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From July 1830, when the capture of Algiers effectively opened the gates of the Orient to the avid gaze of French artists, representations of Algerian subjects were scattered throughout the Paris Salon. By framing Algeria into an “artistically arranged composition”, the artists of the July Monarchy provided and relayed a digested description of Algeria, a ready-to-consume argument for colonial exploitation. Frank Felsenstein, in Anti-Semitic Stereotypes: A Paradigm of Otherness in English Popular Culture, 1600-1830, defines the act of stereotyping as a “crude process of evaluative categorization, … a form of inexact generalization that becomes, by acceptance, a fixed idea in our heads”. Stereotypes, made of patterns of behaviour, basic distortions of physical features, fixed moral codes, were authenticated by what Sara Suleri calls an “hysterical overabundance of the documentation of racial vision” necessary to construct Algerian identity as racially inferior and as a threat (to moral values, to security, to French ‘civilised’ integrity). With the repeated use of well-defined stereotypes, or, ‘rules of recognition’ as labelled by Homi K. Bhabha, the imagery of the conquest of Algeria is ripe with overtly negative representations of the native population, as slothful, violent, cowardly, fanatic, sexually divergent. Defining the Algerian as inferior asserted the myth of a benevolent and generous France set to ‘civilise’ and ‘educate’ him - incidentally, Claude Liauzu tells us, the verb civiliser [to civilise] appeared in the French language in 1830, year of the conquest of Algeria; defining the Algerian as threatening justified the war and its accompanying disciplinary apparatus.

If the discourse was dominantly negative, some artists favoured a seemingly more positive view, which, in my opinion, can be accommodated within the dominant voices. Such is the case with Horace Vernet (1789-1863), King Louis-Philippe’s favourite painter, who, until the fall of the July Monarchy in 1848, benefited from some of the regime’s most important commissions, most particularly of Algerian subjects.

Vernet was first sent to Algiers by the Ministry of War in March-April 1833, in order to gather a repertoire of motifs and find suitable subjects for illustration of the conquest. The quest for motifs was successful, as Vernet wrote to General Athalin after his trip:

I stayed ten days in Algiers, and did not go further. I found three subjects I considered admirably suitable. The first is the Capture of the Kasbah of Bone by the captain d’Armandy and Yusuf; the second would be the fight of 21 April, when the lieutenant-colonel killed three Arabs with his bare hands, and when Yusuf received a gunshot in his face.

The first of many trips to come, this was to be Vernet’s revelation of the Orient, from which he would develop the visual templates for his Algerian subjects. His trips were widely publicised in France, and Vernet’s personality of artist traveller, together with the strength of details of his representations, added to the aura of authenticity borne by an eyewitness account. As a result, Vernet’s Algerian subjects did not only appeal to the State, as he also received private commissions. In November 1833, Vernet was paid eight thousand francs for Les Arabes conversant sous un figuier for Lord Pembroke, now identified as The Arab Tale-Teller (Wallace Collection, London). The same month, he was paid the same price for a ‘repetition of the Arabs for Mr de Gouvief’, the Le Parlementaire et le Medjeles (Musée Condé, Chantilly). If the two paintings appear, at first sight, very similar, their significant differences permit an effective analysis of Vernet’s first attempts to circumscribe Algerian otherness.

When Vernet exhibited at the 1834 Salon his Arab Tale-Teller (known at the Salon as Arabes écoutant un conte), the first orientalist subject he painted after his first trip to Algeria in 1833, it aroused mixed critical reactions [Pl.1]. Most deplored the treatment of the landscape, considering the vegetation “of the most shocking garishness”, claiming that “this is not an African sky, this is Normandy, not Arabia”, and disapproving of the monotony of the tones, hardly suitable to an oriental setting. While the critics were all too ready to
dismiss Vernet’s treatment of the landscape, they unanimously welcomed the rendering of
the characters, the “truthfulness” of the physiognomies and attitudes which undeniably
corresponded with their expectations. For Vernet’s painting was seeking referents in earlier
representations of the Oriental, the most conspicuous at the time being the results of
Napoleon’s campaign of Egypt, the Description de l’Egypte, and Vivant-Denon’s personal
account, Voyages en Haute et Basse Égypte. What appeared as an accurate ethnographic
representation of the racial diversity of Algeria was in fact a display of stock types.

The painting depicts Bedouin male figures seated in a circle by a fig tree at the edge
of their camp. The men are smoking the chibouk while attentively listening to the character
wearing a striped burnous, in the right foreground. The group is framed by female figures. To
the left, a standing woman holding an amphora on her shoulders bears Vernet’s debt to
neoclassical painting. To the right, in the background, protected by the shadow of a tent, another
woman cards wool between her big toe and left hand. This detail had particularly
marked the critic Laviron, who saluted the accuracy of the posture. In the far background,
shepherds look after their flock. The atmosphere is peaceful and intimate – a child holds a
teapot, ready to serve the men, but stops in his action to better hear the story; the men have
removed their babouches (or oriental slippers) to relax. In his Arab Tale-Teller, Vernet
presented the Bedouins, a nomadic community, as living in simple tents, set up in hospitable
places where they could easily profit from what nature could offer them. Items of sedentary
cultures are scarce (the amphora, the metal teapot) and could very well be objects of
exchange. The presence of a caravan in the background validates the existence of such
commercial exchanges.

Vernet was an enthusiastic admirer of the Bedouin way of life, a genuine interest that
is evident in his reading his voluminous correspondence. He found great nobility in the
Bedouin’s attitudes, gestures and costumes, recalling antique sculpture, but conceded their
alleged lack of advancement in the matter of civilisation. The artist was fascinated by the way
that Algerian mores, physiognomies and customs, were, according to him, little different from
those of the Old Testament. In a letter to Baron Taylor dated 23 December 1834, Vernet
enthusiastically declared:

Don’t the Arabs’ persisting and bellicose mores take us back to the Old Testament?
Didn’t the Bible inspire Poussin and so many others? [In Algeria] alone can we find
what we meanly seek on a manikin. Certainly, if Rome still sets ablaze the genius
of artists, wouldn’t they feel moved if they found it animated by a population whose
habits haven’t changed for centuries?

This theory was similar to Delacroix’s famous assertion, when he travelled to Morocco in
1832, that ‘Rome is no longer in Rome’. It remained Vernet’s preoccupation for the
following decade and in 1848 he presented a dissertation to the Académie des Beaux-Arts a
dissertation - Des rapports qui existent entre le costume des anciens Hébreux et celui des
Arabes modernes [On the relation between the costume of the ancient Hebrews and that of
the modern Arabs] - which was widely criticised by the Institute, critics and artists alike, not
ready for a questioning of religious painting. This realisation came to him during his 1833
trip, when, “reading at the back of [his] tent the story of Rebecca at the fountain, holding a
pitcher on her left shoulder, and leaving it slip along her right arm to give water to Eliezer”, he
raised his eyes and saw “a young woman giving water to a soldier and reproducing exactly
the action [he] was trying to picture in his mind.” When comparing Vernet’s Arab Tale-Teller
to the biblical subjects he painted after his Oriental ‘revelation’, one is indeed compelled to
play ‘spot the difference’. Indeed, the female figure in Agar Chased Away by Abraham (1837,
Musée des Beaux-Arts, Nantes) looks like a distant cousin of the Arab Tale-Teller’s
amphora-holder, while her acolyte is a spitting image of the venerable figure seated against
the tree in the same painting. A decade later, Vernet used, for his monumental Smala (1845,
Versailles, Musée National du Château), the same figure of a patriarch to represent the blind
fanaticism of Muslim faith defeated by Christian power. Similarly, the gallery of Oriental
‘portraits’ in Joseph’s Coat (1853, Wallace Collection) can be almost superimposed on that of
the *Arab Tale-Teller’s* [Pl.2]. Furthermore, Vernet’s ‘antiqisation’ of the Orient could be explained by the fact that he was director of the French Academy in Rome between 1828 and 1834 and would have wanted to measure himself against the great tradition of history painting, and against the example of the Antique.

However, the very episodes of the Bible that Vernet selected for the application of his theories did not show biblical characters in their most favourable light, and revealed, it seems, characteristic that were believed innate to the Arabs. Hence when Abraham, compelled by Sara’s jealousy, forced Agar and their son Ishmael to flee, not only does it show an injustice (that would be repaired after the discovery of Sara’s unexpected pregnancy), but it also suggests polygamy, one of the traits most denounced in the Arabs’ customs. *Joseph’s Coat* recalls how Joseph brothers, out of jealousy of their father’s favourite son, sold the young boy to slavery and simulated his death to their father. This is a narrative of envy, thievery, dissimulation and slavery, all traits that one can read in the brothers’ facial expressions and attempts to hide their guilt, and which feature in contemporary descriptions of Algerian society. Finally, in *Judah and Tamar* (1840, Wallace Collection), the story of Judah, buying favours from his daughter-in-law whom he mistakes for a prostitute, Vernet evokes a mixture of sexual covetousness, incest and, again, dissimulation [Pl.3].

Sander L. Gilman claimed that “every stereotype is Janus-faced. It has a positive and a negative element, neither of which bears any resemblance to the complexity or diversity of the world as it is ... For every ‘noble savage’ seen through colonial power, a parallel ignoble savage exists.” Indeed, while for the Westerner, the Bedouin’s nomad way of life showed little concern for progress and civilisation, this society appeared as the sole reminder of the life of the ‘Ancients’ before their mores and customs were polluted by progress. On the other hand, if Vernet’s depictions appear at first sight positive, contemporary imagery and literature described Algerian nomad societies in a way that Vernet could hardly have ignored.

Nomadism was to become the source of one of the predominant arguments for colonisation. Elias Regnault, in his definition of the term ‘Nation’ in Garnier Pages’ 1842 *Dictionnaire Politique*, insisted that, “as long as [pastoral populations] do not hold to the soil, they will have to renounce to progress, any kind of ulterior development; they will never form into a national entity”, concluding that “the Arab population...is nowadays among the last on the scale of civilisation”. More importantly, nomadism was stigmatised as evidence of the native’s inability to develop the potential of Algeria’s soil. For colonialists such as L. Moll, author of an essay on agriculture and colonisation, the Arabs had to be annihilated, since “a race inept to civilisation must disappear, as did antediluvian species.” Work, or the ability to transform nature and produce wealth, and the place given to work in a society, determined its position on the scale of human races. Accordingly, nomad life was seen as a mark of sloth, primitivism, of unstable and unpredictable communities. Probably the most powerful stereotype developed during the conquest of Algeria was that of an Algerian people patently caught in stasis, crippled by its idleness, as a blatant proof of the degeneracy brought by Islam. Indeed, in his analysis of the “mythical portrait of the colonized”, Albert Memmi claims that “nothing could better justify the colonized destitution than his indolence”.

Representations of Algerians for the most part are characteristic, in the sense that they are, invariably represented doing nothing – or little, talking, smoking, or in a state of immobile meditation. Here, storytelling moreover underlined the oral tradition as opposed to the written tradition, which was commonly considered as one of the main features of ‘civilisation’.

Representations of Algeria teach us that smoking and apathy are two of a kind. Bayot’s *Arabes de Constantine*, characteristically shows three Algerians occupied in smoking, two of them seated in rather undignified positions. Like in the *Arab Tale-Teller*, one has removed his babouches, a canonical indicator of slothful relaxation and lasciviousness (as usually represented in depictions of harems) in Orientalist art. His head bent over, this character stares blankly at us, his unsubtle features rendered heavy with tiredness. This state of inactivity, together, perhaps, with the intoxicating substances of the chibouk, puts the mind to sleep. While visiting Algiers in 1845, Theophile Gautier similarly portrayed the customers of a café, as similar to animals, “crouched or laid in bestial postures,
belonging more to the quadruped than to the man, strange figures that one could not imagine, ... wrapped in rags of an ideal dirtiness, but worn with a majesty worthy of a roman emperor".  

In representing crowds of idle Algerians, French artists made, *en passant*, a potent statement: that the Algerian could not govern himself, because his innate laziness condemned him to decadence and incapacity to progress. When one considers the imagery available, women alone in Algerian society seem to be doing something, performing agricultural and domestic duties. Vernet’s *Arab Tale-Teller* bears the stigmata of such a discourse: while the men smoke and listen to a tale, women see to the needs of subsistence of the community. Women moreover appear as objects, domestic possessions of the male. According to General Daumas, author of a description of Algerian mores published in 1853, the Arabs attributed more importance to their horses than to their female companions, as is suggested by the character on the left of the painting, attending to a stallion while ignoring the nearby woman.  

If in the *Arab Tale-Teller*, the classical attitude of the standing female retained a certain dignity, Vernet fully asserted women’s status as object of the male primitive needs and desires in his later *Smala*, where female figures in attitudes of submission appeal to the most dominant desires of sexual possession, as traditionally found in the scenes of abduction that scatter Western art. Algerian nomad communities were commonly seen by the French as patriarchal societies, and contemporary French lithographs of such subjects depict female figures as bare slaves, objects of the libidinous fantasies of the dominating men. The caption of such a lithograph by Achille Deveria, *Arabes du désert. Toujours errants, peuvent-ils former des liens durables?* [Arabs of the desert. Always wandering: can they develop lasting relationships?], was meant to emphasise the instinctive, or animal, rather than human and reasoned character of such societies.  

For L. Moll, the Algerians’ “hatred...of work, indomitable will to enjoy and possess without labour, ... united to their rapacity, make them into bandits by birth,” Nomads were indeed considered as predators, not only from the environment and spoiling the lands that they did not cultivate, but also potentially from other tribes, villages and travellers from whom they stole. Hence the nomad was a parasite, whom one had to civilise (or, if one followed the path advocated by Eugène Bodichon, exterminate) for his own good and the good of other communities.  

Thus, for the French, violence alone could awake the Algerian from his apathy. Hence when he was not indulging his pathological laziness, he was, most often represented in a bellicose attitude, either fighting or hunting. Both activities were linked, since hunting, the Arab’s ‘favourite hobby’ was a rehearsal for war. According to Daumas, “chasing wild beasts teaches how to chase men”. Daumas further remarked that more dangerous even than the lion hunt, was that of the lion cub, for it was the (not so) safest way to attract the fury of the lioness. Vernet’s *Lion Hunt* (1836, Wallace Collection) displays all the fury of such a battle between the man and a pride of lions [Pl.4]. Stealing two lion cubs (to whom Vernet gave the dramatic position at the top of the pyramidal composition), the sneaky hunters have driven the lioness mad with despair. The title of the painting when it was exhibited at the Paris Salon, *Chasse dans le désert de Sahara, 28 mai 1833* claimed that it was a recollection from Vernet’s 1833 trip to Algeria, hence lending ‘truth’ to the depiction. Among the aspects of the incident that struck the eye, must have been the cruelty of the practice, reinforced by the realism of the lion cubs’ emotive attitudes (one with his tail between the hind legs, the other one shaying away).  

The potentially bellicose nature of the Bedouins appears in Vernet’s second version of the painting, *Le Parlementaire et le Medjeles*, also known as *Chefs arabes en conseil dans leur camp* [or Arab leaders in council in their camp], which, as its title indicates, focuses on a more martial aspect than in the first painting [Pl.5]. The amphora has been left unattended in the right foreground, children and women have disappeared - and, perhaps tellingly, have been replaced by dogs: the presence of red tattoos on one of the dog’s tail recall clearly the facial tattoos of the standing woman in the first version of the painting. The men of the audience – who have put their babouches back on - hold guns instead of chibouks and warriors gather around the tents to mount their horses. The Arab tale-teller is
now a leader attending a war council. Behind the group, a French officer, identified by the title of the painting as a parliamentary, dismounts his horse and awaits, arms folded, the council’s decision. In the background, French troops watch a fantasia, which suggests that the Arabs represented here will choose to ally themselves with the French in the subjugation of the tribes still independent of French rule. These were perhaps destined to join the ranks of the Spahis, a special corps of the French Armée d’Afrique [African Army] constituted mainly of natives.

While the first version of the painting represented the Bedouins in a timeless fashion, out of historical context, the sudden presence of the French inside the frame grounds the painting in the present, and possibly the future. Nineteenth-century Europe conceived history as a tale of progress or ‘time’s arrow’, classically opposed to time’s cycle, here the Algerian stagnant state of civilisation. Progress was a notion dear to Vernet, who enjoyed experimenting modern technologies, as attests his enthusiasm for the invention of the daguerreotype, of which he was one of the first painters to make use, during his 1839-1840 trip in the Orient. More significantly, in the 1840s, Vernet was to create for the Salon de la Paix in the French National Assembly a décor comprising an Allegory of Peace, the Genius of Science and Steam Putting to Flight the Sea Gods, which presented, to use the words of Robert N. Beetem, “the unusual juxtaposition of modern smoke-stacks, locomotives and steamships with classical allegorical figures”. Such a programme highlighted the role of progress and modernity in the formation of a durable peace. Indeed, under the allegories, Vernet painted a balcony in trompe-l’œil, with contemporary legislative, academic, diplomatic and military figures, including Algerians in native dress, among whom was the prominent figure of a Spahi. Thus induced the idea that colonisation was the way of progress and civilisation. Although Vernet’s Parlementaire et le Medjeles precedes the allegorical décor by more than a decade, an attractive theory would be that the latter’s agenda sheds light upon the former’s: accordingly, the parliamentary, by stepping into the camp, and rallying the Algerian to the French, would be a harbinger of the civilising process.

In these two scenes, Vernet effectively gathered some of the most potent stereotypes that continued to define the Algerian people throughout the conquest (and after). While their meaning has dramatically shifted from one composition to the other, they both display a similar agenda, from the seemingly inoffensive depiction of a patriarchal, timeless, pastoral society, to a reunion of Arab warriors allied to the French whose presence in the background is conspicuously paternalistic. The alleged accuracy of the depiction of Algerian physiognomies, attitudes and customs, particularly chosen to demonstrate their peculiarity, was reinforced by Vernet’s first-hand experience in Algeria the preceding year. For an ‘ethnographic’ definition of the Algerian people was essential in the formation of a racial discourse. There was, as Albert Memmi has argued, no will to understand the Other on the part of the coloniser, but a will to remould, shape an identity corresponding to the Western preconceptions, or, to use Edward W. Said’s expression, to ‘orientalize the Orient’.

The dialectics of colonisation were deployed to assert the Algerian’s fundamental inadequacy, his (and I say ‘his’ because the ‘political’ Algerian was considered to be male) inability to govern himself and to interact with the world ‘unsupervised’, that is without the control of the civilised West. Felsenstein has argued that ‘in the process of stereotyping, an imaginary line of demarcation is perpetuated by the host group, creating a needed sense of difference from the other that is essentially defensive’. The Algerian was thus defined by a negative discourse, both in the choice of pejorative traits, and in the sense that he was framed as fundamentally opposed to Western values. The decay of the colonised was contrasted to the coloniser’s self-appointed role as liberator, which awarded him the right to take another people’s land.

1 I am deeply grateful to Pr. John House for his insightful suggestions and unfailing support and to Hannah Williams for reading through this text.
8 A. Dayot, *Les Vernet: Joseph, Carle, Horace*, Paris 1898, Appendix, 212. This was a significant sum for a commission, if one considers that in June the same year Vernet was paid six thousand francs for a portrait of the king and ten thousand francs for a portrait of the duc d’Orléans, heir to the throne.
11 E. Carette, in *Recherches sur la géographie et le commerce de l’Algérie méridionale* (Paris 1844, 7), the second volume of *l’Exploration Scientifique de l’Algérie*, albeit meant to present a pleasant portraiture of the Algerian land, would eventually give right to Horace Vernet’s representations of lush pastures by condemning the stereotypical vision of a desolate and arid Algerian land.
14 G. Laviron, *Salon de 1834*. A similar attitude was described (and illustrated) in length in Wyld and Lessore, *Voyage Pittoresque dans la Régence d’Alger en 1833*, Paris 1835, 9.
15 See A. Durande, *Joseph, Carle et Horace Vernet*. While Vernet’s attraction for the people of Algeria makes no doubt, his support of the French conquest, no matter how extreme the methods of ‘pacification’ could be, is made unambiguous by an unpublished letter dated 22 April 1846 (collections of the Musée de l’Empéri, Salon de Provence, no inventory number). Addressed to colonel Pélissier, who received public opprobrium in 1845 for ordering the massacre of an entire tribe of Algerians by asphyxia, Vernet’s letter is a passionate demonstration of his support for Pélissier’s acts.
28 1837, Bibliothèque Nationale de France [BNF], Cabinet des Estampes, Of.1c. See also Lemercier, *Famille de Bédouins dessinés d’après nature*, 1830, BNF, Cabinet des Estampes, Of.2.d.


On female tattoos, see G. Daumas, *Moeurs et Coutumes de l’Algérie*, 186.
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