351) also mentions the influence of the genre troubadour on David's Sacre.

CHAPTER 6 **PLANCHE; a classicist defending**
Shakespeare

Introduction

Gustave Planche (1808-1857) was the most important and most formidable critic of the July Monarchy. After joining the staff of La Revue des deux mondes shortly after the beginning of this regime, he campaigned against the superficiality which he saw in the art of his time. The vehemence of his attacks earned him the nickname of La Revue des deux mondes' exécuteur des hautes oeuvres(1), that is, its public executioner. His biography is quickly told. He was born into a Parisian family of rich apothecaries and, according to his father's wishes, studied medicine, although he did not complete his studies. His family is described as holding republican and atheist views and not prominent in intellectual terms. However, Gustave was sent to the best schools, where he was confronted by the cultural and political controversies of the Restoration.

Planche's ideas on politics remain vague and it seems likely that the subject ceased to hold his attention after a brief flirtation with liberalism during the years leading up to the July Revolution and its aftermath. Even so his choice of La Revue des deux

mondes as his employer indicates that he sympathized with the magazine's policy of opposition to the July Monarchy and supported its qualified welcome for new tendencies in art and literature. Planche undoubtedly shared his contemporaries' search for new spiritual values which could return to art and philosophy the elevation which they had lost as Christian religion had waned.

Even more than the generation of intellectuals who contributed to Le Globe, Planche was influenced by the eclecticism and spiritualism of Victor Cousin, whose lectures he attended in 1828. In that year Cousin returned to his chair at the Sorbonne, having been suspended for several years because of his liberal sympathies. Planche's writings also betray the influence of Dubos, whose theories influenced the defenders of strong, mimetic expression during the Restoration as they did Eugène Delacroix, a painter Planche admired greatly. Planche wanted to keep intact the French eighteenth-century tradition in art and art theory, whilst combining it with the spiritualism of Victor Cousin. Since Planche fought an endless battle with his fellow critic Delécluze, comparison of their work may clarify the basic differences between the tendencies which they represented.

Unlike Delécluze, Planche was not at the centre of

a group of intellectuals, discussing the culture of their time and initiating new developments, and for most of his life he remained an isolated figure. His status as a medical student was not easily reconciled with his struggle to become part of the Parisian intellectual elite, as he soon discovered. He therefore had to give up his studies, which naturally displeased his intellectually unambitious father. Since his father gave Gustave a very small allowance indeed, the son's decision to become an art and literary critic was prompted as much by necessity as by the desire to make his mark on the cultural life of his time.

By all accounts Planche's appearance was always very sloppy. Again this was partly explained by lack of money but it is also likely that he wanted to draw attention to himself by posing as a bohemian. However, even his friends, Hugo (for a while), Vigny, George Sand, to name the most important, were less than enthusiastic about the extremes to which he went to in this. To make matters worse, Planche always lost out to other men when vying for the affections of the women he loved. As a result he was forever in competition with the men he knew, and his often harsh judgment of their work can partly be explained by his sense of inferiority. For example, Planche reviewed Vigny's drama Chatterton (1834) less favourably than perhaps the piece

deserved. When he wrote his article on Chatterton, the unfortunate critic had just discovered that the actress Marie Dorval, whom he adored, preferred Vigny, who had created the important part of Kitty Bell for her.

Upon the death of his father in 1840, Planche was able to lead a life of ease for an extended period. He spent his inheritance on a five year stay in Italy, returning to his work with La Revue des deux mondes in 1845. By this time he was less concerned with "giving his opinion" and much of his later work suffers from this waning interest in his profession.

Gustave Planche has been the subject of several monographs. The earliest of them, written by Wolfgang Balzer in 1908, displays the least prejudice towards a figure who was not generally liked during his lifetime. Balzer is interested in Planche's criticism of both literature and art, which cannot be said of his later biographers. Maurice Regard, whose biography of Planche appeared in 1955, makes no secret of his lack of sympathy for his subject. Although there is no doubt that the harshness of Planche's criticism can be partly explained by the coldness of his family relations and his later sense of isolation, psychology alone does not explain all aspects of his activities as a critic, as Regard seems to believe. Neither was Planche an inveterate enemy of Romanticism as a whole. Both this

aesthetic movement and the critic were too complex to justify such a simple assertion. Pontus Grate (1959) embedded his ideas on Planche in an excellent study of developments in French art criticism of the "Romantic era". However, like Regard, he tends to see Planche as more of a conservative than he really was. This leads him to underestimate Planche's lasting admiration for Delacroix and to exaggerate the esteem in which he held Ingres' work. Regard sympathizes with the socially committed Thore and cannot generate much understanding for Planche's elitist stance.(2)

In this chapter I will continue with the attempts made by Balzer to compare Planche's art and theatre criticism, in order to reveal the full complexity of his ideas on the culture of his time. This method will also allow me to clarify the basic differences of opinion which existed between Planche and Delécluze, the critic of the Journal des débats. As early as his first Salon, Planche demonstrated the gap between his ideas and those held by Delécluze with a vicious attack on the other critic.

Although Planche was hardly close to Delécluze in his thinking, they were both seen as conservatives by their opponents. Although interested in modern literature, Delécluze was hostile to almost every tendency in modern art, whereas Planche appreciated many

aspects of modern art and literature. In contrast to Delécluze he admired Shakespeare without reservation and as we have seen he could appreciate Delacroix.

As I have indicated, Planche was strongly influenced by the theories of Victor Cousin(3) and by the ideas current among the journalists working for Le Globe, which can also be related to those of Cousin. Of the art critics at Le Globe, Thiers seems to have had an especially strong influence on him. His eclectic point of view allowed nineteenth-century artists the freedom to emulate any master from the past as long as they maintained classical beauty and clarity in their rendering of the human figure.

Planche did not share Delécluze's opinion, based on the theories of Quatremère de Quincy, that the very nature of history painting excluded the possibility of depicting abstract ideas. According to these two critics, history painting could merely represent the actions of human beings and, through peinture d'expression, their passing emotions. They believed that only allegory or the utmost simplicity of form and expression as achieved by Raphael, could compete with poetry in communicating a beau moral, be it religious or wordly. Although Planche agreed with them that Raphael's simple style could not be bettered for religious subjects, he also felt that more modern ideas could perhaps be better

expressed using peinture d'expression, which was abhorred by both Delécluze and Quatremère de Quincy. Planche similarly considered the styles of the Venetian, Flemish and English colouristic Schools better suited to paintings with modern subjects than that of Raphael's Roman School.

Although Planche regretted the passing of the great religious art of the Renaissance as much as Delécluze or Quatremère de Quincy, he was less negative in his judgment of subsequent developments than either of these two critics. Delécluze was a sceptic in religious matters but mourned the end of the simplicity of life in a society dominated by religion. He could not accept the growing individualization of life which had been taking place since the beginning of the sixteenth century and had great difficulty finding a role in society for contemporary art. In the end, for Delécluze only the celebration of national identity and unity could fill the void left by religion.

For most of his life Planche was probably not a religious man. He believed that history painting by showing human beings in dramatic situations was fully capable of filling the gap left by religious painting. He judged that it could depict noble human action and the greatness of human character, or the essence of an historical event. In this way, spiritualism would return

to art. However, instead of using the term beau moral, Planche preferred to speak of painters having to depict le vrai beneath reality. Both terms were familiar from Victor Cousin's vocabulary.(4)

Only late in his career (in an enthusiastic article on Cousin in 1853), did Planche fully accept the Platonic implications of the term beau moral as used by Victor Cousin. He had adopted the view that the ideals of human beauty and human action were only to be found in God. Hence his quest for beau ideal and beau moral ultimately led him to accept the existence of God.(5) This change came in the wake of a growing interest in the idealised nude as the basis of art, which first became evident between 1835 and 1840, and was further strengthened by his stay in Italy. Unfortunately, this late interest in Platonism deprived Planche of much of his former broad-mindedness.

The quality which Planche admired most in writers and artists was their insight into the secrets of the human heart, a value shared by the phares of both classical and modern times. Although ancient and modern cultures could not be more different, they showed that the deepest motives for human actions had not changed over the centuries. In this way Planche, who was hardly a believer, could still define a spiritualism which united great artists and writers, while respecting their

individuality and the process of historical change. As this is particularly true of Planche's writings from the 1830's, before he left for Italy, we shall concentrate mainly on this most fruitful period in his time as a critic.

The Theatre of the 1830's

At the beginning of the July Monarchy, Planche seems to have had high expectations of the 1830 Revolution. In his Salon of 1831 he heaped praise on Delacroix's painting Freedom Leading the People which celebrated this Revolution. His faith in the new regime soon waned, however. He despised the superficiality and materialism which dominated France during the 1830's and criticised the playwright Scribe, whose work he felt epitomised the spirit of the age because he depicted poverty as a crime and wealth as a virtue.(6)

The magazine La Revue des deux mondes was in the hands of the opposition for the first ten years of the July Monarchy. Only after 1840 did it adopt a pro-government stance. Its director Fernand Buloz had gathered the remaining staff of Le Globe around him when the journalists aspiring to a career in politics left in 1830, and those who supported Saint-Simonism transformed Le Globe into a mouthpiece of this movement.

Others defected to La Revue des deux mondes, hoping to preserve the policy of cautious acceptance of new tendencies in art which had characterized Le Globe in its heyday. They saw a great contrast between this attitude and the vulgarized juste milieu which won Paul Delaroche and the playwright Casimir Delavigne immense popularity during the first years of the July Monarchy.(7) Planche in particular was highly critical of them.

Even more scathing were Planche's attacks on Victor Hugo, who became a member of the Academy and Pair of France during the July Monarchy. Planche's other reason for disliking him was probably that in his search for a new Romantic drama, he pandered too much to his public's superficiality and demand for sensation.

Planche, who was familiar with the thinking of progressive circles during the Restoration, must have originally felt he had much in common with Hugo, who had espoused the development of drama suited to a nineteenth century public, although his Preface to Cromwell had made clear that simple realism was not the best way to achieve this aim. However, the essence he wanted to reveal of the events he depicted was slightly different from that which the critics of Le Globe and later Planche wished to see.

Hugo's notion of the complexity of human nature,

which he considered characteristic of the modern, Christian era, prevented any real understanding between himself and Planche. Although Hugo's opposition of complex modern life to the simplicity of life and art in classical antiquity was not new, his belief in the existence of antithetical forces in one and the same character distinguished him from other thinkers. The sublime and grotesque, and the extremes of good and evil in Hugo's characters annoyed Planche and indeed many other critics. For Rémusat, who had reviewed Cromwell in Le Globe, it was one of the main reasons for condemning the play. Planche objected to Hugo's characterisation of the courtesan Marion Delorme, whom the writer had portrayed as capable of complete unselfishness in love. Planche noted that Marion Delorme's biography made her unworthy of Hugo's view of her. Nor did he believe that Lucretia Borgia, one of the most notorious women in history, was capable of the tender maternal love which Hugo attributed to her. The jester Triboulet in Le roi s'amuse (1832), combined physical ugliness with a deep and noble love for his daughter.(8) Hugo himself believed that the value of these sentiments would have more impact on his public because of the way in which they contrasted with the appearance and reputation of his protagonists. His dramas would demonstrate that there was some good in even the most objectionable of

characters and that there was hope even for them.(9)

Planche was of a different opinion. If a writer wanted his public to understand the deeper significance of historical events, his work should obey the classical rule of vraisemblance, respecting both historical fact and the public's understanding of human psychology. Hugo, he felt, had done the opposite, filling his plays with mere spectacle. They offered the viewer only the visual contrast between the palace and the prison, light and dark, Triboulet's frightening appearance and his tender love for his daughter. The moral contrasts were too facile to contemplate. Hugo's plays were food for the eyes only.(10)

Planche's objections to Hugo's plays seem to have been borne out by the fact that most of them failed to secure a lasting place in the repertory. However, Planche may not have given Hugo enough credit. The poet who had started his career as an ardent royalist and who had embraced liberalism during the late 1820's came to feel an increasing sympathy for the common people when the July Monarchy proved unable to change their lot. He wanted to reach them through his plays and therefore resorted to the spectacle and exaggeration of melodrama, and the staggering realism of panorama. Planche was also almost totally blind to the deeper meaning of Hugo's nature poetry. The poet was trying to express the

Romantic notion that God was in even the smallest leaf of grass, but the critic saw only the realistic rendering of scenes from nature. Planche's attitude is all the more surprising given his understanding of this pantheism in the works of the painter Granet.(11)

Although Planche was not kindly disposed towards Hugo, his verdict on Alexandre Dumas' dramas was equally harsh. It also displays the beginnings of his interest in Platonism. He felt that Dumas had confined himself to portraying only the basest of human passions. He did not analyze love as a universal human passion in his plays but depicted only lust, its most base manifestation. Although he claimed to depict reality, even there he failed.(12) Dumas' preoccupations emerge in the most frightening manner in Anthony (1831), where the protagonist kills the object of his desire for resisting him.

Vigny, whom Planche initially condemned because of the conflict over Marie Dorval, was ultimately the only modern playwright he considered able to counterbalance the influence of Dumas and Hugo. Rather than presenting a series of spectacles, his novels mark a return to the analysis of the passions which precipitated historical events. His adaptations of Shakespeare's plays for the French stage in the 1820's were far truer to the originals than any of those before him. His play

Chatterton seemed to Planche to bring back into French drama the spirituality which he and his contemporaries so ardently wished for. Chatterton tells the story of a talented but destitute young poet whose only hope for a change of circumstances is a place as a servant in the household of the Lord Mayor of London. This, and his impossible love for Kitty Bell, a merchant's wife in whose house he rents a room, drive him to suicide. The unities were strictly obeyed by Vigny, and the piece lacked the sensation-seeking so characteristic of the work of Hugo and Dumas. Planche was probably deeply moved by the play's theme, the tragedy of a young genius, at odds with society. Other critics praised Vigny for his ability to use a story which took place in the eighteenth century for its bitter comment on the society of his own time and its contempt for artists and poets. Still, Planche did not consider the play an unqualified success. Instead of showing the action and gripping conflict of passions which formed the attraction of really great plays, Vigny had analyzed them. Chatterton was no more than a lamentation of the sad fate of a talented poet who died too young and by his own hand.(13) The critic considered Vigny's use of only one simple emotion insufficient to hold the public's attention for a whole evening.

Planche saw the same flaws in the work of Casimir

Delavigne. His most popular play, Les enfants d'Edouard, was based on Delaroche's portrayal of the death of the two small princes in the Tower. Here again, the story hardly seemed important enough to form the subject for an elegy, and could not carry a four-act tragedy. The choice of two children and their entourage as the protagonists of a play could not yield the conflict of passions Planche wanted to see, since they were in fact only the victims of conflicts in which they themselves took no part. As in all Delavigne's plays the audience received no clues at all as to the play's theme. Only if he had taken Richard III as his protagonist would he have been able to clarify the reasons for the Wars of the Roses, in which the murder of the princes in the Tower was only an episode. Richard III, their murderer, was one of the feudal lords who allowed nothing to stand in the way of their desire to win the throne of England. Only absolute monarchy had been able to end this near-anarchy.

The influence of Delavigne's typically juste milieu writing on French theatre was judged by Planche to be as fatal as Victor Hugo's. He tried to find middle ground between the classical tragedy and modern historical drama, not to shed light on the role played by human passion in history but simply in order to find favour with the public. Delavigne, he claimed, followed the

classical rules to please the older generation, adding a dash of Shakespearian realism and excitement to appeal to the younger members of the audience. Lavish set decorations and costumes were part of this effort to please the public. In this way, the principle of reconciliation espoused by the critics of the Restoration because it would help to elevate and to restore human interest to modern art and theatre, deteriorated into a means of satisfying the widest possible public. No real insight into history or the human mind should be expected from Delavigne, whose plays would soon cease to move the public.(14)

We must conclude that Planche's view of developments in the theatre of the 1830's was hardly favourable. As he saw it most playwrights had nothing more than empty spectacle to offer a materialistic, superficial public. Those who wanted to write more spiritually stimulating drama were the exception rather than the rule. Vigny, by far the most serious and spiritual playwright of this period, tended to choose subjects which were too simple to hold his public's attention. Although Planche's respect for Vigny's achievement was sincere, he focussed most of his attention on Hugo.

The Problem of Shakespearian Art and Expression in Planche's Thought

As far as the critics were concerned, Planche's main target was Delécluze, whose distinction between Homeric and Shakespearian art Planche violently opposed. The difference between the two he saw as entirely superficial. At a deeper level Homeric art, which was according to Delécluze only concerned with beauty of form, was no different from the art of Shakespeare who sought to depict both the ugly and beautiful sides of reality. Planche's objections to Hugo's works as well as his criticism of *juste milieu* art and theatre are easier to understand in the light of this basic difference of opinion between him and Delécluze. In his Salon of 1831, the first he ever wrote, Planche attacked the older, respected critic for his views on the paintings of Paul Delaroche. Delécluze regarded Delaroche rather than Planche's favourite painter of that year, Delacroix, as the leader of the Shakespearian School in painting, because Delaroche had shown himself to be an observer and a thinker.

Planche felt that Delaroche's portrait of Cromwell revealed only the artist's doubts and uncertainty. Unable to decide what expression to give Cromwell, Delaroche had made him impassive.(15) The painting fell

short of the mark as a history painting, lacking the quality which had been achieved by the great painters of the past. Those which followed had the same flaw. The Children of Edward, which was to inspire Delavigne, betrayed the same thematic weakness as the play. (16)

The Execution of Lady Jane Grey was also criticized by Planche. He considered it vacuous, sentimental and excessively indebted to an English print showing the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots. His objections to Delaroche and juste milieu art in general are most explicit in the article he wrote on the painting in 1834. The work reflected the artist's inability or unwillingness to express the deepest feelings of the characters in the scene, a flaw also detected by other critics. Planche found this particularly annoying in the case of Lady Jane Grey. The girl in the picture had none of the earnestness for which Lady Jane Grey had been known all her life. Her lack of expression and personality made her an ideal object of fantasy to an indiscriminating public. One could fill volumes on the feelings people detected in her half-covered and expressionless face.(17) Like Delavigne, Delaroche's only aim was to please as large a section of the public as possible with creations devoid of any deeper meaning. Planche was aware that the nineteenth-century historical novel was aimed mainly at a public which had only

recently discovered literature and which was unfamiliar with the tragedy and epic writing of the past. These readers loved the endless descriptions of historical scenes in which Walter Scott and his French followers excelled. They read not to be edified, but to be entertained and to have their imagination stimulated. Significantly, Planche objected strongly to Diderot's art-critical writing, which he believed to invite the public to judge paintings by the thoughts they suggested rather than the deeper meaning they expressed.(18) He probably saw Diderot's tendency to weave a story around the paintings which he admired reflected in the attitude of the public of his own time. The most striking example of this is perhaps Diderot's article on Greuze's Young Girl Weeping Over Her Dead Bird(ill. 32), (19) who inspired him to erotic fantasies. Perhaps Delaroche's Jane Grey was a direct descendant of this Greuze-girl.

In Planche's view, a truly Shakespearian artist would never let his imagination run free, nor wish to eliminate the unities of time, place and action. Instead, he would try to reveal to his public the inner life of his heroes and the passions and duties which inspired their actions.(20) For this reason, Delécluze had been totally wrong in assuming that both Victor Hugo and Delaroche were Shakespearian artists. Both men completely lacked Shakespeare's insight into human

psychology.

This realisation enabled Planche to develop a theory of his own without making the same distinction as Delécluze between Homeric and Shakespearian art. In his view, Shakespeare's interest in expression was not only the consequence of his belonging to modern culture, it was in fact the most important feature of any great writer and therefore also evident in the works of the classical Greek playwrights. Here Planche drew heavily on Victor Cousin, who had argued that the highest aim of every form of art was to express an ideal of moral or physical beauty and not to depict the outward appearance of things.

Like Lessing, Cousin believed that the aims and possibilities of all arts were different; poetry was superior to every other form of art because of its ability to inspire a multitude of thoughts and emotions with only one word, "fatherland" for example. Painting and sculpture, by contrast, were both limited to the depiction of reality and could never reach this level of expressiveness. This notion is diametrically opposed to the ideas of Dubos and other sensualist thinkers.

Cousin, however, valued painting much higher than sculpture and only slightly less than poetry. Not only could it depict the entire physical and spiritual world, but it could express the beauty of mankind and the human

soul in all its richness and variety. Only poetry could transcend painting in this respect.(21) Cousin's theory modified Lessing's arguments to relegate sculpture, the classical form of art, limited in its possibilities for expression, to a minor place within the hierarchy of art. Here Cousin showed his affinity with Schlegel and Mme De Staël, although his taste in art was far more conservative than theirs. He felt that the French seventeenth century had been the most successful period in the history of art and culture because it had produced the greatest talents in every form of art.

No painter outside France had ever been able to match Poussin's almost philosophical approach to his calling, in which a superb manner was harnessed to the expression of thought. Nor had any painter been able to express the most tender of human sentiments as well as Le Sueur. The dramatic poets had surpassed the Greeks by adding to the range of thoughts and emotions which tragedy could express the most impressive of them all, those of a great soul torn between passion and duty. This had been Corneille's achievement, while Racine excelled in expressing the simplest and most universal human feelings. Young artists and writers should follow the example of these great compatriots and not the writers and painters of other Schools, who may have excelled in the technical side of their profession but

could not rival the expressiveness of the art and literature of seventeenth-century France. Cousin embraced the Platonic notion that in order to express beauty, moral or other, art should possess unity and variety. (22) He inspired Planche's rigid defence of unity, his unswerving belief in the merits of peinture d'expression, and probably at least part of his theory on the variety in Shakespeare's work.

Shakespeare was the only modern playwright outside France for whom Cousin could muster genuine admiration. He even considered him superior to Corneille in the range of human feelings he could express. He seemed to grasp human nature in its entirety, man's basest passions as well as his most noble. Cousin concluded that the sentiments expressed by Shakespeare were more moving but less noble than those conveyed by Corneille. Cousin defined the difference between the classicist theatre of France and that of Shakespeare as follows: the former expressed nobility and simplicity of feeling while the latter revealed intensity and variety. He did not blame Shakespeare for lack of unity and spectacle for its own sake.

Planche's passionate defence of Shakespeare was based on his reading of Cousin and Schlegel, which convinced him of the inaccuracy of Hugo's interpretation of Shakespeare's work and drama in general once and for

all. The tragedy of Sophocles, a genre later taken up again by Racine, excelled in expressing only one passion in various ways. Shakespeare the dramatist was able to explore the whole range of human passions and was indeed a master in the depiction of every human emotion. He enabled the public to grasp the emotional development of a character and the conflicting passions which inspired his actions. At the same time, he would always make it clear that such conflicting emotions were two sides of the same coin. Though they might differ immensely, they remained recognizable as plausible manifestations of the same character, and not, as was the case in Victor Hugo's dramas, as incompatible qualities chosen at random. Planche's conclusion was that Shakespeare's dramas did not possess the explicit unity of tragedy, but an implicit one. The thoughts expressed by his characters led the audience back to the common centre from which all these varied and complex thoughts emanated.(23) Both Planche's view of the succession of emotions visible in Shakespeare's work and his description of the centre around which his plays revolved were based directly on Schlegel.(24)

Cousin's theories enabled Planche to attack Delécluze's basic notion that Shakespeare's art was inferior to classical art because it was an art of expression and not an art of form. Planche maintained

that expression had been the most important aspect of art for every great writer and painter of the past. Both Hugo and the *juste milieu* artists Delaroche and Delavigne had failed to understand this. Hugo's plays were centred around the puerile concept of the existence of antithetical sides to human character. The implausible characters and need for spectacle resulting from this completely mistaken interpretation of drama could hardly interest the educated viewer, since it lacked plausibility and elevation. Delavigne and Delaroche had understood Shakespeare even less well because they failed to express even one idea or emotion.

By using the criterion of expressiveness, Planche was able not only to elevate Shakespeare to a higher rank in the hierarchy of literature, but also to place every artist and writer he admired where he felt they belonged, regardless of the views of other critics.

Expression and Style

In his critical writings on painting Planche defended unity and expressiveness as ardently as in his theatre criticism, and objected to the realism and imitation of Schools from the past to which painters of his time were prone. Yet he did not reject these tendencies outright. He saw the desire to stress colour,

visible in the art of the sixteenth century and later, as part of a wish to depict new, non-religious themes, or the human, dramatic side of biblical history. Unlike Delécluze, Planche considered this a perfectly legitimate desire stemming from irreversible historical changes. Paintings of non-religious themes could be as valuable as religious scenes in a sobre, linear style, as long as the artists employed their technique to express their ideas and not only to explore colour or show off their technical skills. In Planche's view invention was an artist's greatest gift.(25) However, he was too well aware of the differences between artist's personalities not to analyze the different ways in which they used their capacity for invention. This is particularly clear in his writing on Ingres, Huet and Delacroix.

Planche's attitude to the debate on the merits of classical and Raphaelesque art over colouristic art is clear in his article on Calamatta's engraving after Ingres' Vow of Louis XIII (26). His admiration for the painting and Calamatta's copy in a different medium was sincere, and he even defended it against the more uncompromising observers who criticised the Madonna's facial expression because no Madonna of Raphael had looked like this. According to Planche, Ingres was not at fault, because he had to depict a subject never

tackled by the Master. For this reason it was impossible for him simply to copy the facial expression of one of Raphael's Madonnas. They showed only the happiness of motherhood, while Ingres' Madonna should also reveal intelligence and strength. Planche stressed that the changes which Ingres had made were permitted by the Roman School. We must conclude that Planche admired Louis XIII because Ingres had not copied the work of his model literally, but had attempted to reconcile a post-Raphaelite idea with Raphael's style.

Planche was also aware of the salutary effect which Ingres' resurrection of Raphael's manner had had on the painting of the young artists of the Restoration. However, he believed that Ingres' influence on French art of his time could go no further than this, because of the very nature of his style and subjects. A common objection to Raphael's work was that his figures lacked life. According to Planche, Raphael had deliberately simplified and abstracted the human form to underline the supernatural character of the Madonnas and saints he painted. They did not breathe the same air as ordinary human beings and if they could speak their voices would sound entirely different from ours. The fact that Raphael's manner was ideal for the depiction of religious subjects became even clearer when one compared his work with that of the Spanish painter Murillo. A

Madonna by the latter artist in the collection of Marshal Sault, probably the Conception Sault (ill. 33)(27), rendered in brilliant Andalusian colours, was more voluptuous than Raphael's and inspired more than a purely religious response.

Ingres' style could only be modified slightly to allow the expression of more modern ideas and subjects. Over the years he had lost his originality in interpreting Raphael's works, his paintings had become petrified copies of works of art made to suit the demands of an earlier era. Ingres had lost touch with his own time. Planche challenged Ingres' attitude towards Raphael. He had no doubt at all about Raphael's ability to absorb the important contributions to art made by other painters. Planche suggested that if he could really be reborn and not just resurrected by Ingres, the Renaissance master would incorporate the developments which had taken place in art since the sixteenth century in his work. In other words, he would be completely in touch with his time, while in the hands of Ingres he had become a mere shadow of his former self.

Nineteenth-century artists wishing to express the ideas and preoccupations of their own time could therefore not follow Ingres in his emulation of Raphael. Armed with their knowledge of art history they had to

find new ways to use it to serve their gift for invention.

Here Planche's theory of eclecticism differs from Cousin's. Although Cousin was seen as the father of eclecticism in philosophy, politics, literature and art, we have already seen that he was fairly conservative in his appreciation of artists and writers. He considered the achievements of the French seventeenth century the standard of perfection and he warned against emulation of colouristic painters, whose work he felt lacked the expressiveness of French art.(28) The influence of Dubos and De Piles on Planche's thinking is evident here. Dubos readily admitted that Raphael would have been an even greater artist had he been able to profit from later innovations in painting technique(29), while De Piles liked to recount the anecdote of the man who went to the Vatican to see Raphael's Stanze. Because the paintings did not boast realistic colouring which could attract the viewer to them, the poor man did not notice them even when they were right in front of him.(30) If Raphael had only been able to benefit from the lessons of the later colouristic Schools... Even more significant is De Piles' invention of an eclectic personal hierarchy of excellence in his judgment on painters.

Cousin, who largely rejected the sensualist

philosophy of the eighteenth century, believed in painting's ability to depict human feeling but did not agree that its direct appeal to the senses made it superior to every other form of art. Although Dubos and De Piles both emphasised that the imitation of nature should be kept in check by reason, this was not enough to convince Cousin. He believed that art which aimed to appeal to the senses and truly beautiful art were nearly incompatible. Man should be guided by reason in his search for the universal principles of physical and moral beauty. If art was to appeal to the senses and sentiments, his understanding of these principles would never transcend the limitations of his own personality.(31)

At least in the years before his stay in Italy, Planche seems to have believed that changing taste and personal emotions did not necessarily have to stand in the way of knowledge of the true principles of beauty. As we know, his indebtedness to Cousin later became more evident in his writing.

Reality and Tradition

Dynamic reality was one of the most important sources of inspiration for the artists of Planche's time. Government politicians wanted art glorifying

events from the Revolutions of 1830 and 1789, while commissions from Louis-Philippe's Museum generated a market for battle paintings. Landscape painters increasingly chose the scenery of France, particularly the rural areas around Paris.

One of Planche's favourite landscape painters and indeed one of his best friends was Paul Huet, a painter who found himself in an anomalous position in the artistic life of the July Monarchy. Both his paintings and those of Theodore Rousseau, which still retained much of the freshness of his sketches from nature, were shown at the Salon of 1831, against the wishes of the Academy. Their admission to the Salon was meant as a demonstration of Louis-Philippe's liberal standpoint in artistic and political matters.

Planche admired Huet's interpretation of these landscape sketches. He removed every ugly, banal or disturbing detail and introduced a harmonious system of perspective lines to draw the eye to a point of interest and beauty. Huet confronted those who saw his work with an effet voulu. Planche felt that the true artist should sketch after nature and that in the composition of his painting he should rearrange and beautify his sketches to reveal le vrai behind everyday reality.(32) He also believed that great landscapists of the past like Poussin and Lorrain had worked in this way. Because he

shared Planche's view (33) and applied these methods with brilliance, Huet should be counted among the great painters.

In his defence of Huet's work Planche used the same strategy as in his writings on Shakespeare. By identifying qualities in it which could also be seen in the work of great painters of the past he assigned it to the great tradition in art which had always upheld basic principles. Painters and writers whom more conservative critics placed in separate categories Planche would bracket together as part of this tradition and as examples for later generations.

Since Huet was a landscapist and not a history painter Planche believed that his personal, subjective interpretation of a scene was as important in the creation of his paintings as his theoretical and technical knowledge. Planche stressed this point in his Salon of 1831 in particular.(34) In later years Huet's work would be judged by the critic's increasingly inflexible rules. While Planche's admiration for Huet's working method was as great as ever he was later to object to the painter's lack of precision in rendering contours.(35)

During the first years of his career as a critic Planche attached great importance to the role of an artist's imagination in his interpretation of reality,

as did Gautier. As is well known, Delacroix, never wishing to depict reality as he saw it but striving instead to communicate with the viewer's soul, was also deeply interested in the power of the imagination. However, he showed himself to be an adherent to the seventeenth and eighteenth-century French tradition in art theory with his belief that the imagination should be kept in check by reason and resented being labelled a Romantic artist.(36) Planche's desire to put reason back into art seems to have developed only around 1836, when intellectuals were taking a keener interest in French classicism. Planche was now more interested in the purely intellectual conception of subjects and composition than in the painter's emotional involvement with his subject.(37) As we have seen he eventually embraced Cousin's Platonism, whereas Delacroix to the end of his days had great difficulty in describing the true nature of beauty. In the end he resorted to definitions based on the Aristotelian tradition which stressed the sensual and emotional power of beauty.(38)

At the outset of his career as an art critic Planche echoed Victor Cousin's view that art should not be subordinated to either politics or religion. According to Cousin this had never been the case during classical antiquity or the Renaissance. Although some of Raphael's subjects had been religious, his ultimate aim

had been the celebration of beauty for its own sake.(39)

When, in 1831 Planche described the position which artists should take during the July Monarchy, he believed that artists should refuse to adopt the hectic, superficial lifestyle of their countrymen in a democratic France which was almost entirely preoccupied with money-making. After a while people would need something to fill their hours of leisure. Naturally they would come to admire artists, the true aristocracy of genius (an idea pointing to a passing flirt with Saint-Simonism), able to fill the emptiness of their rootless society.(40)

In this way, the principle of l'art pour l'art enabled Planche to solve a problem which both Quatremère de Quincy and Delécluze had found insurmountable. Art did not have to serve religion or politics but could, through its own power and beauty, be of great importance to a society no longer motivated by a shared faith. This did not mean that Planche admired the products of the l'art pour l'art movement of the 1830's. He did not see in them the beauty and intellectualism which he demanded from art. Only once did he express admiration for a work of art which explored the possibilities of pure painting without recourse to anecdote. This was when Delacroix showed his Algerian Women (ill. 34) at the Salon of 1834.(41) But in the same year, Planche was also

confronted with the meaninglessness to which history painting could sink at the hands of Delaroche.

However, it would be wrong to think that Planche's belief in the autonomous force of art prevented him from admiring the work of artists who tried to immortalize events from recent history. Sharing Cousin's belief in painting's potential to express human passion and an event's beau moral, he was deeply interested in the work of the history painters of his day. The fact that this type of painting was now reduced to the status of Museum and Salon art hardly seemed to trouble him. He probably believed that paintings created outside the religious and political context gave both artist and public greater freedom than ever before to appreciate a variety of subjects and styles. Cousin himself had argued that an artist, while not serving politics and religion, should nonetheless be free to choose subjects from the realms of religion or history.(42)

Planche was no admirer of Vernet's battle paintings, Stendhal's touchstone for modernism in painting. In his view, Vernet was unable to come to grips with the difficulty of his subjects or to escape from realism and anecdotism. On the other hand he loved Gros' ability to idealize subjects from modern history, transforming them into Homeric compositions, (perhaps an ironic reference to Delécluze).(43) By striving to

become an epic artist, Gros had paid tribute to the European artistic tradition and emerged as artist of the stature of Raphael or Michelangelo.

Planche's views on history painting are better understood in the light of his doubts about the relative importance of the sensitive artistic personality vis-à-vis reason in the creation of history painting. By 1831, he had recognized Delacroix as an artist with the ability to renew the genre. He saw him as one of the few great artists able to translate their thoughts directly onto canvas. He praised Delacroix's Freedom Leading the People (ill. 35) for the way in which it idealized an event from very recent history. We know that Delacroix, whose career had been threatened by the growing artistic and political conservatism of the regime under Charles X had much to gain from the Revolution of 1830. Although it is uncertain how deeply Delacroix was involved in the Revolution itself, Planche believed that he had tried to record what he had actually seen of the events which took place that July.(44)

As far as we know, Delacroix was present at the Pont d'Arcole during these days but it is not known whether he witnessed the events of 28 July, which Freedom Leading the People immortalized. Insurgents had tried to reach the Hôtel de Ville from the Left Bank by way of the Pont d'Arcole, but the Swiss Guards defending

the building had been able to keep them at bay for some time. Both parties had suffered heavy losses by the time the insurgents managed to secretly cross to the Right Bank and mounted a surprise attack. Now, finally, those behind the barricades on the Pont d'Arcole were able to fight their way to the Right Bank. To encourage them, a young man took hold of a Tricolour and stormed forward. He was almost immediately killed by a volley from the Guards. As George Heard Hamilton has pointed out, Delacroix' interpretation of the scene owed much to poems commemorating the Revolution, popular prints, stories about the heroism shown by women and eye-witness accounts of the battle on the Pont d'Arcole.(45)

Lee Johnson relates the anecdote of Anne-Charlotte D., a poor girl dressed only in a petticoat who went in search of her brother during the fighting. Upon hearing that he had been killed by soldiers of the Swiss Guard, she vowed to shoot ten Swiss soldiers because her brother had been hit by ten bullets. She had almost fulfilled her promise when she was shot herself.(46)

From these various sources Delacroix created his own image of the fight on the Pont d'Arcole, adapting historical fact to arrive at a new allegorical interpretation. Indeed, many critics wondered whether the Goddess of Liberty taking the place of the young fighter waving a flag in Delacroix's picture, should be

understood as an allegorical figure, inspired by the goddesses of Antiquity or rather as a woman of the people, perhaps even a prostitute, fighting side by side with the men, bare-breasted and proudly wearing a Phrygian cap.(47)

Planche was impressed by Delacroix's ability to capture such a vivid impression of the July Revolution. He showed the dust and the dirt, the weary poor people, ignoblement beau, a type of beauty stemming from the poverty and depravity of modern life.(48)

Delacroix's sensitivity and commitment had helped him to lift the scene above the uninspired anecdoticism of Vernet and others. Still, Planche had doubts about Delacroix's use of allegory in this work, a device he disliked at this stage of his career. However, only two years later, when Vernet's The Duke of Orléans Proceeds to the Hôtel de Ville (ill. 36) had failed to move him, he finally concluded that realism alone was not enough to keep the memory of an important historical event alive, not even with Delacroix's deep feeling for its dramatic and inspirational qualities. Without allegory he would never have been able to do more than render the feelings of those taking part in the July Revolution and would have failed to communicate the lasting significance of the event to later generations. Besides, Delacroix's use of allegory here was perfectly suited to

the needs of the time in which Freedom Leading the People was created. Even the uneducated masses, unused to interpreting allegory, would be able to understand it with the help of the realistic action which Delacroix had incorporated in the work.(49)

What Planche sought in Delacroix's Freedom Leading the People was a sensitive rendering of the problems and events which occupied the artist as well as idealization and the lasting, higher meaning which he felt a history painting should have. Although he often sent works to the Salon which Planche considered no more than sketches, Delacroix remained one of his favourite painters. What he admired most, however, was not the painter's more private inventions but the wall paintings for which he received numerous commissions during the July Monarchy and the Second Empire. These works demonstrated his increasing ability to solve the problem of reviving the old-fashioned allegories traditionally used in the decoration of public buildings. Planche set out his views on the way in which Delacroix had tried to do this in an article on the painter's wall paintings for the Salon du Roi in the Palais-Bourbon, an extremely important commission.(50) As in the case of Freedom Leading the People Delacroix's solution was to depict an action which was summarized by an allegory. The ceiling was painted with allegorical figures, while wall-friezes

beneath them showed the action belonging to them. In this way Delacroix made the concepts of Justice, War, Agriculture and Industry understandable to a large public. To give an example, the allegorical figure of Agriculture (ill. 37a) is a woman breastfeeding children. The frieze below this figure (ill. 37b) shows a Bacchic scene on one side and harvesters resting on the other. Planche realised that if Delacroix had confined himself to pure allegory, his paintings would have been admired only for his beautiful drawing and fine colouring, since they would have failed to capture the viewer's lasting interest. The painter had understood the importance of combining allegory, action and dramatic interest to ensure that the painting would have an impact on the masses.(51)

Planche now revealed himself as a true disciple of Cousin. He no longer considered it necessary for a painter to be deeply moved himself by his subject to be able to reach his public. On the contrary, this was achieved through a calculated combination of allegory and action. It is interesting to note that the article on the Salon du Roi appeared shortly after the article on the engraving by Calamatta of Ingres' Vow of Louis XIII. Planche may have been implying that Delacroix had not been caught in the same trap as Ingres. Delacroix's starting point was not the work of a greatly admired

artist but the demands made by his subject. There was much to criticise in Delacroix's work, but Planche placed such a high value on the expressive qualities of art that, although he increasingly came to mistrust personal imagination, he would always admire Delacroix for this quality and for his gift for invention, while only at the end of his career did he profess unreserved admiration for Ingres' mastery of classical form.(52)

The article on the Salon du Roi revealed Planche's preference for Delacroix above Ingres. He praised Delacroix for emulating several masters and Schools of European painting rather than just one. The master he chose to follow depended on the subject of his painting. Among the examples he took were masters of the Flemish and Dutch Schools as well as the Venetian School. According to Planche this was as it should be. Delacroix's attitude was consistent with the idea which was first expressed in Planche's Salon of 1836. Guided by nature and the artistic tradition, it was the artist's job to invent.(53) This meant that artists were free to select their style to match their subjects and that for the depiction of any subject a specific master offered the perfect example. Planche distinguished three stages in the process of invention - inspiration, conception and execution. The latter two were guided by the will and therefore of greater importance than the

more personal and non-intellectual aspect of inspiration.(54) This strict rule should guard art against the sketchiness and inability to choose a consistent source of inspiration which were widely seen as the greatest flaws of contemporary painting. Planche's views on the Scottish portrait painter Thomas Lawrence may serve as an example of this attitude. Since it was difficult to idealise the inelegant fashions of the day, portraitists should study the work of a contemporary master who had managed to solve the problem. According to Planche, Thomas Lawrence provided an excellent example. Planche nonetheless hoped that the large wall-decorations which Delacroix created during the July Monarchy would give him a chance to make a final decision and begin to perfect his own style. Only in this way would he learn to persevere until he had completely mastered his art, producing finished work and idealized human figures.(55)

At the beginning of the 1830's, Planche did not criticize Delacroix for his lack of finish and idealization as other critics had done from the beginning of the painter's career. On the contrary, he praised the perfect execution of Freedom Leading the People.(56) Shortly before seeing the Palais-Bourbon wall paintings, Planche criticized Delacroix's Saint Sebastian (ill. 38) in his Salon of 1836 for the

realistic, ungainly depiction of the saint's limbs. It was the first important painting by Delacroix which failed to convince him that the painter had made a serious attempt to finish and idealize his work.(57) As in his judgments on Paul Huet's work, Planche's criteria became increasingly inflexible. By 1836, he would no longer tolerate ignoblement beau figures.

It is surprising to note that around this time Planche still managed to overcome his objections to realism in art as such. He himself probably coined the term realism, which came to be commonly used as the name of an artistic direction only later.(58) He believed that it might stop artists from imitating only one artist from the past, as Ingres tended to do, and put an end to the undesirable consequences of the desperate pursuit of originality demonstrated by Restoration Romantic painters. Planche also coined the terms he used to describe these two directions. He labelled Ingres' ideas renovation and those of the Romantics innovation. For some time prior to his use of the term realism he had been an ardent defender of innovation, which tallied with his admiration for Delacroix's individualism during the early 1830's. He steadfastly objected to the concept of reconciliation, the term he invented for the juste milieu.(59) He believed that realism, although not an aim in itself, could discourage artists from copying

classical art, and put an end to the bizarrerie of the innovators. It seems unlikely that Planche would have welcomed realism for its own sake. His rejection of it in his theatre criticism and his dislike of the flat realism of painters like Vernet and Courbet argue against this.

Planche on Theatricality and Drama

Planche's views on David and Léopold Robert highlight the differences between his and Delécluze's versions of classicism, and shed light on his interpretation of the concepts of theatricality and drama.

Planche had little to say about David. He was no admirer of David's paintings and quoted from Guizot and Stendhal to describe the achievements of this recognized leader of the modern French School of painting. He did not try to develop an independent opinion on David's work. He had after all been very young when David died, and could not have known much about the discussions which had taken place between 1820 and 1825 regarding the merits and shortcomings of the painter's work. He cited the views of David's most vehement opponents, presenting them as his judgment of the qualities of those painters from David's School who were still alive

when he began his career as an art critic.

Planche respected David for the reforms he had brought about in the French School of the eighteenth century. He had taught artists to strive towards a purer rendering of the human figure and had therefore had a positive influence on French art. Yet he showed no further interest in David. He saw little merit in the painter's attempts to idealize modern history which had won the admiration of others, arguing instead that David had totally failed to extract the meaning from the historical scenes he depicted.(60) Delécluze saw this flaw only in David's pre-Revolutionary works and Leonidas.

Aware of David's involvement with Jacobinism, Planche saw David as a typical exponent of the ideas and values of the French Revolution, which could no longer appeal to the public of the Restoration and July Monarchy. David's Greeks and Romans had been almost superhuman beings, embodying the ideals and selfless commitment to duty of the Revolution. In 1831, still influenced by the subversive ideas of Hugo and others, Planche wrote that the disillusioned public of his own day had no need of these perfect heroes but wanted to see the Greeks and Romans as ordinary human beings, creatures of flesh and blood and not as statues come to life.(61) This again was not a demand for realism as

such but a plea for a re-thinking of the essential qualities of the people of antiquity which would reveal that human nature had changed little over the centuries.

Instead of choosing David's outmoded work as his target, Planche focused his attention on the paintings of Léopold Robert, David's pupil, who was still alive and active when Planche began his career. He was a highly popular artist whom, as we have seen, was praised by Delécluze as the most gifted defender of the Homeric system of his day.

Guizot had criticized David for his failure to realise that statues depicted a pose while paintings showed an action. Sculptures were admired mainly for their beauty and expression other than the expression of tranquility or melancholy was not attractive in them, since facial expressions and gestures were easier to capture in painting of an action involving several figures communicating with each other. Guizot maintained that David's figures looked posed and theatrical because he was in the habit of copying statues.

Stendhal agreed with this view, adding that David, and to an even greater extent his followers, were completely incapable of capturing the expression of human feeling. Planche, who saw this type of expression as the true aim of painting, was persuaded by these arguments. He evidently felt that Léopold Robert's works

displayed the faults of Delécluze's Homeric system as well as those of the realism which Stendhal sought in painting. According to Planche, Léopold Robert chose his subject matter from the world around him and depicted it according to the rules he had learned in David's workshop. Living in Italy, he took no part in the fruitless quarrels between the Schools. For the same reason, his drawing and colours had become hard and monotonous. Italian art was long dead and Robert was working in isolation, unable to compare his work with that of his contemporaries.(62)

Planche was as aware as Delécluze that the figures in Léopold Robert's work were portrayals of rustic types seen in Italy. However, he did not admire the painter's attempts to render them so that they might be admired for their beauty and simple dignity. He accused Robert of copying his sketches from life, or perhaps memory, without attempting to create a new, powerful, unified scene. When his paintings did possess unity it was because Robert had seen it in a real-life scene. However, this effect was very rare in his paintings and his figures therefore seemed neither to communicate meaning or form part of a coherent action in most of his works. Like the figures in David's paintings they merely posed for the viewer, who could see the actors in a drama, but not the drama itself.(63) Delacroix

expressed the same views on the exact copying of scenes from life. Like Planche, he relied on the passage of time and failing memory to be able to use his sketches for a work of art which revealed the poetic and moving side of reality.(64)

Planche introduced the ideas of unité poétique and unité pittoresque, which he probably based on Dubos' composition poétique and composition pittoresque, the first referring to the arrangement of the figures around a protagonist, according to their role in the scene, the second to a means of leading the viewer's eye to the protagonist. He found neither of these unities in David's works or in most of Robert's.(65) The individual figures in their paintings could be admired for their perfection, but the paintings themselves did not form a dramatic, expressive whole. Planche not only considered David and Robert to be theatrical painters but he also regarded Delaroche's Execution of Lady Jane Grey as theatrical,(66) since it showed only a series of figures next to each other as if on a stage. The scene did not express a single, obvious meaning but could be interpreted in various ways. Delaroche had been more interested in historical costumes than in the convincing interaction of the figures.

Like Delaroche and the realistic landscape painters, whose work Planche contrasted to that of Paul

Huet, Robert had never been an inventor. He had not been able to develop his paintings beyond the stage of his first drawings from nature. It seems that for Planche a Homeric artist could work on the same pedestrian level as a painter of realistic landscapes or a *juste-milieu* painter like Delaroche. Both the Homeric School and the *juste-milieu* were theatrical. Whether one copied statues or scenes from real life seems to have made no difference in Planche's view. The really great artists were those capable of invention. They worked on a level where the conflicts between the different Schools of painting were no longer of overriding importance. Gros, Delacroix, even Ingres in his best moments, never copied from life or from works of art from the past but interpreted the two, making them serve their personal aims and their quest for dramatic unity.

Planche did not agree with Quatremère de Quincy or Delécluze that modern peinture d'expression could not communicate the underlying meaning of a scene. He believed that the great dramas of human life and history should inspire the history painter to dramatic paintings. A work would become theatrical only if the artist was unable to distil the deeper meaning from his subject-matter and give his works a unity which would enhance the expression of this deeper sense. Quatremère de Quincy and Delécluze, in contrast, had thought that

modern history painting was almost inevitably theatrical, because artists used exaggerated gesture in a desperate attempt to be expressive, although there was no longer a universally understood beau moral. They felt that art should use simple forms to express simple ideas which were universally understood. Planché argued that a great artist like Delacroix, with a powerful gift for invention, could use his talent to give lasting significance and meaning to subjects which would not be immediately recognized and understood when seen in a painting.

In his view, Shakespeare had captured all the complexity, variety and colour of modern life, while still being able to subject these qualities to the unifying effect of the one idea which they expressed. His work was the highest standard for artists who wanted to express the drama and meaning of human life. By copying his example they could uplift their audiences without taking recourse to religious messages that neither they nor their public any longer understood, or having to subject themselves completely to the political requirements of the regime under which they lived. After all, Delacroix had managed to accept commissions from the July Monarchy whilst at the same time demonstrating that his art could reach a level of perfection far beyond that achieved by those prepared to become

obedient servants of the regime. Vernet's The Duke of Orleans Proceeds to the Hôtel de Ville was to Planche the perfect demonstration of the lack of quality and drama in these painters' works, as indeed were almost all other paintings in Louis-Philippe's Museum.

Conclusion

Planche was a classicist but one of a completely different temperament than Delécluze, whose work we have also examined. Although he was no supporter of the July Monarchy and its regime, he was far more prepared than his older fellow-critic to accept the changes which had taken place in European art and culture since the sixteenth century. He observed that later artists and writers had more examples and superior technique at their disposal than those of the Renaissance and classical antiquity. If studied properly these could enrich the nineteenth-century French school. However, they should never be cultivated for their own sake because this would result in art losing its intellectual value.

Delécluze's standards were based on only one current in art, the one which David had established, whereas Planche could accept almost every direction except David's School, the *juste-milieu* and the

Romanticism of Victor Hugo and his followers. He considered the former to be theatrical because of the importance it attached to the imitation of classical statues, a view which was adopted from Guizot and Stendhal. He saw in David's work, the *juste milieu* and the works of Hugo a superficiality and an inability to express a clear, elevated idea.

Planche firmly believed that modern history painting had great potential, if only artists would observe the rules set out by the French theorists of the eighteenth century. Hierarchical grouping, the discerning use of gesture and peinture d'expression, light and shade, would help them to make their ideas clear to their viewers. He did not believe, like Delécluze, that the religious art of the Renaissance had been the last truly great art the world had known. His preoccupation was mainly with the history painter's ability to portray the inner life of the figures in his works. Unlike Delécluze he did not see the depiction of human passion as necessarily theatrical and banal.

Artists and writers could win over Planche by demonstrating an understanding of human passion and emotion. As long as this quality was present in their work and reason guided their hand he could accept poems and paintings from artists who belonged to widely differing directions. Artists like Hugo who in Planche's

view failed on these two counts would be harshly criticized.

Planche's indulgent attitude towards artists like Delacroix who showed a willingness to experiment, combined with his strictness on the validity of rules in art, made him hard to place and to understand. He could obviously not be bracketed with incurable conservatives like Delécluze but neither was he a whole-hearted advocate of new directions in art. This would conventionally leave only the juste-milieu movement, but he despised Delaroche and Delavigne, its two heroes who both enjoyed public favour for a long time. Planche's brand of classicism was entirely his own and he made good use of it. Whilst accepting the irrevocability of change, he offered artists a standard to uphold and so gradually to work towards the level of the truly great artists and writers of the past.

NOTES

1. H. de Balzac, "Monographie de la presse parisienne," L'oeuvre de Balzac, XIV (Paris, 1953) 583.

2. W. Balzer, Gustave Planche: Eine Untersuchung zur Geschichte der Französischen Kunstkritik im 19. Jahrhundert, thesis, Leipzig U, 1908.

M. Regard, L'adversaire des Romantiques: Gustave Planche, 1808-1857 (Paris, 1955). Grate, Deux

critiques d'art de l'époque Romantique.

3. In my indication of the most important sources of Planche's thinking I also follow Balzer. Balzer considered Cousin to have influenced Planche more than any other thinker of his time.

4. Planche demanded that the work of many artists of his time should be "moins réelle" and "plus vraie". See for instance his criticism of Barye's Tiger Devouring a Crocodile from 1831. Planche, "Salon de 1831," Etudes, I: 61.

5. Planche, "Victor Cousin," Etudes littéraires, I, (Paris, 1855) 50, 55. Originally La Revue des deux mondes 15 November 1853.

6. Planche, " Du théâtre moderne en France, I," La Revue des deux mondes 15 February 1837: 442.

7. Furman describes the attitude of La Revue des deux mondes as follows: "Fondée au moment même où triomphait le romantisme, la Revue se plaça d'emblée dans le camp des vainqueurs. Buloz comprit parfaitement que les forces vives de la littérature ne résidaient plus essentiellement dans le talent des écrivains de tradition classique. Aussi chercheroit-on en vain dans les Tables de la Revue les noms des représentants les plus éminents de l'ancienne école: Baour-Lormian, Brifaut, Viennet, Dupaty, Alexandre Duval, Casimir Bonjour (...) On n'y trouverait pas davantage les noms de ceux qui, comme Delavigne, Guiraud, Pichat ou Soumet, tentèrent de concilier les deux esthétiques. Dès ses débuts, la Revue est un lieu de rencontre pour les écrivains de la jeune école exclusivement (...).

En proclamant la liberté de l'art, le romantisme permettait aussi tous les excès. La mission de la Revue fut donc de tempérer, de discipliner les débordements de la sensibilité et les abus du talent; de remédier, dans une atmosphère d'autocritique, à la décadence du

romantisme; de maintenir ce principe de la mesure, cette maîtrise du talent et cette élégance de l'expression qui, depuis le XVIIe siècle, sont souvent considérés les vertus traditionnelles du génie français." N.Furman, 'La Revue des deux mondes' et le romantisme (1831-1848) (Genève, 1975) 144-145.

8. Planche, La Revue des deux mondes, 15 February 1837: 451.

9. ... enseigner qu'il y a ... presque toujours un peu de bien dans les pires, et par là, inspirer aux mauvais l'espérance,.." V. Hugo, "Préface," Littérature et philosophie mêlées, (1834; London, n.d) 45.

10. Planche made this point especially strongly in his criticism of Lucrece Borgia. "La pièce, envisagée dans sa totalité indivisible, intéresse comme un panorama, un spectacle pyrotechnique, comme les manoeuvres d'une armée." La Revue des deux mondes, 15 February 1833: 392.

11. Planche remarked of Granet that "il professe et pratique une sorte de panthéisme pittoresque". "Salon de 1831," Etudes, I: 140. In 1834 he added to this: "...il relie si solidement l'homme, l'air qu'il respire, le sol qu'il foule, l'ombre qu'il projette en marchant, que toutes choses, en passant par son pinceau, paraissent n'avoir qu'une même âme." "Salon de 1834," Etudes, I: 243. Iknayan (84) points to Mme De Staël as the most important popularizer of the idea that "...L'âme de la nature se fait connaître à nous de toutes parts et sous mille formes diverses". She mentions (196) the poem 'Ce siècle avait deux ans' from Les feuilles d'automne (1831) as an example of Hugo's awareness of the artist's need to unite his soul (the universe within) with the visible universe.

12. Planche, La Revue des deux mondes, 15

February 1837: 448-449.

13. Planche advised Vigny to "placer l'action au-dessus des événements, au-dessus de la plainte, en un mot, a montrer les passions, au lieu de les analyser". La Revue des deux mondes, 15 February 1837: 455.

14. Planche, "Criticism of Delavigne's Les enfans d'Edouard," La Revue des deux mondes 1 June 1833: 492-503.

15. "Je suppose que l'auteur, après avoir longtemps hésité entre les différentes expressions qu'il pouvait choisir, ne sachant auquel entendre, craignant le trop ou le trop peu, s'est enfin décidé pour l'impassibilité..." Planche, "Salon de 1831," Etudes, I: 74.

16. Planche, "Salon de 1831," Etudes, I: 74.

17. Planche, "Salon de 1834," Etudes, I: 242.

18. "Les pages éloquentes que nous a laissées Diderot ont habitué le public à juger la peinture plutôt d'après les pensées qu'elle suggère que d'après les pensées qu'elle exprime. Malgré ma vive admiration pour Diderot, je considère cette manière de juger comme parfaitement fausse." Planche, Portraits d'artistes, I (Paris, 1853) 346.

19. Diderot, "Salon de 1765," Salons, II: 145-148.

20. Shakespearian writers would look to history for "les passions qui agitent et les devoirs qui gouvernent l'humanité". Planche, "Du théâtre moderne en France, II," La Revue des deux mondes 15 May 1837: 516.

21. V. Cousin, Du vrai, du beau et du bien (Paris, 1853) 216.

22. "La plus vraisemblable théorie du beau est encore celle qui le compose de deux éléments contraires et également nécessaires, l'unité et la variété." Cousin (169).

23. "Ce qu'il faut chercher dans le dialogue de Shakespeare, ce n'est pas l'unité explicite, mais bien l'unité implicite. A des caractères complexes, quel langage peut convenir si ce n'est un langage complexe? La seule condition de ces personnages, c'est de ramener tous les rayons divergens de la pensée vers un centre commun. Or, je crois sincèrement que Shakespeare n'a jamais manqué à l'accomplissement de cette condition." Planche, La Revue des deux mondes 15 May 1837: 513.

24. Schlegel assumed that it was only possible to understand Shakespeare when one tried "bis zum Zentralpunkt hindurchzudringen und alle Theile als so viele Ausstralungen von daher zu betrachten". Cited in S.A. Reavis, August Wilhelm Schlegels Auffassung der Tragödie im Zusammenhang mit seine Poetik und ästhetischen Theorien seiner Zeit (Bern, 1978) 124.

25. G. Planche, "Histoire et philosophie de l'art, VI; moralité de la poésie," La Revue des deux mondes 1 February 1835: 250.

26. Planche, "MM. Ingres et Calamatta," La Revue des deux mondes 1 April 1837: 94-104.

27. The Conception Sault, dating from 1678, was seized by marshal Sault from the Hospital de Venerables Sacerdotes in Seville in 1813. The painting was offered for sale to Louis-Philippe in 1835 but it was acquired for the Louvre much later, in 1852, after Sault's death. In 1941 it was returned to Spain. It is now in the Prado.

28. "Jeunes artistes, qui dégoûtés à bon droit de la manière sèche et inanimée de David, entreprenez de renouveler la palette française, qui voudriez ravir au soleil sa chaleur et son éclat, songez que de tous les êtres de l'univers le plus grand est encore l'homme, et que ce que l'homme a de plus grand c'est son intelligence, et surtoût son coeur; qu'ainsi c'est ce

coeur qu'il faut mettre et répandre sur votre toile. Voilà l'objet le plus élevé de l'art. Pour l'atteindre ne vous faites pas les disciples des Flamands, des Vénitiens, des Espagnols; revenez, revenez aux maîtres de notre grande école nationale du XVIIe siècle." Cousin (233-234).

29. "... les Peintres qui travaillent aujourd'hui, tirent plus de secours de l'Art, que Raphaël & ses contemporains n'en pouvoient tirer. Depuis Raphaël, l'Art & la Nature se sont perfectionnés; si Raphaël revenoit au monde avec ses talens, il feroit mieux encore qu'il ne l'a pu faire dans le tems où la destinée l'avoit placé." Dubos (I: 409).

30. In his Cours de peinture par principes. "Je puis donner ici un exemple assez récent du peu d'effet que produisent d'abord les ouvrages de Raphaël. Ceux que l'on admire le plus, ce sont les fresques qu'il a peintes dans les sales du Vatican. On y mena le curieux dont je parle, & passant indifféremment à travers les sales, il ne s'apercevoit pas qu'il avoit devant les yeux ce qu'il cherchoit avec tant d'empressement. Celui qui le conduisoit l'arrêta tout à coup & lui dit: 'Où allez-vous si vite, Monsieur? voilà ce que vous cherchez & vous n'y prenez pas garde'." (1708: Amsterdam, 1766) 11.

31. Cousin (147).

32. Planche, "Salon de 1831," Etudes, I: 95-96.

33. "If the scene has made a profound impression on you, and you have grasped and recorded its main features at once, it is unlikely that you will not make good use of it. But the time to do so is later on; sometimes it is a good idea to let it mature. When you come to work it up, you see the difference between a study and a picture." Cited by Boime, The Academy and

French Painting during the Nineteenth Century (London, 1971) 155.

34. "...il veut surtout traduire ses impressions personnelles et intimes." Planche, "Salon de 1831," Etudes, I: 95.

35. Planche, "Les sources de Royat: Gravure a l'eau forte de M. Paul Huet," La Revue des deux mondes 1 February 1838:356.

36. See Mras (5, 73).

37. See for instance Planche's criticism of Delacroix's Battle of Taillebourg, shown at the Salon of 1837. Although he admires Delacroix's enthusiasm and imagination, the critic makes it clear that they serve the creation of a "grande machine, habilement et vigoureusement menée". Planche, "Salon de 1837," Etudes, II: 56.

38. One of the most elaborate attempts to define beauty can be found in Delacroix's diary (1st of January 1857). He criticizes contemporary definitions of "le beau", like the Platonic definition that it was "la splendeur du bon", or others which linked it with Raphael or antique art, and cites the definition by Voltaire in his article "Aristote, Poétique" in his Dictionnaire philosophique: "...nous n'appelons beau que ce qui cause à notre âme et à nos sens du plaisir et de l'admiration." E. Delacroix, Journal, III, ed. by A. Joubin (Paris, 1932) 1. For Delacroix's writings on beauty see also Mras, (99-105) and K. Schawelka, Eugène Delacroix: Sieben Studien zu seiner Kunsttheorie (Mittenwald, 1979) 47-63.

39. "... au XVe siècle, en Italie, j'aperçois surtout la foi de l'art en lui-même et le culte de la beauté. Raphaël, dit on, allait passer cardinal, oui, mais sans quitter la Fornarina et en peignant toujours la Galatée." Cousin (199).

40. Planche, "Salon de 1831," Etudes, I: 4-5.

41. "Ce morceau capital, qui n'intéresse que par la peinture, et n'a rien à faire avec la niaiserie littéraire des badauds ou la sentimentalité des femmes frivoles." Planche, "Salon de 1834," Etudes, I: 247.

42. "L'art puise ses inspirations à ces sources profondes, comme à la source toujours ouverte de la nature. Mais il n'en est pas moins vrai que l'art, l'Etat, la religion, sont des puissances qui ont chacune leur monde à part et leurs effets propres: elles se prêtent un concours mutuel: elles ne doivent point se mettre au service l'une de l'autre. Dès que l'une d'elles s'écarte de sa fin, elle s'égare et se dégrade. L'art se met-il aveuglement aux ordres de la religion et de la patrie? pour vouloir leur être utile, il ne leur sert plus à rien. En perdant sa liberté, il perd sa charme et son empire." Cousin (198).

43. "...Gros a peint Eylau, Aboukir et Jaffa. Ces trois magnifiques épopées ont placé d'un seul coup la France à côté de l'Italie. Raphaël et Michel-Ange avouent pour leur frère le grand artiste, le poète sublime à qui nous devons ces compositions homériques." Planche, "Salon de 1831," Etudes, I: 111.

44. "Il a pris la scène telle qu'elle s'est passée sous ses yeux." Planche, "Salon de 1831," Etudes, I: 62.

45. G. H. Hamilton, "The Iconographical Origins of Delacroix's Liberty Leading the People," Studies in Art and Literature for Belle da Costa Greene (Princeton, 1954) 55-66.

46. See L. Johnson, The Paintings of Eugène Delacroix: a Critical Catalogue, 1816-1831, I, text (Oxford, 1981) 147.

47. The strange mixture of idealization and realism visible in the figure of Liberty was criticized

by Jal, Peisse and Tardieu in particular, while Schoelcher and Lenormant, like Planche, approved of it.

48. Planche uses the term ignoblement beau in his description of the man in a high hat. "L'homme au chapeau poudreux, au pantalon gris, à la redingote lézardée, au visage terreux et amaigri, placé près du gamin, est d'un type ignoblement beau. On lit sur sa figure le jeu, la débauche, la misère et le courage." Planche, "Salon de 1831," Etudes, I: 63.

49. Planche, "Salon de 1833," Etudes, I: 199-200.

50. Planche, La Revue des deux mondes 15 June 1837: 752-769.

51. Planche, La Revue des deux mondes 15 June 1837: 755.

52. In his article "Ingres et Delacroix: L'Apothéose de Napoleon et le Salon de la Paix" he tried to compare Ingres' and Delacroix's greatest talents and achievements. His conclusion was that their works showed two sides of human intelligence, which would both exist as long as painting existed. Both should be judged according to their own laws. However, Ingres' search for an elevated style had had a beneficial effect on contemporary painting, which Delacroix's lonely quest could never have. Etudes sur les arts, II (Paris, 1855). Originally La Revue des deux mondes 15 April 1854.

53. "Inventer dans le cercle de la nature et de la tradition." Planche, "Salon de 1836," Etudes, II: 49.

54. See Iknayan (77-78) for Bonstetten as a probable source for Planche's theories on the creative process.

55. Planche, La Revue des deux mondes, 15 June 1837: 765-766.

56. "Il n'y a pas, au Salon de cette année, un

seul tableau dont l'exécution soit plus serrée, plus sévère, plus complète que celle de sa Liberté." "Salon de 1831," Etudes, I:62.

57. Planche, "Salon de 1836," Etudes, II: 22-23.

58. My interpretation of Planche's use of the word realism is consistent with Grate's (99-101).

59. For Planche's definition of the terms tradition, innovation, reconciliation and realism see his "Salon of 1836," Etudes, II: 47-48.

60. "Il a choisi dans le passé aucun moment capital pour en extraire la pensée dominante, ou pour y découvrir un germe caché et le féconder: sa vue n'allait pas si loin." Planche, "Salon de 1833," Etudes, I: 184.

61. "La vie parlementaire des deux Restaurations, les luttes dialectiques de tous les jours, le désabusement de toutes les illusions, la ruine de toutes les majestés, l'ébranlement de toutes les croyances, devaient amener et ont amené la perte de la peinture romaine. Le succès des Sabines et des Horaces reposait sur une foi puérile, sur un respect ridicule pour les études de collège. Les travaux de la critique allemande et française ont remis le peuple souverain à sa vraie taille. Aujourd'hui que nous les avons mesurés, nous les voulons bien que Shakespeare nous les a montrés dans Jules César et Coriolan; mais autrement nous n'en voulons plus. De chair et d'os, parlant, agissant comme nous, animés de nos passions, ignobles et salis par les mêmes vices, rongés par les mêmes désirs, d'or et de boue, à la bonne heure; mais ciselés en marbre, posés pour le spectacle, groupés en masses régulières et symétriques comme les bas-reliefs d'un tombeau, la chose est aujourd'hui impossible." Planche, "Salon de 1831," Etudes, I: 110.

62. Planche, "Salon de 131," Etudes, I: 50-51.

63. Planche, "Salon de 1836," Etudes, II: 28.

64. "Je n'ai commencé à faire quelque chose de passable dans mon voyage d'Afrique, qu'au moment où j'avais assez oublié les petits détails pour ne me rappeler dans mes tableaux que le côté frappant et poétique; jusque-là, j'étais poursuivi par l'amour de l'exactitude, que le plus grand nombre prend pour la vérité." E. Delacroix, 17 October 1853, Journal, II: 92.

65. In an article from 1838 on Delécluze's Notice sur la vie et les ouvrages de Léopold Robert (Paris, 1838), the last article Planche would ever write on Robert, who had recently died, he analyzed the unité poétique and unité pittoresque, here called unité linéaire, of these paintings. Planche, "Léopold Robert," La Revue des deux mondes 1 June 1838: 659-675.

66. "...il (the public) s'inquiète fort peu que la Jane Grey de M. Paul Delaroche soit plutôt théâtrale que dramatique." Planche, "Salon de 1834," Etudes, I: 241.

WORKS CITED

PRIMARY SOURCES

André, Y. Essai sur le beau. Paris, 1741.

Annales de la Société libre des beaux-arts, depuis son origine, mises en ordre par M. Miel, l'un de ses membres. Années 1830 et 1831. Paris, 1836. 4, 15.

A.R., L'. (Robin). L'ami des artistes au Sallon. Paris, 1787.

Aristotle. The Poetics. Transl. W. Hamilton Fyfe. The Loeb Classical Library. 1927, rev. and repr. 1932; London, 1965.

L'Artiste 4 (1843): 230. On the panorama.

"De l'avenir des Beaux-Arts dans les gouvernements à bon marché." Le Globe 28 June 1831.

Balzac, H. de. "Monographie de la presse parisienne." L'oeuvre de Balzac. XIV. 1842; Paris, 1953.

Batteux, Ch. Les beaux-arts réduits à un même principe. 1746, ed. Paris, 1883; Genève, 1969.

Baudelaire, Ch. "Salon de 1846." Curiosités esthétiques. Nouvelle édition. Paris, 1889. 64-157.

Bellori, G.B. L'Idée del Pittore, dello Scultore e dell'Architetto. Lecture, Accademia di San Luca, 1664. Printed as an introduction in Vite de' pittori, sculturi et architetti moderni. Rome, 1672.

Béraud, A. Annales de l'école française des beaux-arts: Salon de 1827. Paris, 1827.

"Bertin, Louis-François (Bertin aîné)." P. Larousse. Grand dictionnaire universel du XIXe siècle. II. Paris, 1866. 620.

Bidaut. "Des moyens de propager en France le goût des beaux-arts: Au directeur du Journal des artistes." Journal des artistes (1832): 316-319.

Blanc, Ch. Histoire des peintres français au dix-neuvième siècle. I. Paris, 1845.

Camp, M. du. Les beaux-arts à l'exposition universelle de 1855, peinture, sculpture: France, Angleterre, Belgique, Danemark, Suède et Norwège, Suisse, Hollande, Allemagne, Italie. Paris, 1855.

Caylus, A.C. Comte de. Nouveaux sujets de peinture et de sculpture. Paris, 1755.

---. Tableaux tirés de Homère et de Virgile: Avec des observations générales sur le costume. Paris, 1757.

---. Histoire de Hercule le Thébain: Tirée de différents auteurs, à laquelle on a joint la description des tableaux qu'elle peut fournir. Paris, 1758.

Chateaubriand, F.-R. de. Le génie du Christianisme. Paris, 1802.

---. Les quatre Stuarts. Paris, 1828.

Chaussard, P.-R. Le Pausanias français: Etat des arts du dessin en France à l'ouverture du XIXe siècle. Salon de 1806. Paris, 1807.

Coupin, P.-A. "Beaux-Arts, peinture: Mars désarmé par Vénus, l'Amour et les Grâces." Revue encyclopédique 22 (1824): 769-773.

---. "Notice sur l'exposition des tableaux en 1824; I." Revue encyclopédique 23 (1824): 551-560.

---. "Notice nécrologique sur Jacques-Louis David." Revue encyclopédique 34 (1827): 34-58.

---. "Exposition des tableaux en 1827: I," Revue encyclopédique 36 (1827): 526-530.

Cousin, V. Du vrai, du beau et du bien. Paris, 1853.

Coytel, A. "Sur l'esthétique du peintre." Conférences de l'Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture. Ed. by H. Jouin. Paris, 1883.

Coytel, C.A. "Parallèle de l'éloquence et de la peinture." Mercure de France May 1751. Oeuvres. Genève,

1971. 113-120.

C.R. (Charles de Rémusat). "Cromwell, drame, par Victor Hugo; II." Le Globe 2 February 1828.

---. "La mort de Henri III, août 1589, scènes historiques, faisant suite aux Barricades, et aux Etats de Blois par L. Vitet." Le Globe 6 June 1829.

David, J.-L.-J. Le peintre Louis David, 1748-1825: Souvenirs & documents inédits. Paris, 1880.

Delacroix, E. Journal. II, III. Ed. by A. Joubin. Paris, 1932.

Delaforest, A. Cours de littérature dramatique. I. Paris, 1836.

Delavigne, C. Les enfans d'Edouard. Paris, 1833.

Delécluze, E.-J. "Salon de 1822; X." Le Moniteur universel (1822): 850-851.

---. "Exposition du Louvre; II." Journal des débats 5 September 1824.

---. "Exposition du Louvre; III. MM Scheffer, Gérard, Mme Hersent, Delaroche, Saint-Evre." Journal des débats 8 September 1824.

---. "Exposition du Louvre; IV." Journal des débats 11 September 1824.

---. "Exposition du Louvre; X. MM. Scheffer, Delaroche, Delacroix, Sigalon, Fragonard, Picot, Drolling, Rouget." Journal des débats 9 October 1824.

---. "Exposition du Louvre; XXII. M. Vernet, Ingres, Hersent etc." Journal des débats 12 December 1824.

---. "Salon de 1827; XII." Journal des débats 21 March 1828.

---. "Résumé de l'exposition de 1824 et '27." Ms. in Collection des feuilletons. Bibliothèque historique de la ville de Paris, no. 10708.

---. "Ouverture du Salon." Journal des débats 1 May 1831.

- . "Salon de 1831; VIII." Journal des débats 25 May 1831.
- . "Salon de 1831; IX." Journal des débats 26 May 1831.
- . "Salon de 1831; XIV." Journal des débats 2 July 1831.
- . "Salon de 1834." Journal des débats 5 March 1834.
- . "Salon de 1836; II." Journal des débats 11 March 1836.
- . "Salon de 1837; II. Peinture: MM Bendemann, Paul Delaroche, Ary Scheffer." Journal des débats 8 March 1837.
- . "Salon de 1837; VI. Peinture (batailles). MM Delacroix, Schnetz, Scheffer etc." Journal des débats 6 April 1837.
- . "Le Louvre." Journal des débats 3 February 1838.
- . "De l'art chrétien, de A.F. Rio; II." Journal des débats 9 September 1838.
- . "Salon de 1840; IV." Journal des débats 10 April 1840.
- . "Exposition de 1842; III." Journal des débats 25 March 1842.
- . Louis David: Son école et son temps. Paris, 1855.
- . Les beaux-arts dans les deux mondes en 1855. Paris, 1856.
- . Souvenirs de soixante années. Paris, 1862.
- . Carnet de route d'Italie (1823-1824): Impressions romaines. Texte inédit publié avec une introduction et des notes par R. Baschet. Paris, 1942.
- . Journal 1824-1828. Texte publié avec une introduction et des notes par R. Baschet. Paris, 1948.
- Deloynes, Collection. (Paris, Bibliothèque

Nationale), XXI, no. 597.

Desains. "Aperçu sur l'état actuel des arts en France." Annales de la Société libre des beaux-arts Année 1830-1831: 199-205.

Diderot, D. Lettre sur les sourds et muets à l'usage de ceux qui entendent et qui parlent. 1751; Amsterdam, 1772.

---. "Discours sur la poésie dramatique." 1758. Oeuvres esthétiques, textes établis, avec introduction, bibliographies, notes et relevés de variantes par Paul Vernière. Paris, 1965. 183-287.

---. Le père de famille. Amsterdam, 1758.

---. Salons. Ed. J. Sezec and J. Adhémar. I, II. Oxford, 1957, 1960.

Donnet, Orgiazzi and Kaufmann. Architectonographie des théâtres. Paris, 1837-1840.

Dreuille. "Rapport sur le Traité complet de la peinture de M. Paillot de Montabert." Annales de la Société libre des beaux-arts. Année 1841-'42. Paris, 1841. 108-160.

Dubos, J.B. Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture. 1719; Amsterdam, 1766.

Dufourny. "Report on the panorama. 28 Fructidor an 8. (Monday 15 September 1800)." Buddemeier (169).

Dumas père, A. Anthony. Paris, 1831.

E.A.R.T.L.A.D.C.S. Avis important d'une femme sur le Sallon de 1785. N. pl., 1785.

Eméric-David, T.-B. Recherches sur l'art statuaire. Paris, 1805.

Gautier, Th. Mademoiselle de Maupin. 1834. Paris, 1927.

---. La France industrielle April 1834.

Guizot, F. "De l'état des beaux-arts en France, et du Salon de 1810." 1810. Etudes sur les beaux-arts en général. Paris, 1852. 1-100.

---. "Essai sur les limites qui séparent et les liens qui unissent les beaux-arts." 1816; 1852. 101-146.

---. Histoire de la Révolution d'Angleterre. Paris, 1826-'27.

Hegel, G.W.F. Aesthetik. II. 2nd ed. H.G. Hothos 1842. Berlin, 1965.

Heine, H. "Salon de 1831." De la France. Säkularausgabe. Werke, Briefwechsel, Lebenszeugnisse. Vol.XVIII. 1833; Berlin, 1977. 113-138.

Huet, P. Letter to Sainte-Beuve, 1862. Cited Grate (20).

Hugo, V. Préface de 'Cromwell'. Paris, 1827.

---. Le roi s'amuse. Paris, 1832.

---. Littérature et philosophie mêlées. 1834; London, n.d.

Jal, A. L'Ombre de Diderot et le Bossu du Marais. Paris, 1819.

---. "Mars, Vénus et les Grâces, par David." Le Mercure du XIXe siècle 5 (1824): 374-382.

---. L'artiste et le philosophe: Entretiens critiques sur le Salon de 1824. Paris, 1824.

---. "De la nouvelle école de peinture." Le Mercure du XIXe siècle 13 (1826): 548-551.

---. Salon de 1831: Ebauches critiques. Paris, 1831.

---. Salon de 1833: Les causeries du Louvre. Paris, 1833.

J.R.A. "Quelques vues sur l'Ecole de David et sur les principes de la peinture historique." Revue encyclopédique 34 (1827): 579-593.

Journal des artistes (1827): 493, 578, 779.

Journal de Paris 19 December 1824: 3, 8 November 1827: 3.

Lacaze, A. de. Biography of Marino Faliero. Nouvel biographie générale depuis les temps les plus reculés

jusqu'à nos jours, sous la direction de M. le Dr. Hoefer. XVII. Paris, 1856. Col. 52-56.

Landon, C.-P. Salon de 1819: Recueil de morceaux choisis parmi les ouvrages de peinture et de sculpture exposés au Louvre, le 25 août 1819. II. Paris, 1819.

--- Salon de 1824. I. Paris, 1824.

Latouche, H. de (Hyacinthe Thabaud de). Lettres à David sur le Salon de 1819, par quelques élèves de son école. Paris, 1819.

Laviron, G. Le Salon de 1834. Paris, 1834.

---., and B. Galbaccio. Le Salon de 1833. Paris, 1833.

Le Brun, Ch. Sur l'expression générale et particulière. Paris, 1668.

Lessing, G.E. "Laokoon: Oder über die Grenzen der Malerei und Poësie." 1766. Lessing's Werke. III. Ausgewählt von Karl Balser und Heinz Stolpe. Berlin, 1965. 161-332.

Lessing, G.E. Laocoon. Transl. by Ch. Vanderbourg. Paris, 1802.

L.V. (Ludovic Vitet). "Exposition des tableaux en bénéfice des Grecs; II. M. Delacroix." Le Globe 3 June 1826. Reprinted: L. Vitet. Etudes sur les beaux-arts: Essais d'archéologie et fragments littéraires. Paris, 1847. 189-196.

---. "Diorama: Vue du village d'Unterseen, par M. Daguerre. Vue intérieure de l'abbaye de Saint-Vaudrille, par M. Bouton." Le Globe 30 September 1826.

---. La mort de Henri III, août 1589, scènes historiques. Paris, 1829.

---. "Le Musée Cosmopolite de M. Mazzara: Le Diorama, le Néorama." Le Globe 30 May 1830.

"Mars désarmé par Vénus et les Grâces, tableau de M. David." Le Constitutionnel 11 June 1824.

Martainville, A.-L.-D. "Exposition de 1824: A M.

B... à Rome; IIIe lettre." Le Drapeau blanc 6 September 1824.

---. "Exposition de 1824: A M. B... à Rome; VIe lettre." Le Drapeau blanc 29 September 1824.

Mérimée, P. Le théâtre de Clara Gazul. Paris, 1825-1830.

Milon. "Rapport sur l'ouvrage de M. Thénot, intitulé: Traité de perspective pratique pour dessiner d'après nature." Annales de la Société libre des beaux-arts. Année 1839-1840. Paris, 1840. 142-153.

0. (Prosper Duvergier de Hauranne). "Des unités; I." Le Globe 24 December 1825.

---. "Des unités; II. M. Manzoni." Le Globe 7 January 1826.

---. "Du mélange du comique et du tragique; I." Le Globe 6 May 1826.

"Orientales par M. Victor Hugo." Le Globe 21 January 1829.

Paillet de Montabert, J.-N. Traité complet de la peinture: I. Paris, 1829.

Perrault, Ch. Parallèle des Anciens et des Modernes en ce qui regarde les arts et les sciences. Paris, 1688-1697.

Piles, R. de. L'art de peinture de C.A. Du Fresnoy, traduit en françois, enrichy de remarques, & augmenté d'un dialogue sur le coloris. Paris, 1673.

---. Cours de peinture par principes. Paris, 1708.

Pillet, F. "Salon de 1831." Le Moniteur universel (1831): 968, 1218.

---. "Musée du Luxembourg." Le Moniteur universel (1836): 1694.

---. "Salon de 1839." Le Moniteur universel (1839): 454.

---. "Salon de 1841." Le Moniteur universel (1841): 454.

Planche, G. "Lucrèce Borgia." La Revue des deux mondes 15 February 1833: 376-398.

---. "Criticism of Delavigne's Les enfans d'Edouard." La Revue des deux mondes 1 June 1833: 492-503.

---. "Histoire et philosophie de l'art; VI: Moralité de la poésie." La Revue des deux mondes 1 February 1835: 241-263.

---. "Du théâtre moderne en France; I." La Revue des deux mondes 15 February 1837: 440-458.

---. "MM Ingres et Calamatta." La Revue des deux mondes 1 April 1837: 94-104.

---. "Du théâtre moderne en France; II." La Revue des deux mondes 15 May 1837: 449-516.

---. "Léopold Robert." La Revue des deux mondes 1 June 1838: 659-675.

---. "Le Salon du roi, par M. E. Delacroix." La Revue des deux mondes 15 June 1837: 752-769.

---. "Les sources de Royat: Gravure à l'eau forte de M. Paul Huet." La Revue des deux mondes 1 February 1838: 352-359.

---. Portraits d'artistes: Peintres et sculpteurs. 2 vols. Paris, 1853.

---. Etudes sur les arts. 2 vols. Paris, 1855.

---. Etudes littéraires. 2 vols. Paris, 1855.

---. Etudes sur l'école française (1831-1852): Peinture et sculpture. 2 vols. Paris, 1855.

Poussin, N. "Correspondance." Ed. by Charles Jouanny. Archives de l'art français. 1911; Paris, 1968.

Quatremère de Quincy, A.-C. Considérations sur les arts du dessin en France. Paris, 1791.

---. Considérations morales sur la destination des ouvrages de l'art ou de l'influence de leur emploi sur le génie et le goût de ceux qui les produisent ou qui les jugent et sur le sentiment de ceux qui en jouissent

et en reçoivent les impressions. Paris, 1815.

---. Essai sur la nature, le but et les moyens de l'imitation dans les beaux-arts. Paris, 1823.

---. Histoire de la vie et les ouvrages de Raphaël. Paris, 1824.

---. Histoire de la vie et des ouvrages des plus célèbres architectes du XIe siècle jusqu'à la fin du XVIIIe, accompagnée de la vue du plus remarquable édifice de chacun d'eux. Ed. J. Renouard 1830. New York, 1970.

---. Essai sur l'Idéal dans ses applications pratiques aux oeuvres de l'imitation propre des arts du dessin. Paris, 1837.

---. "Notice historique sur la vie et les ouvrages de M. Gros, né a Paris, le 16 mars 1771, mort le 26 juin 1835." Suite du recueil de notices historiques lues dans les séances publiques de l'Académie royale des beaux-arts à l'Institut. Paris, 1837. 308-334.

Rabbe, A. "Beaux-Arts." Le Courrier français 29 August 1824.

Racine, J. Oeuvres. 3 vols. Paris, Didot, an IX.

La Revue encyclopédique 4 (1819): 527.

Reynolds, J. Discourses delivered at the Royal Academy. London, 1769-1791.

Rio, A.F. De l'art chrétien. 4 vols. Paris, 1836-1867.

Rumohr, C.F. von. Italienische Forschungen. Berlin, 1827-'31.

"Le Salon; I." Le Globe 12 May 1831.

"Le Salon; II." Le Globe 11 June 1831.

"Salon de 1824." Le Moniteur universel (1824): 1226.

"Salon de 1834." La Gazette de France. Paraphrased in L'Echo de la jeune France (1834): 23.

Saint-C. "De la poésie et des beaux-arts dans notre

époque; II." L'Artiste 4 (1832, 2e sem.): 177-179.

S.B. (Ch.-A. de Sainte-Beuve). "Victor Hugo: Odes et ballades." Le Globe 2 January 1827.

Scheffer, Arnold. "Salon de 1827." La Revue française 1 (1827): 188-212.

Schlegel, A.W. Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst und Literatur. II. Kritische Schriften und Briefe VI. Herausgegeben von Edgar Lohner. 1809-'11; Stuttgart, 1967.

Schlegel, F., or L. Lombach. "Die Pariser Kunstaussstellung vom Jahre XI." Europa 1 (1803): 89-107.

Sismondi, Sismonde de. Biography of Marino Faliero. Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne ... rédigé par une Société de gens de lettres et de savants. XIV. Paris, 1815. 131-132.

Staël, G. de. De la littérature considérée dans ses rapports avec les institutions sociales. Paris, 1800.

---. De l'Allemagne. 1810; Paris, 1814.

Stendhal (H. Beyle). Histoire de la peinture en Italie. Seule édition complète entièrement revue et corrigée. 1817; Paris, 1860.

---. Racine et Shakespeare. Paris, 1823.

---. "Salon de 1824." 1824. Mélanges d'art. Etablissement du texte et préfaces par Henri Martineau. Paris, 1932. 1-152. The Salon first appeared in the Journal de Paris et les départements.

Thiers, A. "Salon de mil huit cent vingt-quatre; IV: Philippe V, par M. Gérard." Le Constitutionnel 7 September 1824.

---. "Exposition de 1824." Le Globe 15 September 1824.

---. "Exposition de 1824; III," Le Globe 28 September 1824.

---. "Direction des arts et particulièrement de la peinture en France." Revue européenne 1 (1824): 35-39.

Thoré, Th. "M. Eugène Delacroix." Le Siècle 24 February 1837.

Tripier le Franc, J. Histoire de la vie et de la mort du Baron Gros, le grand peintre. Rédigée sur de nouveaux documents et d'après des souvenirs inédits. Paris, 1880.

Vautenet. "Travaux courants. Conférence sur ces deux questions:

1. Que sont les arts en eux-mêmes? Quel est leur but?

2. Est-il avantageux ou nuisible à la gloire et à l'honneur des arts qu'il y ait un grand nombre d'artistes?" Annales de la Société libre des beaux-arts. (1835): 71-78.

Viel-Castel, H. de. "Salon de 1831." L'Artiste 1 (1831): 185-187, 268-270.

Vigny, A. de. Chatterton. Paris, 1834.

Winckelmann, J.J. "Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerey und Bildhauerkunst." 1755. Sämtliche Werke: Einzige vollständige Ausgabe. Ed. by J. Eiselein. I. 1825; Osnabruck, 1965.

SECONDARY LITERATURE

Athanassoglou, N. "Under the Sign of Leonidas: The Political and Ideological Fortune of David's Léonidas aux Thermopyles under the Restoration." Art Bulletin 63 (1981): 633-649.

Balzer, W. Gustave Planche: Eine Untersuchung zur Geschichte der Französischen Kunstkritik im 19. Jahrhundert. Thesis, Leipzig U, 1908.

Barrell, J. The Political Theory of Painting from Reynolds to Hazlitt: 'The Body of the Public'. New Haven, 1986.

Baschet, R. E.-J. Delécluze: Témoin de son temps,

1781-1863, Thesis, Université de Paris, 1942. Paris, 1942.

Bätschmann, O. "Das Historienbild als tableau des Konflikts: Jacques-Louis David's Brutus von 1789." Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte 39 (1986): 145-162.

Bénichou, P. Le temps des prophètes: Doctrines de l'âge romantique. Paris, 1977.

Boime, A. The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century. London, 1971.

---. Thomas Couture and the Eclectic Vision. New Haven, 1980.

Borowitz, H.O. "The Man Who Wrote to David." Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art 67 (1980): 256-274.

Buddemeier, H. Panorama, Diorama, Photographie: Entstehung und Wirkung neuer Medien im 19. Jahrhundert. Untersuchungen und Dokumente. München, 1970.

Carlson, M. "Hernani's Revolt from the Tradition of French Stage Composition." Theatre Survey 13 (1972): 1-27.

Chélin, H. Friedrich Schlegel's 'Europa', Thesis 'Europa': une revue éditée par Friedrich Schlegel, Metz U, 1977 (Frankfurt a.M., 1981).

Crow, Th. "The Oath of the Horatii in 1785: Painting and Pre-Revolutionary Radicalism in France." Art History 1 (1978): 425-471.

---. Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris. New Haven, 1985.

De David à Delacroix: La peinture française de 1774 à 1830. Exhibition catalogue, Paris, 1974.

Dowley, F.H. "D'Angiviller's Grands Hommes and the Significant Moment." Art Bulletin 39 (1957): 261-277.

Duncan, C. "Fallen Fathers: Images of Authority in Pre-Revolutionary French Art." Art History 4 (1981): 186-202.

Eggli, E. and P. Martino. Le débat romantique en France, 1813-1830: pamphlets, manifestes, polémiques de presse. I. 1813-1816. Paris, 1933.

Eitner, L. Géricault's 'Raft of the Medusa'. London, 1972.

Emge, R.M. Saint-Simon: Einführung in ein Leben und Werk, eine Schule, Sekte und Wirkungsgeschichte. München, 1987.

Ewals, L. Ary Scheffer: Sa vie et son oeuvre. Thesis, Nimwegue, 1987.

Foucart, B. Le renouveau de la peinture religieuse en France, 1800-1860. Paris, 1987.

Fried, M. "Thomas Couture and the Theatricalization of Action in 19th-Century French Painting." Artforum 8 (1970) 10: 36-45.

---. Absorption and Theatricality: Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot. Berkeley, 1980.

Furman, N. 'La Revue des deux mondes' et le romantisme (1831-1848). Genève, 1975.

Gaetgens, Th.W. "Jacques-Louis David: Léonidas bei den Thermopylen." Ideal und Wirklichkeit der bildenden Kunst im späten 18. Jahrhundert. Berlin, 1984. 212-251.

Germer, S. "'On marche dans ce tableau': Zur Konstituierung des 'Realistischen' in den Napoleonischen Darstellungen von Jacques-Louis David." Frankreich 1800: Gesellschaft, Kultur, Mentalitäten. Hrsg. G. Gersmann and H. Kohle. Stuttgart, 1990. 81-103.

---., and H. Kohle. "From the theatrical to the aesthetic hero: On the privatization of virtue in David's Brutus and Sabines." Art History 9 (1986): 168-183.

Granges, Ch.-M. des. La presse littéraire sous la Restauration, 1815-1830. Paris, 1907.

Grate, P. Deux critiques d'art de l'époque romantique: Gustave Planche et Théophile Thoré.

Stockholm, 1959.

Groethuysen, B. J.-J. Rousseau. 1949; Paris, 1983.

Hamilton, G.H. "The Iconographical Origins of Delacroix's Liberty Leading the People." Studies in Art and Literature for Belle da Costa Greene. Princeton, 1954. 55-66.

Haskell, F. "Art and the Language of Politics." 1974. Past and Present in Art and Taste. New Haven, 1988. 65-74.

Helsdingen, H.W. van. Politiek van de dood: Begraven tijdens de Franse Revolutie, 1789-1800. Amsterdam, 1987.

Hyde, R. Panoromania! The Art and Entertainment of the All-Embracing View. Intr. by Scott B. Wilcox. London, 1988.

Iknayan, M. The Concave Mirror: From Imitation to Expression in French Esthetic Theory 1800-1830. Saratoga, 1983.

Jacques Louis-David 1748-1825. Exhibition catalogue, Paris, Versailles, 1989-1990. Paris, 1989.

Johnson, D. "Desire Demythologized: David's L'Amour quittant Psyche " Art History 9 (1986): 450-470.

---. "Corporality and Communication: The Gestural Revolution of Diderot, David and The Oath of the Horatii." Art Bulletin 71 (1989): 92-113.

Johnson, L. The Paintings of Eugène Delacroix: A Critical Catalogue, 1816-1831. I. Text. Oxford, 1981.

Jonker, M. "David's Léonidas aux Thermopyles in the art-criticism of the Restoration." Frankreich 1800: Gesellschaft, Kultur, Mentalitäten. Hrsg. G. Gersmann and H. Kohle. Stuttgart, 1990. 49-63.

Jowell, F.S. Thoré-Bürger and the Art of the Past. Thesis, Harvard U, 1971. New York, 1977.

Kemp, W. Der Anteil des Betrachters: Rezeptionsästhetische Studien zur Malerei des 19.

Jahrhunderts. München, 1983.

Kirchner, Th. "Neue Themen, neue Kunst? Zu einem Versuch die Französische Historienmalerei zu reformieren." Historienmalerei in Europa: Form, Funktion und Ideologie. Hrsg. von E. Mai unter Mitarb. von A. Repp-Eckert. Mainz a. R., 1990. 9-25.

Körner, H. Auf der Suche nach der 'wahren Einheit': Ganzheitsvorstellungen in der französischen Malerei und Kunstliteratur vom mittleren 17. bis zum mittleren 19. Jahrhundert. München, 1988.

Laurent, J. Arts & pouvoirs en France de 1793 à 1981: Histoire d'une démission artistique. Saint-Etienne, 1982.

Lee, R.W. Ut Pictura Poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting. 1940; New York, 1967.

Leith, J.A. The Idea of Art as Propaganda in France 1750-1799: A Study in the History of Ideas. Toronto, 1965.

Levitine, G. Girodet-Trioson: An Iconographical Study, Thesis, Harvard U, 1952 (New York, 1978).

---. The Dawn of Bohemianism: The Barbu Rebellion and Primitivism in Neoclassical France. University Park, 1978.

Locquin, J. La peinture d'histoire en France de 1747 à 1785: Etude sur l'évolution des idées artistiques dans la seconde moitié du XVIIIe siècle. Paris, 1912.

Mai, E. "Historia! -Von der Figurenmalerei in Theorie und Praxis seit dem 16. Jahrhundert." Triumph und Tod des Helden: Europäische Historienmalerei von Rubens bis Manet. Exhibition catalogue Cologne, Zürich and Lyons. Zürich, 1988. 15-29.

---. "Poussin, Félibien und Lebrun: Zur Formulierung der Französischen Historienmalerei an der Académie Royale de Peinture et Sculpture in Paris." Historienmalerei in Europa: Paradigmen in Form, Funktion

und Ideologie. Hrsg. von E. Mai unter Mitarb. von A. Repp-Eckert. Mainz a.R. 1990. 9-25.

Mainardi, P. Art and Politics of the Second Empire: The Universal Expositions of 1855 and 1867. New Haven, 1987.

Marrinan, M. Painting Politics for Louis-Philippe: Art and Ideology in Orleanist France 1830-1848. New Haven, 1988.

Meisel, M. Realizations: Narrative, Pictorial, and Theatrical Arts in Nineteenth-Century England. Princeton, 1983.

Mosby, D.F. Alexandre-Gabriel Decamps, 1803-1860. Thesis, Harvard U, 1973. New York, 1977.

Mras, G. Eugène Delacroix's Theory of Art. Princeton, 1966.

Panofsky, E. 'Idea': Ein Beitrag zur Begriffsgeschichte der älteren Kunsttheorie. Leipzig, 1924.

Paulini, H.M. August Wilhelm Schlegel und die vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft. Frankfurt a. M., 1985.

Prochno, R. Joshua Reynolds. Weinheim, 1990.

Puttfarcken, Th. "David's Brutus and Theories of Pictorial Unity in France." Art History 4 (1981): 291-304.

---. Roger de Piles' Theory of Art. New Haven, 1985.

Raphaël et l'art français. Exhibition catalogue. Paris, 1983.

Reavis, S.A. August Wilhelm Schlegels Auffassung der Tragödie im Zusammenhang mit seine Poetik und ästhetische Theorien seiner Zeit. Bern, 1978.

Regard, M. L'adversaire des Romantiques: Gustave Planche, 1808-1857. Paris, 1955.

Rosenblum, R. Transformations in Late Eighteenth

Century Art. Princeton, 1967.

---. The International Style of 1800: A Study in Linear Abstraction. Thesis, New York U, 1956. New York, 1976.

---., and H.W. Janson. Art of the Nineteenth Century: Painting and Sculpture. London, 1984.

Rosenthal, L. Du Romantisme au Réalisme: Essai sur l'évolution de la peinture en France de 1830 à 1848. Paris, 1914.

Rubin, J.H. Ut Pictura Theatrum, Painting as Theater: An Approach to Painting in France from 1791 to 1810. Thesis, Harvard U, 1972.

Sahut, M.-C., and R. Michel. David: L'art et le politique. Paris, 1988.

Sauerländer, W. "Pathosfiguren im Oeuvre des Jean-Baptiste Greuze." Walter Friedlaender zum 90. Geburtstag: Eine Festgabe seiner europäischen Schülern, Freunde und Verehrer. Berlin, 1965. 146-150.

Schawelka, K. Eugène Delacroix: Sieben Studien zu seiner Kunsttheorie. Mittenwald, 1979.

Scherer, J. La dramaturgie classique en France. Paris, 1970.

Schlenoff, N. Ingres: Ses sources littéraires. Paris, 1956.

Schnapper, A. J.-L. David und seine Zeit. Fribourg, 1981.

Schneider, R. L'esthétique classique chez Quatremère de Quincy. Paris, 1910.

Schoch, R. Das Herrscherbild in der Malerei des 19. Jahrhunderts. München, 1975.

Scott, D. Pictorialist Poetics: Poetry and the Visual Arts in Nineteenth-Century France. Cambridge, 1988.

Seznec, J. "Diderot et l'affaire Greuze." Gazette des beaux-arts 67 (1966): 339-356.

Sfeir-Semler, A. Die Maler am Pariser Salon 1791-1880. Frankfurt, 1992.

Snell, R. Théophile Gautier: A Romantic Critic of the Visual Arts. Oxford, 1982.

Stemmrich, G. "David's Léonidas bei den Thermopylen: Klassizistisch vollzogene Kunstautonomie als 'Patriotisme sur la Toile'." Frankreich 1800: Gesellschaft, Kultur, Mentalitäten. Ed. G. Gersmann and H. Kohle. Stuttgart, 1990. 64-80.

Stolpe, E. Klassizismus und Krieg: Über den Historienmaler Jacques-Louis David. Frankfurt a. M., 1985.

Sulger-Gebing, E. A.W. und F. Schlegel in ihrem Verhältnisse zur bildenden Kunst. Mit ungedruckten Briefe und Aufsätzen A.W. Schlegels. 1897; Hildesheim, 1976.

Teyssèdre, B. Roger de Piles et les débats sur le coloris au siècle de Louis XIV. Paris, 1957.

Thomasseau, J.-M. Le mélodrame. Paris, 1984.

Thuillier, J. "Temps et tableau: La théorie des 'péripiéties' dans la peinture française du XVIIe siècle." Stil und Überlieferung in der Kunst des Abendlandes. III. Berlin, 1967. 191-203.

Trimpi, W. "The meaning of Horace's 'Ut Pictura Poesis'." Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 36 (1973): 1-34.

Vaggi, G. The Economics of François Quesnay. Basingstoke, 1987.

Vyverberg, H. Historical Pessimism in the French Enlightenment. Cambridge, Mass., 1958.

Wakefield, D. "Stendhal and Delécluze at the Salon of 1824." The Artist and the Writer in France: Essays in Honour of Jean Seznec. Ed. by F. Haskell, A. Levi and R. Shackleton. Oxford, 1974. 76-85.

Will, F. Flumen Historicum: Victor Cousin's

Aesthetic and its Sources. Chapel Hill, 1965.

Wind, E. "The Revolution of History Painting." Journal of the Warburg Institute 2 (1938-'39): 116-127.

---. "The Sources of David's Horaces." Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 4 (1941-'42): 124-138.

Wright, B.S. The Influence of the Historical Novels of Sir Walter Scott on the Changing Nature of French History Painting, 1815-1855. Thesis California U Berkeley, 1978. Ann Arbor, 1978.

Ziff, N. Paul Delaroche: A Study in Nineteenth-Century French History Painting. Thesis, New York U, 1974. New York, 1977.

ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Poussin. The Gathering of the Manna. Louvre.
2. Poussin. The Testament of Eudamidas. Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen.
3. Greuze. Filial Piety. Hermitage, Saint Petersburg.
4. C. Van Loo. Jason and Medea. Neue Palais, Potsdam.
5. David. The Oath of the Horatii. Louvre.
6. David. Brutus. Louvre.
7. David. The Intervention of the Sabine Women. Louvre.
8. Gros. Napoleon Visiting the Plague House in Jaffa. Louvre.
9. Gérard. Louis XIV and the King of Spain. Musée national du château, Versailles.
10. David. Amor and Psyche. Cleveland Museum of Art, Ohio.
11. David. Mars Disarmed by Venus, Amor and the Graces. Musées royaux, Bruxelles.
12. Reynolds. Omai. The Castle Howard Collection.
13. David. Leonidas at Thermopylae. Louvre.
14. E.F. Burney. Loutherbourg's Eidophysikon. British Museum, London (Department of Prints and Drawings).
15. Cross-section of Prévost's third panorama-rotunda on the Boulevard des Capucines (1816). Source: Donnet, Orgiazzi and Kaufmann, Architectonographie des théâtres, Paris, 1837-1840.
16. Géricault. The Raft of the Medusa. Louvre.
17. Delacroix. The Massacre of Chios. Louvre.
18. Sigalon. Locuste. Musée des beaux-arts, Nîmes.
19. Delacroix. Dante and Virgil in the Underworld. Louvre.
20. Delacroix. Christ in the Olive Garden. Church of Saints Peter and Paul, Paris.
21. Delacroix. The Death of Sardanapalus. Louvre.

22. Delacroix. The Execution of the Doge Marino Faliero. Wallace Collection, London.
23. Delaroche. Cromwell Viewing the Body of Charles I. Musée des beaux-arts, Nîmes.
24. Delaroche. The Children of Edward. Louvre.
25. Delaroche. The Execution of Lady Jane Grey. National Gallery, London.
26. Ingres. The Death of Saint Symphorian. Cathedral, Autun.
27. Decamps. The Defeat of the Cimbri. Louvre.
28. Ingres. The Vow of Louis XIII. Cathedral, Montauban.
29. L. Robert. Fisherman from Naples Improvising. Musée des beaux-arts. Neuchâtel.
30. Scheffer. Christus Consolator. Rijksmuseum Vincent van Gogh, Amsterdam (Collection Fodor).
31. David. Napoleon's Sacre. Louvre.
32. Greuze. Young Girl Weeping over her Dead Bird. National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh.
33. Murillo. Conception Sout. Prado, Madrid.
34. Delacroix. The Algerian Women. Louvre.
35. Delacroix. Freedom Leading the People. Louvre.
36. Vernet. The Duke of Orléans Proceeds to the Hôtel de Ville. Musée national du château, Versailles.
- 37a. Delacroix. Agriculture, ceiling from the Salon du Roi. Palais-Bourbon, Paris.
- 37b. Delacroix. Agriculture, wall Salon du Roi.
38. Delacroix. Saint-Sebastian. Church of Nantua (Dép. Aix).