



## American Society for Eighteenth Century Studies (ASECS)

---

Revolution, Representation, Equality: Gender, Genre, and Emulation in the Académie Royale de Peinture et Sculpture, 1785-93

Author(s): Nicholas Mirzoeff

Source: *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 2, Questions of Gender (Winter, 1997/1998), pp. 153-174

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press. Sponsor: American Society for Eighteenth Century Studies (ASECS).

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30053297>

Accessed: 04/04/2009 16:01

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=jhup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



The Johns Hopkins University Press and American Society for Eighteenth Century Studies (ASECS) are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Eighteenth-Century Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

# *R*EVOLUTION, REPRESENTATION, EQUALITY: GENDER, GENRE, AND EMULATION IN THE ACADEMIE ROYALE DE PEINTURE ET SCULPTURE, 1785–93

*Nicholas Mirzoeff*

---

Nowhere is the history of art so entwined with wider political history than during the French Revolution. In order to render these complex events comprehensible, art historical narratives have tended to stress the dominant role of Jacques-Louis David and his studio.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, the Revolution has come to be depicted as the moment of masculinity in French art, setting the tone for the unfolding of modern art in the nineteenth century.<sup>2</sup> As such, the liberty sought by radical artists has been connected primarily to the notion of fraternity. Historians, on the other hand, have recently moved away from such overarching narratives to pay far closer attention to the pattern of events, the complexities of revolutionary discourse and the attempts to put such discourse into practice. In this essay, I shall argue that the received canon cannot continue to direct our sense of the meaning of art and artistic practice in the French Revolution. Rather than the traditional unfolding narrative of heroic masculinity from David's *Brutus* (1789) to the *Death of Marat* (1793), I offer an alternative reading of this key period in the formation of modernism centering on the intensely contested debates as to the role of art in the new era. During these first dramatic years of the Revolution, the watchword of artistic reformers was equality, not fraternity. Equality meant giving women artists equal status, modernizing art training, ending the powerful cliques like that of David's studio, and declaring all artistic genres equal. Above all, it meant ending the hierarchical structures of emulation that gave the Royal

---

NICHOLAS MIRZOEFF is Associate Professor of Art History at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. He is the author of *Silent Poetry: Deafness, Sign and Visual Culture in Modern France*.

*Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 31, no. 2 (1997–98) Pp. 153–174.

Academy of Painting and Sculpture (L'Académie Royale de Peinture et Sculpture) both a pedagogical method and a bureaucratic structure. Emulation was a conservative slogan during the early years of the revolution, despite its later adoption by the Jacobins. For several years after 1789, artists saw the institutional politics of art as a crucial part of artistic practice. In essence, the question was the same as that being debated in the French polity at large: what was representation, who had the right to represent, and who or what should be represented?<sup>3</sup> The institutional struggles of the nineteenth century over genre and gender had their origin in these unresolved debates.<sup>4</sup> None of the participants in the debate on the arts was prepared to entertain the full radicalism of equality.

### THE ACADEMY IN THE ANCIEN RÉGIME

As all recent studies of the revolution have stressed, the discontent in the Academy had deep roots in the structures of the ancien régime. From the moment of its establishment in 1648, the Academy had always been a political and contested institution. It was set up in order to escape the regulatory attentions of the guilds, or *maîtres*, only to experience an enforced merger with the guilds during the Fronde (1648–53). The guilds created their own Academy of St Luke as a rival to the Royal Academy and claimed many leading seventeenth-century artists as members. However, Louis XIV's first minister, Colbert, intervened in 1663 to revive and, in the phrase of contemporaries, "re-found" the Academy. Its tasks were to be the decoration of the new royal palace at Versailles, the creation of designs for the Gobelins tapestries, and the organization of public conferences on the arts. Soon afterward, the Academy showed its new confidence by expelling its own professor of perspective, Abraham Bosse, a Frondeur and Huguenot who had sought to create a common language for what we now call craft and the fine arts. His expulsion at the hands of the first painter Charles Lebrun caused a revolt by the pupils in the Academy's school, leading to their own expulsion. Such actions were not quickly forgotten. During the revolutionary period, anti-academic rhetoric referred time and again to Lebrun's despotism as the origin of the Academy's problems.<sup>5</sup> The Academy continued to struggle both against the guilds and for government approval until the appointment of Charles-Claude de Flahaut de la Billarderie, comte d'Angiviller as *directeur des bâtiments* in 1774. Two years later, the Academy was once again reorganized under the directorship of the painter Jean-Baptiste Pierre, with its goal now being the promotion of civic virtue via Neo-Classical painting.<sup>6</sup>

By the 1770s, the Academy of St Luke was again a serious rival to the Academy, supported by alternative sources at court and holding increasingly frequent exhibitions.<sup>7</sup> The guild provided women artists with one means of public exhibition, beyond the usually closed doors of the Academy. In the first of their exhibitions in 1751, three women portraitists—Mlles Bocquet, Neuve, and de St Martin—showed their work, and others followed.<sup>8</sup> By 1774, 258 artists could be seen at the St Luke exhibition, including Elisabeth Vigée-Lebrun and Adélaïde Labille-Guiard.<sup>9</sup> The Academy was much relieved when, as part of Turgot's reforms, the guild was abolished in 1776, with royal agents raiding the homes of guild members at two in the morning to seize artworks and documents.<sup>10</sup> But they were not to be left with an open

field. Old guild members held exhibitions under the name of the Salon du Colysée, and other exhibitions could be seen at the musée de la rue Saint-André, and the house of one Guillard.<sup>11</sup> D'Angiviller deployed a range of measures against these exhibitions, including the infamous *lettres du cachet*, leaving non-Academic artists with only an annual open air exhibition at the place Dauphine. In 1783, the Salon de la Correspondance held a retrospective historical exhibition of French painting from 1500 to the then present, noting in its catalog that the arts “languish as classed by the Academies.”<sup>12</sup> It was perhaps this opposition that led d'Angiviller to arrange for the admission of two women artists from the guilds—Vigée-Lebrun and Labille-Guiard—in May 1783, while limiting the total number of women academicians to four.<sup>13</sup> Not for the first or last time, the Academy sought to nullify its opposition by absorbing it. Although Vigée-Lebrun was the more controversial choice because of her apparent connection with picture dealing via her husband, Labille-Guiard proved to be more dangerous, becoming one of the leaders of the reform movement after 1789.

After the abolition of the guilds, the Academy's School became the only means of artistic preferment for young artists, and a second school was opened to cope with demand.<sup>14</sup> The previous weakness of the institution had left the school in a poor state to deal with this new task. In March 1784, d'Angiviller wrote that “there will be several places vacant at the Rome Academy” unless suitable candidates could be found from that year's competition.<sup>15</sup> Two prizes were therefore awarded that year, one to Jean-Germain Drouais and the other to Brenet. However, this seemingly generous announcement led to some disorder among the students, and discontent remained in the air. In March 1785, the Academy changed its traditional procedures so that the Rome Prize subject was set not by the Professor of the month but by a committee of emeritus professors, in order to avoid “all suspicion” of impropriety. However, when the prizes were announced on August 28, Pierre reported that “punches” were thrown among the “youth” of the school. A month later, a letter by d'Angiviller was read to students assembled for distribution of medals and prizes: “The Director General is displeased by the riotous assemblies and several indecencies committed at the time of judging the Grand Prix.”<sup>16</sup> The pupils were not dismayed and sent a delegation to the next meeting of the Academy on September 30 to announce that “the judgment did not conform to their ideas.” Many Academicians pronounced themselves insulted by this unusual protest, and d'Angiviller threatened the instigators with expulsion and the school itself with closure, which would have left France without official art education of any kind. For the *Journal de Paris*, the consequences were clear: “The pupils are already divided amongst themselves. They form cabals against each other's success whose chiefs go about talking, criticizing, destroying those who show any interesting dispositions.”<sup>17</sup> These cabals clearly continued to have influence after 1789.

The Rome Prize competition in 1787 saw further scandals and drama. On 25 April Pierre reported that the favorite to win, Anne-Louis Girodet, had been caught preparing his drawings in David's studio, not in the *loges* where candidates were required to work. Girodet's drawings were confiscated, but now it was alleged that his master David had retouched his work, and the other students demanded that he be excluded from the competition. Similar accusations had been made concerning Drouais' prize-winning entry, *Christ and the Canaanite Woman* (Paris:

Musée du Louvre, 1784), rumors that gained fresh force when his submissions from Rome were compared to the *Christ*. The students reportedly protested that: "We wish to compete one against the other but not against a David who will favor a protégé every year. We must therefore utterly renounce the hope of winning a prize." D'Angiviller instructed Pierre that Girodet should withdraw on pain of expulsion. Pierre handled the matter with delicacy: "I said the minimum regarding the withdrawal and its cause and spoke at great length regarding the good qualities and talents of the young pupils. The name of the real culprit was not even mentioned."<sup>18</sup> Although this maneuver satisfied the students in the short term, these controversies were to be remembered and played a role in the students' demands for teaching reforms in the revolutionary period.

Meanwhile the Academy sought to organize its membership. In order to become a full member of the Academy, a candidate had to go through a two-stage process. First, he or she offered a number of preparatory works, typically studies of the male nude or drawings after Classical sculptures. If accepted, the candidate achieved the status of *agrégé*, or aspirant, Academician and enjoyed the protections of Academic membership. Next, the *agrégé* was supposed to prepare his or her *morceau de réception*, a fully finished work in his or her genre. This piece would be presented to the Academy whose Officers would then vote on accepting the artist as a full member, or Academician. During the period of competition with the guilds, many artists became *agrégés* in order to escape the restrictions imposed by the guilds but never sought full membership. Now that the Academy enjoyed a monopoly, a report of November 1788 felt it was time to end this anomaly.<sup>19</sup> The *agrégés* were thus summoned to a meeting on 17 December 1788 to explain what they intended to do about resolving their status. It was discovered that there were forty-five *agrégés*, one of whom was dead and another blind.<sup>20</sup> Most promised to submit a reception piece within the three year grace period offered by the Academy. Eleven artists stayed away, including the painter Robin who was to lead the rebel *agrégés* against the Academic establishment.<sup>21</sup> On the eve of the Revolution, therefore, the Academy was far from a secure institution, despite its triumph over the guilds. Its traditional hierarchical structures were being challenged from within by students and *agrégés*, while other groups continued to defy its monopoly of artistic exhibitions. When the Revolution called into question the fundamental privilege of Royal protection, the Academy was unable to defend its practices any longer.

## REFORMING THE ACADEMY

No sooner had the Bastille fallen than the consequences were felt in the Academy of Painting. From August 1, 1789 the students of the Academy kept a guard at the Salon. They called for an open Salon "in the hope of hastening this happy revolution, so desired by true lovers of the arts."<sup>22</sup> At the Academy's regular September meeting, the students presented a series of requests, calling for an end to all grace and favor places in the school, even for the children of Academicians, and demanding the right to stand guard over the Salon entry of Jean-Germain Drouais, whose recent death had elevated him to martyr status. Finally, they requested that the Academy open a class for drawing from Antique sculpture for one week each month. These

demands were echoed in a pamphlet entitled *Le Voeu des Artistes*, circulated in artistic and political milieus.<sup>23</sup> The first two requests were granted, but the third was refused. For the Academy's entire *raison d'être* rested on its control of art education, and to concede the direction of the program to the students was unacceptable.<sup>24</sup> A month later the Academy suppressed the former practice whereby the Professor of the month took his favored students with him to witness his posing of the model, "this particular favor being in contradiction with the newly established law, which abolished all privileges and predilections."<sup>25</sup> This small concession finally opened the Academy's doors to reform.

Outside the narrow confines of the Academy, many other artists had already realized the dramatic importance of the revolutionary changes for the arts. The Société d'Apollon, one of the many unofficial artistic groups of the late ancien régime, held a Te Deum of praise for the events of July 14, culminating with a speech declaring that: "Peoples, none of you will any longer know debasement or slavery; man will respect man; the fruit of your labors will belong to you alone. . . . The rights of the nation, the prince, and the citizen will be fixed and respected."<sup>26</sup> Such remarks were typical of the utopian strand of regenerative discourse that sprang into being as soon as the possibility of reform emerged in 1787.<sup>27</sup> In the audience was Simon-Charles Miger (1736–1821), an engraver, member of the Academy since 1781 and of the Société d'Apollon since 1785, who was to lead the attempt to reform the Academy.<sup>28</sup> On 20 November 1789 Miger published an open "Letter to M. Vien," calling for wholesale reform: "If everything is to take a new form in the state, then the constitution of the Academy must also change."<sup>29</sup> While praising Joseph-Marie Vien (1716–1809), who had taken over as director of the Academy following Pierre's death on 15 May 1789, Miger openly attacked what he called the "despotism" of Pierre's administration.<sup>30</sup> His examples were certainly eye-catching. He noted that Alexis Loir had been elected to the post of *conseiller* by the Academy only to have Pierre install his candidate Jacques-Antoine Beaufort instead. Even more glaring was the election of the sculptor Etienne-Maurice Falconnet (1714–1791) to the post of *adjoint à Recteur* upon his return from Russia in 1783, despite his protests that he was "so paralyzed as to not be able to get out of an armchair." Indeed, one Clément Belle was initially elected but Pierre at once called for another vote in which Nicolas-Bernard Lépicié, Belle's proposer, recorded his vote for Falconnet in such ostentatiously large letters as to be visible to all. Miger asserted that he had limited his examples to recent events, a claim borne out by the Academy's own archives. As early as March 1777, the painter Chardin complained to d'Angiviller that Pierre had annulled the election of the long-serving secretary of the Academy Charles-Nicolas Cochin to the post of *conseiller*, a decision that the Comte upheld, as he invariably did.<sup>31</sup> These posts were not simply honorific but carried significant pensions from the King, a recompense that Miger now demanded should be shared with at least two of the rank-and-file Academicians. In his marginal notes on a copy he sent to the administration, Vien remarked that such comments were unsurprising from "a man whose mediocrity and laziness has kept him in penury."<sup>32</sup>

Miger set out a program to create an equal Academy, beginning with abolishing the limit on the number of women Academicians: "The Academy must be, like a church, open to all its faithful. The real law is that one should be

particular over talent, as over morals; but all honest (*honnête*) women, who really are artists, are men from the Academy's point of view." While subscribing to the traditional notion that the woman artist was a contradiction in terms, Miger proposed that they were instead to be considered as men.<sup>33</sup> This procedural transvestism may not have been his idea, for Vien noted that "the woman Guyard is at the moment agitating artists in favor of Miger, her lost child." The participation of Labille-Guiard also implied that of François-André Vincent, her lover and soon-to-be husband, who was widely acknowledged as one of the leading Neo-Classical artists.<sup>34</sup> Her involvement in reform is tacitly confirmed by the fact that she was never the target of radical hostility that drove her fellow court painter, Vigée-Lebrun, into exile.

Equality further required that all members of the Academy should have the vote and that there should be an end to meetings for Officers only, "as if an armchair [the privilege of Officers] had the exclusive privilege of giving good sense." The right of Academicians to vote had been claimed in a meeting of the Academy in December 1778 but now it had the backing of the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Man.<sup>35</sup> Miger further argued that the right to exhibit at the Salon was too important to be left to a committee and should be judged by elected members of both Officers and Academicians. He cited as evidence an occasion on which the refusal of a portrait by Loir had led to the sitter disowning the work, as well as the recent affair over the reception of Drouais.<sup>36</sup> Finally, he demanded a wholesale revision of the statutes in line with the new spirit of the times. In all, Miger's "Letter" was a declaration of revolt within the Academy that clearly modeled itself on the revolutionary principles of the day.

It was a sign of the changed times that Miger won the right to present his paper at the Academy's meeting on 28 November 1789. He noted that it was the first time in ten years of meetings that he had been able to speak and suggested that "the entire Academy name by vote several commissioners to redraft our statutes," which he termed "humiliating laws."<sup>37</sup> By December 1, Vien noted that the printed version of Miger's letter had "inundated Paris" and he realized that "an insurrection had been introduced and fomented with violence into the Academy."<sup>38</sup> A few days later, an anonymous member of the Academy announced that the "spirit of equality must be the basis of all institutions" and called for "the regeneration of the Academy which cannot be the only body in the State deprived of the happy fruits of the memorable revolution of which we have the happiness to be witnesses."<sup>39</sup> At the next meeting of the Academy, Vien was presented with a petition signed by twenty-three Academicians supporting Miger's proposals. He felt forced to agree that: "The Academy, without being discontent with its regulations, has had the idea of several gentle modifications to which they might be susceptible."<sup>40</sup> On 5 December 1789 it was agreed that both Officers and Academicians would meet in separate Assemblies in order to compose Memoirs detailing any concerns and that these would then be discussed in a General Assembly with a view to reforming the statutes.<sup>41</sup> The inspiration for this procedure was clearly the calling of the Estates-General and their *cahiers* of grievances. In the space of a few months, the Academy had abandoned its insistence on an emulative hierarchy that had been its central philosophy for almost a century and a half in favor of a regenerated and equal Assembly.

The reformers now sought to extend their demands. On 19 December the painter Jean-Bernard Restout launched a radical attack on Miger's proposals in the Assembly of Academicians. He rejected all pensions and financial support, claiming that artists needed only "reciprocal esteem" and hence called for the abolition of the Academy. He proposed instead an "Assembly of Artists Practicing Painting and Sculpture," claiming that: "in order that equality should be reborn, it is necessary that all pretensions, all ranks, all distinctions be returned, so to speak, to a common mass." Amongst a host of bureaucratic rules for this Assembly, one crucial change was proposed, namely that the *agrésés* should henceforth be considered full members of the Academy with speaking and voting rights (*voix délibérative*) in the Assembly.<sup>42</sup> This proposal won and won the prestigious adherence of David to the reformers. On 14 January 1790 David wrote to Vien as president of the Assembly of Academicians and to the *agrésés* demanding a general Assembly to reform the statutes. The reformers now had support from all three classes of the Academy, as Officers like Pasquier joined with Academicians like David and Miger in welcoming the *agrésés*.<sup>43</sup>

The proposed inclusion of the *agrésés* provided an issue around which the Officers could rally support. Given that he was aged 73, Vien unsurprisingly lacked the determination and administrative aggressiveness of his predecessor Pierre. However, in February 1790 he gained crucial support from the return of d'Angiviller to office after a hiatus in which he had abdicated responsibility for the arts.<sup>44</sup> At the Academy's regular meeting on February 5, the Officers resolved that the Academicians could no longer use the building for their assemblies, for fear of giving the impression that the Academy was divided.<sup>45</sup> The next day the first General Assembly was held on the issue of the demand for the inclusion of the *agrésés*. The engraver Johann-Georg Wille described in his journal how "David, Giraud, and Moreau spoke the most and with great energy. Lebarbier calmly proposed a very long motion, although he was often interrupted by several of our Officers. Finally the heat of the dispute was great. However, we could not agree according to our statutes to their demand, which was for the equality of all members of the body in general."<sup>46</sup> This insistence on the existing statutes was to be heard many times in the subsequent months and provided the Officers with a means of evading the issue.

The Academicians now sought to bring outside pressure to bear on the Officers by writing to the *Chronique de Paris* complaining of the "intolerable yoke" of the statutes that submitted the likes of David to the decisions of a Bachelier. The Officers replied in the same journal that "equality consists not in being admitted but in being admissible."<sup>47</sup> The reformers gained a vote of support for their proposals from the Commune of Paris, leading Vien to propose successfully that each class of the Academy draw up a Memoir that should then be considered by commissioners elected by both groups.<sup>48</sup> A meeting was held on 6 March for the election of these commissioners, but it was at once interrupted by David who announced the presence of a delegation of *agrésés*, led by Robin, claiming the right to name their own commissioners. Robin was allowed to speak and was invited to depose his text as a Memoir for the *agrésés*, a concession he was unwilling to accept. The question of whether to delay the appointment of commissioners was then put to a vote of Academicians alone and was defeated by 32 votes to 10. Oddly, David voted against the delay,

thereby supporting the Academy.<sup>49</sup> The elections were then held with the result that Vincent was elected for the Officers, and the reformers won all the Academicians slots, electing Le Barbier, Miger, Houdon, David, Jollain, and Barthelemy.<sup>50</sup>

This result was nonetheless hailed by Vien as one of “rapprochement” and led to the first split in the reform group. At a meeting held after the vote, a group of thirteen artists led by David and Restout called for the foundation of a Société des Beaux-Arts to replace the Academy. Its twin goals were to be artistic instruction and the holding of open exhibitions, while “utterly rejecting the hope of gaining perpetual dignities, because they consist in exercising an insulting domination over equals whose effects they had all bitterly felt.”<sup>51</sup> This strategy was that outlined by Restout in December but was now a public proposition with a call for signatures on their petition. Nonetheless, the radicals were back at the Academy on 27 March, calling for a vote to declare the *agrés* an “integral part” of the Academy. Once again, as Vien had anticipated, on a vote of the Academicians alone the proposition that “the Academicians disapprove of the approach and pretensions of the *agrés*” was upheld by 23 votes to nine.<sup>52</sup> David, who by now had faced all ways on the issue, resigned as a commissioner for the Academicians and led the five Academicians and eight *agrés* in a petition of protest. In fact, they had moved too soon. Wille found Robin’s Memoir “to have good arguments and they claim the right which they believe they have to make a common group and cause with the Academicians.”<sup>53</sup> The radicals’ despair of the possibility of reform was as misplaced as the Officer’s belief that their problems were over.

### GENDER AND STUDENT TROUBLE

The art school continued to generate strife. In 1789, two first and second prizes for painting had been awarded. Girodet and Gérard won first and second prizes for David’s studio, as did Charles Meynier and Charles Thévenin for the studio of Vincent.<sup>54</sup> In this way, the awards were balanced between what became the radical and reform factions. Before the next spring, the students had their own agenda. On March 27, 1790, “a kind of revolt among our young students,” took place, as Wille described it; the students were outraged that one of their number had not been nominated for the Grand Prix competition. Those students not attached to the influential *ateliers* of significant figures in the Academy felt overlooked and soon asserted a pedagogical agenda very different from that art history has led us to expect. On 10 April 1790 the students addressed the Academy’s meeting and demanded to be allowed female models in the *loges*, that is to say, the individual spaces in which Rome Prize entries were completed. Here was an issue on which the conservative Officers and radicals alike could agree, and they rejected the request “for the same reason of decency that has determined the King not to allow any nude female models to pose in the school,” while permitting students to bring nude studies of women into the *loges* as a guide.<sup>55</sup> At the very moment that has been hailed as the ascendancy of masculine Neo-Classicism, the young art students of the Academy were most concerned about their lack of opportunity to draw the female body. This contradiction, both with elite art practice and received art historical wisdom, highlights the contested nature of representation in the revolutionary moment.

Certainly no one could argue that David's representation of the female body, or his work in perspective, were among his strong points. Indeed, the failure of the Academy to teach adequate courses in perspective and anatomy was another key student grievance. Perspective had long been the preserve of the Le Clerc family, whose members had taught a course limited to Euclidean geometry since the late seventeenth century. When Jacques-Sebastien Le Clerc died on 17 May 1785, his successor de Machy was not even appointed until 1 April 1786.<sup>56</sup> The same relaxed situation existed with regard to the teaching of anatomy, the fief of the Süe family, who simply allowed artists to attend their courses for medical students, a practice even the Academy realized was "useless." In 1764, the Academy was embarrassed when the Academy of St Luke offered a free anatomy course, as they had not offered such a course in fifteen years. As a modest improvement the Academy instead supplied its students with a wax model of the body to study, paid for by the profits of the Salon catalog.<sup>57</sup> When drawing up the 1777 Statutes, some had proposed that the Academy appoint deputies to the Professors of Perspective and Anatomy only to realize that "the Academy does not ordinarily have any member suitable to fill these two places," and the idea was quietly dropped.<sup>58</sup> The students took matters into their own hands in August 1790, by substituting study of the *écorché*, the flayed figure, for that of the Antique figure as a means of improving their anatomical skills.<sup>59</sup> Again, the students sought a different artistic direction from that offered by the Neo-Classical Academy. Their revolt induced all subsequent reform proposals to propose better teaching of anatomy and perspective and foreshadowed Géricault's later figure studies and the wealth of nineteenth-century publications on anatomy and perspective.<sup>60</sup> Labille-Guiard may well have lent her support to these claims for, as one contemporary critic put it, "she knew that painters ordinarily neglected those parts of sciences like anatomy and perspective which put them off because of their abstraction and dryness; she acquired them to a degree that few artists could claim to equal."<sup>61</sup> Given that she had as many as ten students in 1781, Labille-Guiard's example may have inspired the students to demand such reforms.<sup>62</sup> The Academy's students were clearly as aware of the artistic as the political failings of their teachers. Their emphasis on muscular anatomy and the drawing of the female nude indicates that masculine Neo-Classicism was not, as is so often assumed, automatically seen as a revolutionary mode of representation. Rather it was the ultimate victor in a five year struggle over the definition of art in an age of equality.

For those who remained in the Academy, the ongoing debate over the rewriting of its statutes centered around pedagogical as well as procedural concerns. In June 1790 this debate became acrimonious in the extreme, after the Academicians finally won the right to speak and vote in the ordinary meetings of the Academy. Miger soon made it clear that this concession was not enough.<sup>63</sup> The meetings became more frequent until they were occurring three times a week in September, with Labille-Guiard "speaking a great deal."<sup>64</sup> By now it had become clear to the Officers of the Academy that their position was untenable, having sought in vain to restore the voting by class that had predominated in the Estates-General. On 23 September 1790, Labille-Guiard "made a very well reasoned speech on the admission of women artists to the Academy and proved that an indeterminate number was the only one possible. . . . Mme Guyard's motion was carried by majority vote."<sup>65</sup> For the

Officers, this was the final straw: “we do not find it acceptable that *women* have become mixed up in work that is foreign to them, as it is only a question of redrafting the statutes, which has nothing at all to do with them, since they are not subject to them, having never taken the oath to obey them.” Indeed, the Officers’ proposed statutes offered women only an associate membership, with the right to exhibit in the Salon but not to participate in the Academy’s meetings. Significantly, after months of debate, the unrestricted admission of women artists caused the Academy to split.

### EMULATION VERSUS EQUALITY

Now that the Officers had withdrawn, the remaining Academicians believed that they constituted the Academy and wrote to the Assemblée Nationale, notifying them of the change.<sup>66</sup> By the end of September 1790, three bodies existed, all claiming the right to be the national body for the arts: the radicals; and the Officers outside the Academy; and the majority within. The Officers claimed in an address to the Assemblée Nationale that “we have only to propose reforms according to present circumstance and to temper a certain rigidity, which derives from an excessive love of order, discipline and emulation.” This lofty reply marked the beginnings of a conservative definition of equality in the arts that was to center on the traditional notion of emulation. That is to say, although every artist was to enjoy equality of opportunity, talent and experience necessarily separated individuals who aspired to improve themselves by emulating their peers. Renou, the secretary of the Academy, offered this redefinition of artistic equality as emulation to counter the politicized notion of equality being circulated by the reformers. Renou argued that women academicians presented further danger to the processes of emulation: “One knows how heavily women weigh in the balance of judgment and how even judges with the most integrity risk being seduced by them.”<sup>67</sup> His proposal was signed by 24 officers joined by 14 Academicians who included Vien’s wife and Madame Vallayer-Coster. While this monarchist proposal had no practical effect in 1790, its ideological propositions would form the basis of the nineteenth-century Ecole des Beaux-Arts.

On the other side of the intellectual and political divide, the radicals continued to aim for the abolition of the Academy. Their proposal sought the creation of a Société des Beaux-Arts libre et universelle, motivated by the principles of “equality and liberty.” Responding to the reformers’ initiatives concerning the role of genre, architects were to be admitted to the new Society, but there was little of substance in the Memoir sent to the Assemblée Nationale in June 1790. The twin centers of the new art world were to be an annual open Salon and the new Museum which would instruct young artists.<sup>68</sup> Only fifteen signatures were attached, headed by that of David, and the legislature buried the report by referring it to the Comité de la Constitution. On 12 August 1790 the first call for the abolition of the Academy was made in the National Assembly by the radical Jean-Denis Lanjuinais, following Marat’s dismissal of them as the home of “the modern charlatans.”<sup>69</sup> However, there was little support in the chamber for such a proposal and instead the abbé Grégoire successfully proposed that the Academies be given one month to draft new statutes.<sup>70</sup>

The ball was thus very much in the reformers' court, and they attempted to seize the opportunity. On 25 September, the Officers' authority was ended once and for all when the reformers insisted on placing the letter from the Assembly regarding the reform of the statutes into the Academy's minutes over the objections of Vien and his secretary Renou.<sup>71</sup> The rump of the Academy—the majority of Academicians, a few officers, and about half the *agrées*—now constituted a new body, known at first as the Commune des Arts.<sup>72</sup> In order to conclude their proposed reforms as quickly as possible, the new body met daily throughout October and November.<sup>73</sup> In early November, the projected institution was named The Central Academy of Painting, Sculpture, Engraving and Architecture, and it was under this name that its statutes were published. Miger promised in the opening remarks that “the grand principles which are the basis of the fortunate constitution in which the future happiness and power of the French people are entrusted, are the fundamental points around which the academy has arranged its new organization. Thus, equality, the inviolability of rights, individual liberty, the permanence of places, and elections by ballot, have furnished the subject of different articles of our plan.”<sup>74</sup> However, the reformers had a distinctly limited notion of equality. At this time, the National Assembly was dominated by the so-called Triumvirate of Barnave, de Lameth, and Duport, who had successfully opposed Mirabeau's call for a royal veto of legislation and were firmly behind the ideals of 1789. Now, in the words of Adrien Duport, it was time “to restrain equality, reduce liberty, and stabilize opinions.”<sup>75</sup> This belief in a limited liberty was given its clearest expression in Barnave's passionate support for the white colonists in Haiti against the revolution of Africans and “mulattos.”<sup>76</sup>

The Central Academy offered a model of restrained equality. As promised during the earlier disputes, the key areas of reform were in teaching, genre, gender, and the apparatus of the Academy. The first principle of the new Academy was teaching. The demands of the pupils over the past two years were clearly reflected in the new arrangements.<sup>77</sup> A school for the study of the antique was to be open every day for three hours. Admission would be based on work submitted to the professor of the month. Having demonstrated their capacity in this area, students then proceeded to drawing after the nude, available for two hours daily. Seats in these classes were to be determined by three-monthly competitions. The formerly neglected areas of anatomy, perspective, and history were now given a much higher priority. Anatomy classes were to be held daily, using live models as well as figures, while perspective was to be taught three times a week. Classes were divided into elementary geometry, architecture and perspective. In the second half of the academic year these classes were replaced by instruction in history, studying relevant texts, costumes, and architectural styles. Each of the new subjects had annual prizes to encourage the students' participation. Furthermore, tuition was now to be offered in engraving and genre painting, that is to say, landscape, portraits, marines, and the catch-all area of *peinture familière*. Prizes and pensions at the Ecole de Rome were similarly now to be created for students in these genre areas. The professors were even to submit their course plans in advance so that an annual timetable could be devised.

The procedural rules of the Academy were tightened in the light of past experience, and the officers were now made accountable to the membership. For example, it was stipulated that any pupil entering a competition who had received help from another artist was to be excluded in order to prevent a repetition of the upheavals of the 1780s. All prizes were to be voted on by the entire membership, as were admissions to the Academy. Similarly, the director was to make no decision without consulting the sections. There were two sections, one for architects and one for all others, which were enjoined to meet monthly, with a variety of complicated provisions designed to prevent the reemergence of a powerful director like Pierre. For established artists a biennial open Salon was to be supplemented with the weekly opening of the Academy for the display of new work. A Museum, based on the Royal Academy's collections and open to artists and the public alike, was to be established. Women artists felt the limits of the reformers' notion of equality. No restrictions were placed on the number of women members, but it was stipulated that they could hold neither teaching nor administrative posts. The post of *conseiller* which Labille-Guiard had opened to women was abolished. Women students were still not permitted to draw from the male figure, except for heads, hands, and feet. Equality offered women artists the chance to belong to the Academy but to draw about one-sixth of the male body, with no hope of advancement within the institution. Nonetheless, the officers of the Royal Academy continued to hold Labille-Guiard responsible for the reform movement. In November 1791, Renou complained of her that: "She has sown among us the most dangerous division. Two cocks live together in peace, along comes a chicken, *voilà* war begins. . . . It is said that Talent has no sex but those who possess it have one, and when it is feminine, it must be kept away from the masculine because of its inevitable influence."<sup>78</sup> In the National Assembly, a different assessment of her merits was current. Both she and Vincent were appointed as instructors to the newly established Institute for the Deaf,<sup>79</sup> while Talleyrand praised her ideas as a model for the association of art and industry.<sup>80</sup>

Despite the reformers' success, a stalemate now existed among the varied groups; its outcome would be determined, in large measure, by the political power wielded by each group. In November 1790, the radical group redesignated itself the Commune des Arts, borrowing the reformers' discarded title, no doubt realizing that it had a useful political connotation with the Commune de Paris. Ironically the Commune attacked the reformed Academy for failing to promote emulation: "If there is no more emulation, if there are no more ranks, one must close the doors of the Academy. . . . Emulation is like a fire, it has an invincible tendency to grow, but if it has no further goal to attain, it weakens and dies at once." Equality was now under attack by emulation from left and right.

In the Spring of 1791, all factions sought to convince the Assemblée Nationale of their case. The reformers' statutes were passed by the Assembly on 5 March 1791;<sup>81</sup> the Assembly largely agreed with Creuzé de Latouche that "principles of tyranny and servitude" held sway in the Royal Academies in general and the Academy of Painting in particular.<sup>82</sup> The Commune des Arts retaliated on 19 April 1791 by dismissing the statutes of the Central Academy as "risible charlatanism" and their new teaching agenda as "mere nothing, even harmful to the arts." As for the Royal

Academy, it was reviled as “the Order of Academic Nobility,” which “far from producing emulation, destroys it.” The Commune des Arts was to be “a great family, reuniting all artists without exception and without any distinction of rank or person.” By that, they meant male artists, finding that

the study [of art] is contrary to those morals which are appropriate [to women] and which are their greatest attraction.

It is for the legislators to decide, in their profound wisdom, all the ways in which it would be impolitic and dangerous for the recompenses and encouragements assigned to the arts by the public purse to excite women to prefer careers in the arts to their true vocation, the respectable and holy functions of wife, mother and mistress of the house, in short to all the virtues which will ever assure the respect and highest consideration for them which distinguish free peoples.<sup>83</sup>

In this regard, the Commune des Arts was even more conservative than the Royal Academy who had simply proposed returning to the 1783 limit of four women members. By turning the issue into one of national gender politics, the Commune ensured their ultimate success in 1793, aligning themselves with the Jacobin tendency that was to revoke the advances made by women in the first three years of the revolution.<sup>84</sup>

However, despite these apparent divides, all the various groups agreed that art should represent uplifting moral subjects, and artists must therefore be, in the phrase of the Central Academy “of good morals and recognized probity.” The Academy had long stipulated that artists must behave with due decorum and had used this rule against Abraham Bosse. All the newly proposed statutes contained sections dealing with morality. Each candidate for the Central Academy was to offer three referees as to his or her moral character, and an examiner would investigate the moral rectitude of the candidate and the work. This structure was maintained and expanded after the abolition of the Academy by the Société populaire et républicaine des Arts, who demanded four referees and an examination by eight members. In addition, all candidates had to accept the Constitution, be a member of the National Guard, and be making civic contributions.<sup>85</sup> In short, artists and administrators agreed that art and artists must be virtuous. Their disagreements concerned the nature and gender of virtue, and how best to inculcate it in students.

### THE SALON OF 1791

At this moment, attention turned away from the politics of art institutions to those of art exhibitions. Both radicals and reformers had made an open salon part of their platform, and it was now time for the 1791 Salon to be announced. On 22 March 1791, in a submission to the Assemblée Nationale, a group entitled the Société des Arts led by Jean-François Garneray, a pupil of David's, and Ollivier demanded an open Salon. Three weeks later, the dissident *agrégé* Robin added his voice to the call, as did a different Société des Artistes under the engraver Nicolas Colibert and Gerbet.<sup>86</sup> By June 17, when the Commune des Arts made a similar petition to the Commune de Paris, the movement for an open Salon was gaining irresistible momen-

tum.<sup>87</sup> On 9 August, a formal motion was put to the Assemblée Nationale; it was referred to committee and then adopted following Barère's address on 21 August.<sup>88</sup> The origin of this request is not entirely clear, some sources attribute it to the Commune des Arts and others simply to a "deputation of Parisian artists," as the *Moniteur* put it.<sup>89</sup> David, who has usually taken the credit, sent a separate letter of support for the proposal, seeming to indicate that he had now split away from the Commune des Arts, and indeed his signature no longer appeared on their literature from this time.<sup>90</sup>

Whoever was responsible, the 1791 Salon was the first sight of the new art world for the great majority of the French public. The Salon of 1791 was the first experiment in art after the monarchy. It constituted the artistic equivalent of what Walter Benjamin described as the French Revolution's "leap into the open air of history." Just as the 1789 Salon opened on the eve of the Declaration of the Universal Rights of Man, that of 1791 preceded the creation of the Assemblée Legislative by less than a week. For the first time, art was on display in France without the all-powerful referent of the monarchy to give it meaning. These comforting certainties were now gone, forcing artists, spectators and Salon critics alike to make new choices and new decisions. No consensus can be found or should be sought in the reviews that were produced. The novelty of the experience was precisely the sense of uncertainty the Salon produced. For many, this shift proved the worth of the revolutionary changes in itself: "Never has the public exhibition of works of painting, sculpture, engraving etc. offered a more brilliant spectacle than this year." While one might expect such a partisan of reform to praise the work of David or Vincent, the critic hailed instead Vien, director of the Royal Academy, "always faithful to the antique style and who perhaps can be regarded with reason as the one who has restored taste among us."<sup>91</sup> Johann-Georg Wille, one of the few Officers to support the Central Academy, an enthusiastic member of his Section and elector of the Jacobin Pétion de Villeneuve as Mayor of Paris, was realistic about the quality of art on display but enthusiastic about the democratic moment:

[The works] are more considerable in number than for their excellence on the whole; but this mélange of the good and the mediocre amused me greatly. . . . I saw there the sublime, the beautiful and good, the mediocre, the bad and the execrable. In the end, the crowd was prodigious, and each one put forth their sentiments. You could hear the reasoning of real connoisseurs, of semi-connoisseurs, of biting wits, of inexorable critics, of the envious, the ignorant and the stupid.<sup>92</sup>

On the other hand, the abbé de Fontenay, a harsh critic of the Officers, found "no general sense of taste" at the Salon and remarked instead on "the mix in which one could find the songs of the streets, *ça ira ça ira*, or others with the cantatas of Rousseau, or the light poetry of Voltaire."<sup>93</sup>

It was certainly more of a mixture than France had seen before; 255 artists exhibited, compared to the 88 on display in 1789, including twenty women, up from three in 1789.<sup>94</sup> The number of works on display increased from 328 to 744 in painting and sculpture alone, while women showed over sixty works, compared to

sixteen previously shown. The increase was noticeable in all genres,<sup>95</sup> not just history and indeed portraits showed the most noticeable rise of all from 95 to 303: France had new faces to learn.<sup>96</sup> In this regard, we should be careful not to allow the prejudices of the Academy to color our historical viewpoint, for just as the portrait of the King had been central to the ancien régime, so too were the portraits of legislators and other revolutionaries to the new regime. Much of the Salon criticism devoted itself to portraiture, and if there were some who felt that “talent itself has lost its aristocracy,”<sup>97</sup> others reveled in the new opportunities.

Nowhere is this tension clearer than in the reviews devoted to Labille-Guiard and her students. She herself exhibited no fewer than fourteen portraits of what one critic disparagingly called “the enragés of the Assembly.”<sup>98</sup> In fact, for the most part her subjects were aristocratic patriots like Alexandre de Beauharnais, or the Triumvirate leaders Adrien Duport and Alexandre de Lameth, but there was also a remarkable portrait of Maximilien Robespierre (now lost; known through a copy, Priv. Coll.). Far from the stern image of the Incorruptible to which we have become accustomed, Robespierre appears here as an engaging and good humored young man, full of the energy of the times. Such shocks of recognition are part of the potential power of the portrait. Although some critics felt she had succeeded “gloriously,”<sup>99</sup> others were brusquely critical. One widely distributed pamphlet noted that: “one must always mistrust the talents of women, for it is rare, very rare that one does not recognize there the touch of a man. Mme Guyard has many other portraits in bust painted either in oil or in pastel. . . . M. Vincent also works very well in pastels, it is said.”<sup>100</sup> The allegation that Labille-Guiard’s work was in fact completed by her lover—soon, thanks to the divorce law, husband—Vincent was not new.<sup>101</sup> But it took on a new importance, given the role played by both artists in creating the Central Academy. The critic’s hostility to these reforms emerged clearly in his discussion of Labille-Guiard’s friend and pupil, Mlle le Roux de la Ville, Sr, better known later as Mme Benoist.<sup>102</sup> Whereas the other women artists in the Salon had ranged across the genres from portrait to landscape and genre, Laville (as she was known during the Revolution) was the only woman to attempt History painting with three paintings, *The Farewell of Psyche to her Family*, *Scene Taken from Clarissa Harlowe*, and *Innocence Between Love and Virtue*. The crossing of this genre/gender divide provoked a remarkable response:

My friend, one thing which has always been inconceivable to me is the extreme shamelessness of mothers and fathers who give up their daughters to the study of the art of painting, young girls susceptible to all impressions, exposed to all seductions, thrown among and confused with a mass of boys, drawing entirely naked men amongst them and exposed to all their attitudes; the models sometimes display in the most apparent manner the impression that the young girls have on them, and I have seen them forced to leave their pose and stand to one side in order to let their nature regain its state of calm . . . a forty year old man would be less brazen than these women; he would blush if he entered one of these societies: for my own part, I’m quite clear that I would never consent to become the husband of a woman who had received such an education.<sup>103</sup>

The attack on Laville was thus also an attack on Labille-Guiard's promotion of women in the Academy, leading to the publication of another pamphlet in her defense.<sup>104</sup> While the critic's hostility is only too apparent, one cannot tell from this passage whether he considered himself a radical or a loyalist of the ancien régime for both were similarly hostile to women's presence in art education. He must however take the prize for the most graphic description of the male fantasy circulating around women drawing the male body that was to lie behind so much obfuscation in the nineteenth century. In these pamphlets hawked at the Salon door, art was no longer to be controlled by institutions but was optimistically presented as an unmediated exchange between spectator and artwork.<sup>105</sup>

The Salon of 1791 was thus a measure both of how much had changed and how much had not. One incident may serve as a microcosm of the difficulties of artistic revolution. During the Salon, the Assemblée Constituante approached both David and Labille-Guiard for new portraits of the King to reflect the changed constitutional situation, a subject on which David was still working in 1792.<sup>106</sup> A storm of comment broke out in the Parisian press, reflecting the new debates in the arts. For some writers, the commission was proof that the vitality of the French school extended beyond one supremely gifted artist, David, to Labille-Guiard and Vincent. Others saw Labille-Guiard's commission as the result of "cabal and intrigue," and radicals wondered whether David would "prostitute" his brush with the work. While some commentators discussed the appropriate manner in which the king might be shown explaining the constitution to his son, the radical *Révolutions de Paris* sarcastically suggested that Louis XVI be depicted with one hand pointing to Varennes and the other indicating the civil list. For the poet André Chenier, writing in the *Journal de Paris*, the commission was evidence of the changes in artistic sensibility: "I would dare to say to the Observer [another critic for the same paper] that this distinction, so long assumed, between the painters of portraits and the painters of History is surely the most futile thing in the world and the most foreign to the spirit and the perfection of art. . . . Because truth, simplicity, and naiveté are the same for a *portrait* painter as for a *History* painter. They are the essence of all pictures featuring the figure."<sup>107</sup> The double commission reflected the then balanced state of the arts between the radical Commune des Arts and the Central Academy, between an exclusive focus on male History painting and a wider search for equality in the arts.

The flow of political events changed that balance decisively in favor of the radicals in general and David in particular; David's election to the Convention on 17 September 1792 ensured that he was on hand to receive commissions from the new legislature. When the Academy was finally abolished on 8 August 1793, it was David and the original defender of the Academy in 1791, the abbé Grégoire, who successfully proposed the motion while reassuring deputies not to fear that "by suppressing them [the Academies] emulation will disappear among us."<sup>108</sup> The event was so expected that Wille did not even note it in his diary. Although the Commune des Arts took over the Academy's functions, by the autumn of 1793 it in turn had been suppressed in favor of the Société Populaire et Républicaine des Arts.<sup>109</sup> Initially cre-

ated in June 1793, this body called on the Convention to recognize its creation of “a noble emulation [which] electrifies genius and inspires it to masterpieces.”<sup>110</sup> Thus, although the Academy had been abolished, its policies of excluding women, inspiring emulation, and prioritizing history painting survived.<sup>111</sup>

### EMULATION AND ITS DISCONTENTS

When reading a speech like that of Gabriel Bousquier to the Convention in June 1794, it is hard not to think of David’s *Oath of the Horatii* or *Brutus*: “Effeminate works by the likes [of Boucher, Vanloo and Pierre] are incapable of inspiring the virile and energetic style that must represent the revolutionary exploits of the defenders of equality.”<sup>112</sup> From our viewpoint of hindsight, the way seems clear to conclude that: “The school of David from the time of the Revolution had wedded itself to the presupposition that a liberated society could be figured only in a male body of perfect soundness and beauty.”<sup>113</sup> While that might be narrowly true of David, the wider picture was far more complex. Artists, critics, students, and spectators claimed other definitions of equality and liberty that included women and artists in genres other than History painting. David and his former rivals in the Academy found complete agreement in opposing this challenge. No equality in art was or is possible without equality of opportunity at the level of pedagogy and exhibition, as Linda Nochlin and the Guerilla Girls have variously reminded us. By opening the Salon and the Academy, and reforming its school, a limited step towards these goals was taken in 1791 that would not be taken again until the late nineteenth century. Emulation cannot be equated to revolutionary art practice for it was central to the artistic politics of the late ancien régime that were later revived by Jacobins and Directory alike. Representing equality was a direct challenge to the hierarchical notion of emulation—one of the many sparks that flew from the forge of the Declaration of the Rights of Man only to be hastily extinguished.

Indeed, the three-way split in the arts that existed in 1791 defined the battleground of artistic politics for the next century. For Charles Blanc, director of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in 1866, the enemy was still the “critics who are in love with equality in art,”<sup>114</sup> while the radical Henry Harvard wrote in 1879 that as “a republican, I love antiquity for its philosophy, its literature, and its arts. I love it because of its simplicity, its purity, its logic, which are precisely the objectives to which the contemporary spirit is developing.”<sup>115</sup> It is no coincidence that in the seventy-five years during which the question of artistic and political representation seemed to overlap so closely, French painting repeatedly transformed itself.<sup>116</sup> Although it is true that masculine Neo-Classicism provided the style for many “masterpieces” of the Western canon and that the representation of equality largely failed, it was the latter that provided the impetus for the renewal of artistic practice. Arguably, equality still evades representation, providing the invisible counterpoint to modernism’s continually new disposition of the visual field.<sup>117</sup> Revolution, like modernism, is a plural noun and has never moved in a straight line but always in a wave.

## NOTES

1. Amid a welter of recent studies, see Thomas E. Crow, *Emulation: Making Artists for Revolutionary France* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1995); Dorothy Johnson, *Jacques-Louis David: Art in Metamorphosis* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1993), and essays by Crow, Whitney Davis, and Wolfgang Kemp in Norman Bryson et al., *Visual Culture: Images and Interpretations* (Hanover: Wesleyan Univ. Press, 1994).
2. See the excellent essays by Abigail Solomon-Godeau, "Male Trouble: A Crisis in Representation," *Art History* 16 (1993): 286–312 and Carol Ockman, "Profiling Homoeroticism: Ingres' *Achilles Receiving the Ambassadors of Agamemnon*," *The Art Bulletin* 75 (1993): 259–74.
3. See Keith Michael Baker, "Representation," in *The French Revolution and the Creation of Modern Political Culture*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Pergamon, 1988).
4. See Tamar Garb, *Sisters of the Brush: Women's Artistic Culture in late nineteenth-century Paris* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1994) and Albert Boime, *The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Phaidon, 1971).
5. For details on the early Academy, see my Ph.D. dissertation, "Pictorial Sign and Social Order: *L'Académie Royale de Peinture et Sculpture, 1635–1752*," (Warwick Univ., 1990).
6. See Thomas E. Crow, *Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1985), chapters 3 and 4.
7. See J. J. Guiffrey, *Livrets des Expositions de l'Académie de Saint-Luc* (Paris, 1876), vi–viii.
8. *Ibid.*, 14–16. Other women artists included, by year of exhibition: (1752) Godefroy, (1753) Mme Vernezobre, and (1764) Mlle Ozanne, Mlle Navarre.
9. *Ibid.*, 160 and 165.
10. Anon., *Demandes des Anciens Membres et Directeurs de l'Académie de St Luc, et de la Communauté des Maîtres Peintres-Doreurs, et Sculpteurs-Marbriers de la Ville et Fauxbourgs de Paris, présentées aux Etats-Généraux* (Paris, 1789), 4.
11. Address of Barère du Vieuzac to the Assemblée Constituante, 21 August 1791, rpr. in S. Lacroix (ed.), *Actes de la Commune de Paris pendant la Révolution*, Série II, tome IV (Paris, 1905), 636.
12. De La Blancherie, *Essai d'un Tableau Historique des Peintres de l'Ecole Française depuis Jean Cousin, en 1500, jusqu'en 1783* (Paris, 1783), iii. The 195 exhibits included the work of five women artists led by Catherine Luzurier (d. 1781), a pupil of François-Hubert Drouais's who "would have without doubt reached the highest degree of perfection had she not been taken from us in the flower of her youth," *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres et des Arts* (August 1783). Luzurier painted a portrait of the young Jean-Germain Drouais (Paris: Musée du Louvre, 1777), reproduced in Crow, *Emulation*, 22.
13. Archives Nationales (hereinafter A.N.), O1 1925 B (2). These manuscript archives are the primary source for the history of the Academy. For a detailed account, see Mary Sheriff, *The Exceptional Woman: Elisabeth Vigée-Lebrun and the Cultural Politics of Art* (Chicago: Chicago Univ. Press, 1996), 75–90.
14. M. D[argenville], *Description sommaire Des ouvrages De Peinture, Sculpture et Gravure, exposés dans les salles de l'Académie Royale* (Paris, 1781), xx.
15. A.N. O1 1925 B (2).
16. Anatole de Montaiglon, *Procès-Verbaux de l'Académie Royale de Peinture et Sculpture 1648–1793* [hereinafter PV] (Paris: Charvaray Frères, 1889), tome IX (1780–1788), 262. The *Procès-Verbaux* is the most often cited source for Academic history, but it is far from complete as a record: like all minutes, it tells the story the secretary wished to have preserved.
17. *Journal de Paris* (1785), excerpted in MS, Collection Deloynes, Cabinet des Estampes, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (hereinafter CD), tome XIV, no. 361.
18. Pierre to d'Angiviller, 3 May, 1787.
19. "This title of *agrégé* was initially introduced into the Academy to relieve the persecution of the

- guilds. . . . As Your Majesty has restored liberty to the arts of painting and sculpture, there is no longer any necessity for this old concession," A.N. O1 1925 B (2).
20. Ibid., "Declaration fait par MM. les Agréés au Comité du 17 décembre, 1788."
  21. Ibid., "Resultat de l'injonction fait aux agréés de l'Académie Royale de Peinture et Sculpture," 23 December 1788.
  22. Philippe Bordès, *Le Serment de Jeu de Paume de Jacques-Louis David: le peintre, son milieu et son temps* (Paris: Editions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 1983), 29.
  23. D. L. Dowd, *Pageant Master of the Republic: Jacques-Louis David and the French Revolution* (Freeport NY: Books for Libraries, 1969), 29.
  24. PV, tome X (1789–93), 26 Sep. 1789, 28.
  25. PV, X, 31 Oct. 1789, 32.
  26. Anon., *La Semaine Mémorable: Discours Prononcé après un Te Deum en musique, dans un Assemblé d'Artistes de tous les genres sous le non de Société d'Apollon* (Paris: de Prault, 1789), 15.
  27. See Mona Ozouf, *L'Homme Régénéré* (Paris: Gallimard, 1988).
  28. Emile Bellier de la Chavignerie, *Biographie et Catalogue de l'oeuvre de graveur Miger* (Paris: J-B Dumoulin, 1856), 9–27.
  29. Simon-Charles Miger, *Lettre à M. Vien*, CD, tome 53, 1446. Reprinted in Bellier de la Chavignerie, *Miger*, 52–63.
  30. Pierre had been widely criticized in pamphlets, see Crow, *Painters*, 229–30.
  31. A.N. O1 1925 B (1).
  32. A.N. O1 1925 B (2).
  33. See Sherrif, *The Exceptional Woman*.
  34. See Nicholas Mirzoeff, *Silent Poetry: Deafness, Sign and Visual Culture in Modern France* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1995), 43–46.
  35. A.N. O1 1925 B (2), letter concerning meeting of 10 December 1778.
  36. See Crow, *Emulation*, 24–25.
  37. *Discours de M. Miger, lu dans l'Académie 28 Novembre 1789, pour servir de supplément de son lettre*, CD, tome 53, 1447.
  38. Vien to M. le Comte de Ste Priest, 1 December 1789, A.N. O1 1925 B (2).
  39. Anon. to Academicians, 4 December 1789, *ibid.*
  40. Petition dated 5 December 1789, CD, tome 53, 1448. Signatories included David, Pasquier, Regnault, and Miger. Vien's response A.N. O1 1925 B (2), 5 December 1789.
  41. PV, tome X, 39.
  42. J-B Restout, "Discours prononcé à l'Académie Royale de Peinture et Sculpture, le 17 decembre, 1789," CD, tome 53, no. 1450, n.p. The Ecole Normale des Beaux-Arts has minutes of the Assemblies, MS 320.
  43. CD, tome 53, Letter to Vien 14 Jan. 1790, no 1452; *ibid.*, no 1454, "Registre de l'assemblée particulière," signed David, [Le]Barbier, Regnault, Jollain, Guérin, Vestier, Girault, Dumont, de Wailly, Callet, l'Empereur, Foucou, Monot, Pasquier, Huet, Restout, Mor[e]jau, Barthelemy, Klauber, and Miger.
  44. Vien to d'Angiviller, Feb. [1?] 1790, A.N. O1 1925b (2). D'Angiviller's influence was short-lived. By November 1790 he was facing charges of corruption that drove him into penniless exile.
  45. PV, tome X, 46.
  46. J-G Wille, *Mémoires et Journal de J-G Wille, Graveur du Roi*, ed. Georges Duplessis (Paris: Jules Renouard, 1857), 2:237.

47. CD, tome 53, nos 1457 and 1458, letters to *Chronique de Paris*, 6 Feb. 1790 and 12 Feb. 1790.
48. PV, tome X, 47–49.
49. Renou, *Esprits des Statuts et Réglemens* (22 Sep, 1790), CD, tome 53, no. 1471, 15.
50. PV, tome X, 51–52.
51. CD, tome 53, no. 1464, David et al. “Mémoire sur l’Académie Royale de Peinture et Sculpture,” 6 March 1790, 1–2.
52. PV, tome X, 54.
53. Wille, *Mémoires*, 2:237.
54. PV, tome X, 23.
55. PV, tome X, 57.
56. PV, IX, 281.
57. Chardin to Marigny, 1 May 1764, A.N. O1 1925 B (1). On the wax model, see Sheriff, *The Exceptional Woman*, 13–33.
58. MS [Sep. 1777], A.N. O1 1925 b (2).
59. PV, tome X, 71.
60. See Anthea Callen, *The Spectacular Body* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1995).
61. Quoted by Anne-Marie Passez, *Adélaïde Labille-Guiard* (Paris: Arts et métiers graphiques, 1973), 15.
62. *Ibid.*, 20.
63. CD, tome 53, no. 1460, “Réflexion de M. Miger au comité des commissaires.”
64. *Ibid.*, 264.
65. *Ibid.*, 267.
66. PV, tome X, 79.
67. Renou, “Esprit des Statuts et Réglemens de l’Académie Royale de Peinture et Sculpture pour servir au réponse aux Détracteurs de son régime,” (22 Sept. 1790), CD, tome 53, no. 1471, 2, 4 and 7.
68. On the long history of the museum in France, see Andrew McClellan, *Inventing the Louvre: Art, Politics, and the Origins of the Modern Museum in Eighteenth Century Paris* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1994), 91–123.
69. Jean-Paul Marat, *Les Charlatans Modernes, ou Lettres sur le Charlatanisme Académique* (Paris, 1791).
70. Lacroix, *Actes de la Commune*, 610–12.
71. PV, tome X, 76.
72. “Assemblée Générale des la Commune des Arts. Resultat des arrêtés de 29 septembre, 1790,” CD, tome 53, no. 1474.
73. Wille, *Mémoires*, 2:269–82.
74. [Miger], *Adresse et projet de statuts et reglemens pour l’Académie Centrale de peinture, sculpture, gravure et architecture* (Paris: Valade, 1790), 2. Also preserved in CD, tome 53, no. 1488. Authorship of the opening remarks ascribed by Wille, *Mémoires*, 2:282.
75. François Furet and Mona Ozouf (eds), *Dictionnaire critique de la Révolution française* (Paris: Flammarion, 1988), 456–57.
76. See C. L. R. James, *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L’Ouverture and the San Domingo revolution*, 2d ed. (London: Allison and Busby, 1980), 79–81.

77. A pamphlet entitled “Les Elèves au Salon, ou l’Amphigouri” purports to be written by the students; it certainly follows their arguments, CD, tome XVI, no. 416. See Bordès, *Le ‘Serment de Jeu de Paume,’* p. 98 n. 75.

78. Renou to Huet de Frobeville, Nov. 1791, AN O1 1925B (2). See also the letter of an “Agrégé” to the same recipient, using exactly the same language, CD, tome 53, no. 1527.

79. Mirzoeff, *Silent Poetry*, 59.

80. Passez, *Labille-Guiard* 35.

81. Renou protested furiously that the Central Academy had forgotten the King and would destroy emulation, *Précis Motivé par les Officiers de l’Académie Royale de Peinture et Sculpture, et plusieurs Académiciennes qui s’y sont joints, pour servir de Réfutation à un projet de Statuts d’Académie Centrale, par quelques Académiciens* (Paris, 1791).

82. Lacroix, *Actes de la Commune*, 612.

83. Restout, “Adresse, mémoire et observations présentés à l’Assemblée Nationale, le 19 avril 1791, par la Commune des Arts qui ont le dessin pour base,” CD, tome 53, no. 1487, rpr. in Lacroix, *Actes de la Commune*, 624–30.

84. See Joan Landes, *Women and the Public Sphere in the age of the French Revolution* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1988).

85. Athanase Detournelle, *Journal de la Société Populaire et Républicaine des Arts* (Paris, 1794), 6.

86. One might note that only Robin and Garneray actually exhibited in the Salon. Lacroix, *Actes de la Commune*, 627–30.

87. *Ibid.*, 598.

88. Philippe Bordès and Régis Michel (eds.), *Aux Armes et Aux Arts! Les Arts de la Révolution, 1789–1799* (Paris: Adam Biro, 1988), 139–41.

89. Lacroix, *Actes de la Commune*, 634.

90. *Ibid.*, 637.

91. *Petites Affiches de Paris*, MS, CD, tome XVII, no. 449.

92. Wille, *Mémoires*, 2:319 and 323.

93. Abbé de Fontenay. “Observations tirées du *Journal Generale de France*,” 21 Dec. 1791, CD, tome XVII, no. 450.

94. The women identified in the Salon *livret* were: Mlles Bouliard, Capet, Delorme, Ducreux, Duvivier, Le Roux de la Ville ainée and cadet, Le Roi, and Rousselet; Mmes Allain, Cadet, Dabos, Desfont, Duchâteau, Gault de Saint-Germain, Laperche, Lebrun, Guyard, Le Suire, and Surigny.

95. See Carol S. Eliel, “Genre Painting During the Revolution and the *Goût Hollondais*,” in Alan Wintermute (ed.), *1789: French Art During the Revolution* (New York: Colnaghi, 1989): 48–61.

96. *Aux Armes et Aux Arts!*, 141. The calculation of work by women is my own: the number cannot be exactly specified as several entries say, for example, “case of enamels.”

97. *Journal de Paris*, quoted in *Aux Armes et Aux Arts!*, 154.

98. Passez, *Labille-Guiard*, 35.

99. CD, tome XVII, no. 449.

100. *Lettres Analitiques [sic], Critiques et Philosophiques Sur les tableaux du Sallon* (Paris, 1791), 13.

101. For example, a pamphlet of 1785 claimed: “Notez que Vincent retouche cette dame-là,” quoted by Passez, *Labille-Guiard*, 25.

102. Leroux had been one of the students briefly attached to David’s studio in 1786, where she copied his *Belisarius*, Bordès, “Consolidating the Canon,” 109.

103. *Lettres Analytiques*, 63.

104. "Reclamation," CD, tome XVII, no. 451.

105. On witnessing as an esthetic practice, see my *Bodyscape: Art, Modernity and the Ideal Figure* (London: Routledge, 1995), 191–98. See also Susan Malan's remark that "at least until 1793–94 [theater] audiences continued to exert extraordinary control over the conditions of theatrical production and performance," in her "Resisting Representation: Theater and Democracy in Revolutionary France," *Representations* 52 (1995): 35.

106. *Passez, Labille-Guiard*, 37. See Johnson, *David*, 81–82 for his sketches towards the portrait.

107. CD, tome 53 nos., 1540–42. These debates are reprinted in Bordès, 'Le Serment de Jeu de Paume,' 167–71.

108. Abbé Grégoire, *Rapport et Projet de Décret, Présenté au nom du Comité de l'Instruction publique à la séance du 8 août [1793]* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1793). On the suppression of the Academy, see McClellan, *Inventing the Louvre*, 102 and PV, tome X, 224.

109. Detournelle, *Journal*, 1–4.

110. *Adresse à la Convention Nationale Par la Société des Arts, réunis de Peinture, Sculpture, Architecture, Gravure, séante au Louvre, salle des Arts*, 12 June 1793, 1. Of the 11 signatories, Dupré, Lebrun, Allais, Petit Coupret, and Lesueur were early members of the Société Populaire et Républicaine des Arts.

111. Erica Rand has argued that David's pictorial strategies after 1793 can similarly be compared to those of Boucher in her "Depoliticizing Women: Female Agency, the French Revolution and the Art of Boucher and David," *Genders* 7 (1990): 47–68.

112. Quoted and translated by McClellan, *Inventing the Louvre*, 103.

113. Crow, *Emulation*, 299.

114. Charles Blanc, "Salon of 1866," quoted and translated by Jane Mayo Roos, "Herbivores versus herbiphobes: landscape painting and the State," in John House (ed.) *Landscapes of France: Impressionism and its rivals* (London: Hayward Gallery, 1995), 41.

115. Quoted by John G. Hutton, *Neo-Impressionism and the Search for Solid Ground: Art, Science and Anarchism in Fin-de-Siècle France* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1994), 32 n.1.

116. See T. J. Clark, "Painting in the Year Two," *Representations* 47 (1994): 13–63.

117. For the relation of visible and invisible, see Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, trans. Alphonso Lingis (Evanston: Northwestern Univ. Press, 1968). The notion of the counterpoint to modernity is elaborated by Edward Said in his *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1993).