The "Demoiselles à Copier" in the Second Empire

PAUL DURO

The copy, when viewed as a form of art, is generally considered inauthentic, noncreative, unoriginal, and derivative. Thus, 19th-century critics, who equated copying with a lack of originality and ascribed the attribute of creativity exclusively to the male, honored the "natural" connection between women and copying. George Moore only echoed a universally held prejudice when he wrote: "In the higher arts [women's] achievements are slight indeed—best when confined to the arrangements of themes invented by men—amiable transpositions suitable to boudoirs and fans."¹

Copying was, however, not exclusive to women painters; indeed, all painters at some stage of their careers made copies. Women typically were copyists because their role in 19th-century art confined them to certain kinds of picture making. Since women in art were treated and categorized much the same as women in society, the result was the same confusion of cause and effect: women were copyists not, as believed in the 19th century, because they were congenitally incapable of original creation, but for solid economic and social reasons.

In a letter to the press in 1870, Ingres's student and biographer Amaury-Duval provided a contemporary view of picture making. Complaining that the overcrowding in his profession was lowering standards, he accused the government of being too ready to encourage mediocre painters to seek professional careers. He cited the making of copies where, he believed, the least successful artists relied on government charity in the form of copy commissions to survive. He noted at the same time that one saw little in the Louvre but foreigners and women copyists, the *demoiselles à copier*.²

The implication was clear: women, because of their dilettante status or mediocre ability, were ruining the potentially lucrative painting profession. His views were shared by critic Léon Legrance, who gave his remarks a familiar bias:

Are there not already women painters, indeed, aren't there already too many? Go to the Louvre on a study day: you will see nothing but petticoats perched on ladders, nothing but female hands ardently brushing immense canvases. . . . That some of these young women, whose parents are rich enough to pay for a teacher, push their studies as far as managing to copy after a fashion the originals in the Louvre, that's their

business. In the end, should a small number of the more gifted find in the profession of copyist a pot boiler, so be it, we won't complain if their talent serves only to reproduce the old masters. . . . This modest task is certainly suitable for women.³

The interpretations of Amaury-Duval and Legrance miss the mark. True, the Louvre at that time was full of copyists; there were waiting lists to copy the most popular pictures,⁴ and the administration instigated detailed regulations to govern the making of copies.⁵ The crowds of copyists were such that it was a common complaint that their materials impeded the circulation of visitors and blocked the view of the pictures on the walls—a scene detailed in Joseph Castiglione's painting *Le Salon Carré* (1861; Fig. 1). But to see in the presence of women in the galleries confirmation of a natural order is, of course, committing the error of attributing determining causes to circumstance. It was the need for a large number of copies that led to an increase in the number of copyists, not the existence of a large number of women painters. In fact, men always received more copy commissions; the ratio of men to women from 1859–68, for example, averaged three to one.⁶

Why then the perception of copying as an activity dominated by women? It has much to do with women's status in the 19th century, for their pictorial production cannot be understood independently of their sociopolitical position. Their circumscribed sphere of activity tended to direct a large majority of women artists toward the kind of work encompassed in copying. This conditioned the way they saw themselves as artists and had a direct bearing on their activity, since it should not be assumed that women were merely the passive recipients of a given professional situation. To a significant extent many women actively participated in the formation of a specialized pictorial practice—the making of copies—which, in the popular mind, became associated with the woman painter and confirmed widespread prejudice.

The distinction, it must be admitted, between those painters who as amateurs practiced painting as a social accomplishment and those who became professional copyists was mainly economic. Both were from the same class and learned to draw and paint—mostly in watercolor—to fulfill the requirements of a bourgeois education. Unlike the amateur, who tended to exercise

her skill as a drawing-room accomplishment, the professional woman copyist needed to earn money. Often single and the sole support of a widowed mother and younger siblings, or deserted, divorced, or widowed herself, she was part of the growing number of "surplus" women who needed to find work without compromising their social positions. Many of these women practiced as professional artists for only as long as economic necessity obliged them to and returned to amateur status if they married or inherited money. Indeed, the "lady amateur" was so ubiquitous in England and France in the 18th and 19th centuries that the serious woman artist was often dismissed as a dilettante, her work classified according to the expectations of her sex and not her pictorial production.⁷

When Mme. Morisot took her daughters Edma and Berthe to the painter Guichard to study, he discovered in them abilities beyond those considered acceptable in young girls of their social situation and warned: "my teaching will not endow them with minor drawing-room accomplishments; they will become painters." Although financially secure, they too became copyists, but only as part of their training.

Guichard instructed Mme. Morisot "to apply for permission for them to work in the Louvre, where I shall give them lessons before the masters."⁸ Berthe and Edma began copying in the gallery in the spring of 1858. They found themselves surrounded by a crowd of copyists—professionals, established artists, amateurs, and students. Copying was common to all forms of art training, and Delacroix advocated its importance as much as did Ingres.⁹ Berthe and Edma Morisot, thus, were not copying because they were female but because they were students. Even so, the constraints on female students were onerous, as Marie Bashkirtseff railed:

What I long for is the freedom of going about alone . . . do you imagine I get much good from what I see, chaperoned as I am, and when, in order to go to the Louvre, I must wait for my carriage, my lady companion, or my family?¹⁰

Marie Quivoron met her husband-to-be Félix Bracquemond while copying in the Louvre. She was chaperoned by her mother and her sister, but Félix obtained an introduction through his friend Montrosier. The couple worked together in the gallery for two years before they married.¹¹ The popular assumption that young women only frequented the galleries in the hope of trapping into marriage an unwary bourgeois out for an afternoon's innocent picture study infuriated the likes of Bashkirtseff.¹² She saw escape only in denying her sexuality:

Curse it all, it is this that makes me gnash my teeth to think I am a woman! I'll get myself a bourgeois dress and a wig, and make myself so ugly, that I shall be as free as a man. It is this sort of liberty that I need, and without it I can never hope to do anything of note.¹³

The woman painter had other, more serious impediments to contend with, however. Copying formed only part of standard art training; study from the nude model was equally important. But women were prevented from entering life classes until the end of the 19th century and, therefore, were effectively excluded

from many of the important competitions at the École des Beaux-Arts. This meant that the woman painter could not obtain the complete training available to the male, with the result that, even before her sex could prejudice judgments of her work, her professional development was seriously impeded.

Her artistic activity constrained within professional, social, and aesthetic limits, the woman painter turned to copying as one of the few ways in which she could work as an artist. The extent to which many women embraced copying then led to an identification of "woman painter" with "copyist," allowing popular prejudice to see copying not as a result of limitations imposed on a woman's artistic personality, but as the cause. These limitations facilitated the prejudicial categorization, consecrated in contemporary literature, of the woman artist as derivative, that is, by definition "minor." In Hawthorne's *The Marble Faun*, Hilda, living in Rome and surrounded by the art of the past, is seduced by the old masters. She abandons her "fanciful" ideas for great pictures "conceived in her feminine mind" and infuses her copies with "all the warmth and richness of a woman's sympathy." Warning to his theme (for Hilda is no mechanical copyist but, thanks to her feminine sympathy, the translator of the old masters), Hawthorne asks:

Would it have been worth Hilda's while to relinquish this office for the sake of giving the world a picture or two which it would call original; pretty fancies of snow and moonlight; the counterpart in picture of so many feminine achievements in literature!¹⁴

Likewise, in Duranty's short story "*l'Atelier*," Mlle. Lambert "drifts from one imitation to another." She was the daughter of a wholesale merchant who had lived comfortably until the death of her father obliged her to turn to advantage her bourgeois accomplishments—her drawing skills—to earn a living.¹⁵ The same scenario, almost caricaturesque except that it frequently reflected reality, was the abandoned wife whose "scoundrel of a husband . . . frittered away her fortune and left her in the lurch with two children . . . and now she has to live on her accomplishments."¹⁶

Although many patrons were private citizens, the Second Empire was remarkable above all for the extent of its patronage of artists.¹⁷ Since the 17th century, the state had commissioned copies of the monarch for distribution to court favorites. By the 19th century, with the abolition of a hereditary monarchy and the inauguration of a period of political unrest, each successive regime needed images of the head of state for distribution to law courts, town halls, royal residences, and ministries. Along with these commissions, which, during the 1860s probably exceeded 100 portraits under execution at any one time, were the equally important and numerous copies of religious paintings made for distribution to churches and religious institutions, the result of an agreement between church and state when the church supported Louis Napoléon Bonaparte in his successful bid to return France to an Empire. During the Second Empire (1851–70) both dynastic portraits and religious paintings were produced in unprecedented numbers.¹⁸ The government in this way

Fig. 1. Joseph Castiglione, *Le Salon Carré* (1861), oil on canvas. Musée du Louvre.

effectively created the profession of copyist; the copyist was not, as Amaury-Duval claimed, a recipient of government charity. Copyists did, however, become dependent on the state. Many came to believe that it was the government's obligation to act as patron to both the young and aging artist, to artists with financial or family problems, and above all, to women artists.

A few women gained recognition in the public arena and had private patrons, but, with the exception of Rosa Bonheur, who donned male attire so she could visit stockyards and horse fairs unmolested in search of subject matter, their sphere of activity was limited. When Quivoron (later Bracquemond) went to study with Ingres, she found women in his studio were expected to specialize in paintings "of flowers, of fruits, of still lifes, portraits and genre scenes." She objected to this limitation: "I wish to work at painting, not to paint flowers, but to express the feelings that art inspires in me." Even so, she accepted commissions to make copies in the Louvre for the administration, while after her marriage she painted mainly flowers and portraits of family and friends.¹⁹ Morisot, who met Manet while copying in the Louvre, likewise made her reputation with genre scenes.²⁰ Of course, both of these women worked within the impressionist circle and shared an artistic philosophy which placed emphasis not on subject but on the study of the effects of light. Important, too, in understanding their work is the fact

that both Bracquemond and Morisot, through spouse and brother-in-law, respectively, were intimately connected with an avant-garde circle. Most women painters were not so fortunate in their contacts, and the profession of flower painter or copyist was imposed, not chosen.

The government, which needed large numbers of reproductions, regarded women as equally as competent as men, since their sex did not preclude them from this kind of work. This enabled a certain number to achieve an unequivocally professional status. Many, of course, became copyists after a change in their personal situation obliged them to abandon the vagaries of a Salon career for a stable income. The cases of Juliette de Ribeiro and Zoé Laura de Chatillon typify the expectations and achievements of many professional woman painters. De Ribeiro exhibited regularly at the Salon, showing twelve paintings between 1831 and 1844, but, significantly, she stopped exhibiting at the Salon when she began receiving official copy commissions. The concurrence of dates is unlikely to be coincidental: she exhibited only one painting in the Salon after her initial success as a government copyist in 1842, although her career continued over the next 30 years.²¹

Mme. de Chatillon (1826-1908), a competent and successful painter who had studied with Léon Cogniet, exhibited at the Salon regularly.²² In 1851, encouraged by the success of three portraits (she also painted re-

ligious paintings and war scenes in oil and pastel) at the Salon, she asked the administration for a commission to make an original painting. A government inspector judged her work favorably and recommended she be given a commission for an original painting "of not more than two figures." But she also accepted copy commissions, which may have stereotyped her. At one point in her correspondence she expressed disappointment at being awarded a copy of "trifling importance" considering the quality of her work.²³ Mme. de Chatillon's early Salon success was exceptional, but was achieved in accordance with the expectations of a woman painter:

I only acquired a reputation slowly and I'm surprised to be a little known, having always worked discreetly and far away from the bustle which gets one known. This system, imposed by family life, was good for a woman, but not for an artist. I needed more patience, but art is everything for certain natures and the rest comes when it can—or doesn't come, as the case might be.²⁴

Most women never succeeded in moving from the making of copies to original compositions—in fact, most never tried.

The commissioning of official copies was highly regulated and strictly overseen by a branch of the fine arts administration. Copies were commissioned at a fixed fee according to size and subject treated, not according to the competence of the copyist. Thus copies of Franz Winterhalter's (1806–73) portraits of either Napoléon III or the Empress Eugénie were paid at the same rate of 1200 francs for a full-length and 600 francs for a half-length (the same portrait was used as a model, but only the bust was copied). Religious copies, invariably chosen from a list of 75 works contained in the Louvre's collection, were paid according to size, usually between 500 and 1200 francs.²⁵ The government never sought out artists; painters petitioned the government for commissions. Petitioners excluded no factor which might prove advantageous to their positions; artistic ability was seldom foremost. Although she could prove herself an artist of talent, Mme. de Ribeiro, for example, wrote the Minister of the Interior:

As the daughter of an ex-official in the Ministry of the Interior, and one who has had the honor of working for many years for the Ministry as well as exhibiting widely at various times, I earnestly ask you to grant me a picture to copy. If you agree to this favor you would be helping an artist with a large family to feed and one who finds herself without work following the recent troubles.²⁶

The dossiers contain many letters from Mme. de Ribeiro, their standardized format testifying to the regularity of her appeals. The requests were accompanied by references from those well placed to support her application. On one occasion, when she felt her application had not received the attention it deserved, she asked with some asperity: "Is the person who recommends me without influence in your eyes?" Clearly, Juliette de Ribiero expected to receive unequivocal support in return for her loyalty. This particular letter had the desired effect—a few months later she was commissioned to copy Carlo Maratti's *Sleeping Child Jesus*.²⁷

Not all copyists were as competent as Mesdames de Chatillon and de Ribeiro. An inspector charged with overseeing the execution of Mme. Ernestine Froidure de Pelleport's copy of Sébastien Bourdon's *Descent from the Cross* wrote to his superiors of having to recall the work to bring it up to an acceptable standard.²⁸ Despite this, Mme. Froidure, who had studied with J. Gigoux and exhibited in the Salons of 1866 and 1868, was a successful copyist, receiving at least 14 government commissions, all, with the exception of Titian's *Jupiter and Antiope*, for religious subjects.

Henriette and Clara Fournier were the daughters of a government official who had given them "an education that would stand them in good stead in the absence of independent means." Henriette was a musician and Clara, a painter. When after her father's death Clara requested her first commission, it revealed that she hoped not for a Salon success but, thanks to her well-placed uncle, Rear Admiral Fournier, and other influential contacts, the more stable career of a copyist. Typically, Mlle. Fournier asked for the traditional subjects to copy, "either a portrait of the Emperor or Empress, or a religious picture." Since this was the initial request of an unknown painter, Dubois, an inspector of the fine arts administration, examined several copies in pastel she had made of Philippe de Champaigne's work to demonstrate her aptitude. Dubois found them "very mediocre" and recommended that she not be entrusted with a commission of any importance. The commission, when it came, was for Champaigne's *Last Supper*, a subject evidently viewed within the painter's aptitude, and the first of ten awarded the artist.²⁹

Mlle. Justine de Janvry perhaps represents the nadir of the fortunes of the copyist struggling for recognition. She had the good fortune of being close to Emperor Napoléon III. On her behalf Comte de Nieuwerkerke, head of the fine arts administration, personally annotated a form letter from his department to de Mercy, head of the fine art section and responsible for copy commissions: "If copies were under my jurisdiction I would have avoided annoying you with a new request but I know the Emperor requires something to be done for Mlle. de Janvry who has not enough talent to make a painting." (Nieuwerkerke means, of course, an original subject.) Mlle. de Janvry received a yearly commission throughout the Second Empire, being paid alternately with funds from the civil list and the fine arts administration. The arrangement continued until the fall from power in 1870 of her imperial protectors.³⁰

When in "Le Peintre Louis Martin" Duranty's hero enters the Louvre to make a copy of a Poussin, he has him distinguish among his fellow copyists:

There are few painters who have never made one or more copies in the Louvre; some commissioned, others for study purposes. Some have grown old there, who have lived by copying. There are two populations in the Louvre, one domiciled there, the other floating.³¹

Having set up his own stool, easel, box of colors, and oil cloth (to preserve the parquet from spots of color), the embarrassed Martin joins the "forest of easels and mobile stepladders hung round with serge."³² Part of the spectacle, one could imagine, was Hawthorne's

Hilda, "sitting at her easel among the wild-bearded young men, the white-haired old ones, and the shabbily-dressed, painfully plain women, who make up the throng of copyists."³³ But it is the Goncourt brothers' cruel irony that best portrays those whose "hunger, misery, need or the sense of a false vocation" has brought them to the galleries:

The old women with grey ringlets, stooped over Boucher's pink nudes, with the appearance of Alecto illuminating Anacreon, women with jaundiced complexions, in cuffless dresses, a grey smock around their shoulders, their glasses pushed back, perched on the top of ladders hung with green serge to protect the modesty of their thin legs, the unfortunate women porcelain painters, eyes straining, grimacing as they copy the *Entombment* by Titian with the aid of a magnifying glass . . . ces êtres déclassés.³⁴

One should distinguish between the working methods of the government copyist and those working for private patrons or themselves. There was no time even for eye-straining grimaces or magnifying glasses for the government employee. To fulfill the great demand for copies, the administration was forced to adopt mass-production-type methods. Quantity replaced quality, and because copyists lacked the time to consider the aesthetic quality of their work, they were also denied the opportunity to practice in any full sense as artists. The intimate relationship between the painter and artwork was transformed to the point where the picture was made almost outside the artist's control. This distancing was a result not only of the need to produce the copies in hitherto unheard of numbers, but reflected also changes in studio practice.

While copies of dynastic portraits had been made since at least the age of Louis XIV, they had been painted by assistants under a studio master's direction. But few artists in the 19th century accepted apprentices, and students now were trained in teaching studios or art schools. Thus the 19th century copier of Winterhalter's *Portrait of Napoléon III* had no personal connection with the painter, nor did Winterhalter have any control over the quality of the copies produced. This problem forced the government to develop an administrative model. Applications and distribution procedures were formalized. A bureau under supervision of a *maître des requêtes*³⁵ was formed to deal with the correspondence relating to official copy commissions, while a system of precedence—Prefectures before sub-Prefectures, for example—sent completed copies to government institutions according to lists drawn in advance of the copy's execution.³⁶ Additionally, *ateliers des copies* were set up where, using "copy models" made by the best copyists, as many as 24 artists could be found at any one time copying images of, for example, the imperial couple.³⁷

In the absence of any other artistic authority, the government employed inspectors—mostly minor artists—to supervise the making of the copies. The first task of these functionaries was to assess the competence of the prospective copyist. Thus, the inspector Dubois judged that Madame de Chatillon "does not lack talent,"³⁸ while an unsigned hand notes that Mme. Brincourt "is an artist who is interesting in every way."³⁹ Once the copy was commissioned, the inspector

next examined the picture at the *ébauche* (blocked-in) stage. The inspector's remarks at this stage usually were confined to stating progress made, permitting the administration to advance part payment of the fee. The inspector was not expected to visit the copyist again until invited to view the completed commission. Some commissions were not accepted as finished until several "final" visits had been made and advice was given and carried out. Certainly this supervision was required of the administration as many of the copyists had not enough skill to execute a complex picture.

The notebooks the inspectors kept for their personal use reveal much about the conditions under which the copies were made and the degree of control employed. "To be retouched by another painter" shows that an inspector would, if need be, have the copy finished by a third party, while "examine the head, and trousers, later" for a portrait of Napoléon III indicates a copy not yet sufficiently worked up.⁴⁰

All did not always run smoothly. Mme. de Ribeiro for example, who was normally on the best of terms with the administration—one inspector praised her as "a conscientious artist who always makes an effort to please the Ministry"—fell foul of Inspector Dubois with her copy of *Napoléon III* by Winterhalter. Reporting back to the Ministry in November 1856, Dubois complained: "This copy, despite all the retouching I have asked the artist to make, remains somewhat weak; it is not possible to improve it further." The picture was, however, accepted and sent to the sub-Prefecture at Montélimar.⁴¹ Such a realization that the copyist was working to her limits is reflected in Dubois's comment on Mlle. Maradon's 1857 copy of the emperor; although weak and retouched several times, "it is not possible to ask more of the artist."⁴² Mme. Froidure was criticized by Dubois in 1853 for her copy of a *Descent from the Cross* by Bourdon: "Far from being finished, there is still much to be done in the drawing and the color." That her status, and the status of the copyist in general, changed little in the next 22 years is indicated in the patronizing comments by Decamps concerning her copy of Titian's *Jupiter and Antiope*:

It is a difficult task for a feminine brush to measure itself against such a master. Madame [Froidure] de Pelleport has made every effort, she has carried out submissively all the advice she has been given and has succeeded in making an acceptable copy. If the model had not been so imposing, if the commission had been appropriate to her skills, she would have made an excellent copy.⁴³

Some copyists seem to have further narrowed their interests, becoming specialists in one particular painting. A Madame Boyer's government commissions were all for Prud'hon's *Christ on the Cross*, copied five times between 1860 and 1868. One group specialized in portraits of the empress. A Mme. Jauzion copied Winterhalter's *Portrait of the Empress Eugénie* six times in the early 1860s, Mme. Coëffier copied the *Empress* four times, Mlle. Cheron four, Mlle. Campenon three, Mlle. Dumas three, Mlle. Drojat five, Mme. Gilbert four, Mlle. Haour five, Mlle. Joannis four, Mlle. Muhl five, Mme. Mallet six, and so on.⁴⁴

Satirists were inspired. Art critic Louis Leroy tours

the Louvre with Jean Potet, an old Impressionist of his own invention. They come upon a matronly figure:

You see that plump woman harnessed to Prud'hon's *Justice and Divine Vengeance Pursuing Crime* . . . Her hair is dressed in the Chinese style as in the days when you could encompass her waist with your hands. Now there would have to be two of you to encircle her, if a wish as culpable as that could enter into the head of the lowest villain! . . . She's a pupil of Blondel de Pujol [Blondel for Abel, an old romantic's joke]. A judge, who she knew as a student, obtained this copy for her for some law court or other: that makes a dozen *Vengeances*.
She only does that?
Yes, it's her speciality.⁴⁵

The government's copy program eventually became a Gargantua that, while it swallowed a large part of the budget, provided neither satisfactory paintings nor aesthetic gratification for the practitioner. Of course, the government's goals did not include such lofty ideals. A measure of success nevertheless must be granted to the administrators who orchestrated the impressive numbers of painters who, as Amaury-Duval remarked, had to produce new effigies with great speed for each change of government.⁴⁶

The fall of the Second Empire in 1870 marked the end of the dynastic portrait copy. The Third Republic inaugurated a liberal government that did not need effigies. By this time, the few portraits of the president were either photographs or prints. Without government support, the religious copy fared no better. Waspishly condemned by Amaury-Duval for serving only to hide a handsome Gothic or Romanesque pillar,⁴⁷ the role of the religious copy was compromised when the government began to distance itself from the church. Although the principal result of this distancing was the secularization of education, it also greatly diminished the demand for religious pictures that had been paid for by the state and used to support the church-state concordat.

Although the Republic recognized a responsibility toward the disenfranchised copyists, most of whom had served the state well, in 1873 Chennevières, the new director of fine arts, deplored the loss even of "a mediocre part of the budget for their mediocre labors."⁴⁸ A new political system demanded a new system of art patronage. Now copyists had to submit finished products and only those deemed artistically competent or otherwise useful were accepted. The government was thus unburdened overnight of the responsibility for the support of hundreds of artists. On the brighter side, one could say that these same painters had restored to them their artistic autonomy. But at the same time this imposed on the woman copyist who was ill-equipped for independence all the risks of a freelance career. Nevertheless, for much of the 19th century, the government-supported copy program provided a respectable way for middle-class women to become self-supporting and they turned, in this arena of art, as they had in many others, an accomplishment into a profession.

Copyists continued to populate the galleries in the Louvre and elsewhere until well into the present cen-

tury, meeting the demands of private patrons and churches for copies of the old masters. Their eventual demise was probably a result of a newly educated art audience who saw little aesthetic value in a copy, and the growing independence of the woman artist. ●

This essay contains many of the ideas presented in "Juliette de Ribeira: A Woman Painter of the Second Empire," co-authored with Julia Welbourne, my colleague from 1979-1980 at the University of Essex, England. I thank her for sharpening my feminist perspective.

1. George Moore, *Modern Painting* (London: W. Scott, 1893), 220.
2. Amaury-Duval, *Atelier d'Ingres* (2nd ed., Paris: Charpentier, 1924), 66-68.
3. Léon Levranger, "Du rang des femmes dans les arts," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* (October 1, 1860), 40.
4. Popular works like Prud'hon's *L'Assomption de la Vierge* were often copied by government commission and were on public display, creating a conflict of interest between copyists and the public. This was in part resolved by limiting the number of copyists working from the model at any one time, thus permitting the public to view the original; however, it slowed down the making of copies. To cite numbers, 259 copyists registered to copy *La cruche cassée* by Greuze between 1893 and 1903; Archives du Louvre, LL31 Ecole française (1893-1906), "Registre d'autorisations attribuées à des copistes."
5. For example, identity cards were issued to those who wished to copy, time slots were carefully allocated, and sales in the galleries were strictly forbidden; Archives du Louvre, LL1-LL21, "Registre des cartes d'études délivrées aux artistes (élèves/permissions/artistes). Classement numérotique et chronologique" (1821-69).
6. The numbers between 1859-68 were: 1859-41 women, 171 men; 1860-56 women, 169 men; 1861-58 women, 183 men; 1862-44 women, 246 men; 1863-78 women, 163 men; 1864-59 women, 198 men; 1865-72 women, 158 men; 1866-69 women, 160 men; 1867-69 women, 159 men; 1868-63 women, 177 men. These figures should be seen as a minimum as they record only the copies sent out to the provinces from the administration of fine arts; see "Etat de Distribution des Objets d'art pendant (cet) exercice: 1858-1868" (comptes rendus); Archives nationales, ADXVIII, 673, 691, 710, 730, 752, 772, 791, 811, 833, 874. During this period women received only about one in twenty of the commissions for original works.
7. Ann Sutherland Harris and Linda Nochlin, *Women Artists: 1550-1950* (New York: Knopf, 1976), 38.
8. Denis Rouart, ed., *The Correspondence of Berthe Morisot* (London: Lund Humphries, 1959), 14.
9. Paul Duro, "Les Elèves de Delacroix au Musée du Louvre," *Archives de l'Art Français* (1984), 259-65.
10. Marie Bashkirtseff, *Journal of Marie Bashkirtseff*, trans. with intro. by Mathilde Blind (New York: Cassell, 1889), 347.
11. Jean-Paul Bouillon and Elizabeth Kane, "Marie Bracquemond," *W&J* (F'84/W'85), 21-22.
12. In a series of satirical articles, Louis Leroy caricatured women copyists: "Berthe de Portenille, me dit Jean à l'oreille. Noblesse douteuse, beauté certaine, mais pas le dot. Elle vient au Louvre pour se mettre en montre et tâcher de cueillir un riche étranger." ("Berthe de Portenille, Jean whispered to me. Of doubtful nobility, undoubted beauty, but without a dowry. She comes to the Louvre to show herself off and to try to pick up a rich foreigner."), "Les Pensionnaires du Louvre," *l'Art*, I, II, sixth series (1880), 189.
13. *Journal of Marie Bashkirtseff*, 347.
14. Nathaniel Hawthorne, *The Marble Faun* (New York: Signet, n.d.), 48-51.
15. Duranty, "l'Atelier," in *Le Pays des Arts* (Paris: Charpentier, 1881), 151.
16. Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, *Manette Salomon* (Paris: La croix, 1876), 423.
17. Pierre Angrand, "L'Etat Mécène: période autoritaire du Second Empire (1851-1860)," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* (1968), 303-48.
18. Paul Duro, "Official Patronage" (Chapt. 4), in "The Copy in French 19th-Century Painting" (Ph.D. thesis, University of Essex, England, 1983), 64-83.
19. Bouillon and Kane, "Marie Bracquemond," 22-23.
20. Rouart, *Berthe Morisot*, 25.

21. Juliette de Ribeiro's official career has been pieced together from correspondence which records the commissioning, execution, payment, and other administrative matters concerned with the making of copies; Archives nationales, F21 53 (1840s), F21 105 (1850s), F21 176 (1860s), F21 250 (1860s). See also Chris Petteys, *Dictionary of Women Artists* (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1985), 595.
22. For Madame de Chatillon, see Eugène Montrosier, *Les Artistes Modernes*, I (Paris: H. Lavrette, 1881-84), 132-34; W.S. Sparrow, *Women Painters* (New York: Frederick A. Stokes, 1905), 186, 219; Petteys, *Dictionary*, 136.
23. Laura de Chatillon's correspondence with the administration is contained in the Archives nationales, F21 70, F21 126, F21 203.
24. Montrosier, *Les Artistes Modernes*, 132.
25. "Relevé des tableaux du Louvre servant à l'exécution des copies commandées par la Direction des Beaux-Arts" (n.d.); Archives nationales, F21 4156.
26. Juliette de Ribeiro's request resulted in a commission to copy van Dyck's *La Vierge aux donateurs* in the Louvre (commission date December 3, 1852, price 800 francs); Archives nationales, F21 105.
27. The copy was commissioned August 3, 1851, for 600 francs; Archives nationales, F21 105.
28. Dubois, the inspector in question, wrote January 6, 1853: "Cette copie est loin d'être terminée, il y a encore beaucoup à faire comme dessin et coloris, j'ai écrit à cette dame pour l'engager à venir immédiatement reprendre son travail et l'achever convenablement." ("The copy is far from finished, as there is still much to do to the drawing and the color. I have written to the lady and asked her to return immediately in order to continue her work and to finish it satisfactorily.") The copy was accepted by Dubois January 27, 1853; Archives nationales, F21 81. See also Petteys, *Dictionary*, 264.
29. Clara Fournier's commissions are recorded in Archives nationales, F21 80, F21 140, and F21 217.
30. The letter is dated July 2, 1853. Justine Janvry was awarded a commission to copy *La Vierge* by Sabattini, July 15, 1853, for 800 francs; Archives nationales, F21 88. Mlle. Janvry's other commissions are recorded in F21 88 and F21 150.
31. Duranty, "Le Peintre Louis Martin" in *Le Pays des Arts*, 344.
32. *Ibid.*
33. Hawthorne, *The Marble Faun*, 52.
34. E. and J. de Goncourt, *Manette Salomon*, 47.
35. See Juliette de Ribeiro file, commission for Murillo's *La Vierge à la ceinture*, May 19, 1846; Archives nationales, F21 53.
36. "Population de la France par arrondissements" and subsection "Sous-préfectures par ordre de population." This list appears to establish an order for the distribution of dynastic portrait copies; Archives nationales, F21 490.
37. An internal memo from Buon, an employee of the Ministry and inspector of fine art, dated April 16, 1861, mentions that a certain M. Colin had supplied 24 stools *pour l'atelier des copies*; Archives nationales, F21 490.
38. Inspector's letter dated March 19, 1851, in connection with the commissioning of a copy by Laura de Chatillon for *Ravissement de Saint Paul* by Poussin for a fee of 600 francs; Archives nationales, F21 70.
39. See Mme. Brincourt dossier for a copy of a portrait of the Emperor Napoléon III, after Winterhalter, commission May 28, 1861, fee 1200 francs, for the Hôtel de Ville of Limoges (Hte Vienne); Archives nationales, F21 122.
40. "Portraits de LLMM," visit November 14, 1867; Archives nationales, F21 490.
41. Juliette de Ribeiro dossier, commission May 20, 1856; Archives nationales, F21 105.
42. Nelle Marandon de Montyel, commission March 23, 1857; Archives nationales, F21 96. Marandon's father Edouard was from 1860, director of Ecole Speciale de Dessin pour les Demoiselles, the school with which the Bonheurs were associated. She studied also with Robert-Fleury and exhibited in the 1859 Salon; Petteys, *Dictionary*, 473.
43. Letter dated June 9, 1875, see dossier Ernestine Froidure; Archives nationales, F21 218.
44. For Madame Boyer see Archives nationales, F21 67 and F21 121; for Madame Jauzion see Archives nationales, F21 88 and F21 150. The dossiers concerning the other artists can be found listed alphabetically by decade in Archives nationales, F21 1-261.
45. Leroy, "Les Pensionnaires du Louvre."
46. Amaury-Duval, *Atelier d'Ingres*, 68.
47. *Ibid.*
48. Chennevières recognized that hardship among copyists was a direct result of government policy: "La guerre faite en ces dernières années aux édifices religieux et aux splendeurs du culte a suspendu pour un temps les travaux de ces copistes auxquels étaient consacrée jadis une médiocre part du budget pour leurs médiocres besognes, destinées à la parure des églises de province et fort appréciées alors par les députés de toute couleur." ("The war waged in recent years against religious buildings and the splendors of catholicism has stopped for the time being the work of these copyists for whom a mediocre budget was granted for the purchase of their mediocre work, intended to decorate provincial churches and greatly appreciated by members of parliament of every persuasion."), Philippe de Chennevières, *Souvenirs d'un directeur des Beaux-Arts* (Paris, 1883; rev. ed., Athena, 1979), 27.

PAUL DURO is Associate Senior Lecturer, School of Art History, Newcastle upon Tyne Polytechnic, England. His dissertation topic for the University of Essex was "The Copy in French 19th-Century Painting."