The individual’s triumph: the eighteenth-century consolidation of authorship and art historiography
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Consolidating authorship, consolidating scholarship

The eighteenth-century consolidation of authorship – apparent in Salon livrets, art criticism, sales catalogues, inventories, the theoretical development of maniera, signing and hanging practices – was crucial to subsequent, nineteenth-century Romantic notions of what constituted individual authorship and to the kinds of eighteenth-century painting that were eventually written into or out of art history. But these developments did not take place unilaterally or overnight. Some of the period’s leading painters partook in practices directly contrary to them, most notably through the practice of multiple hands on a single canvas, typically divided according to genre specialization in a longstanding and practical distribution of labour associated with workshop production. The eighteenth-century saw a shift in this longstanding type of painting, however, towards ‘collaborations’ not between contemporaries in the same city, but between contrasting schools or periods that played on an appreciation of pastiche. Paradoxically, this relied on an understanding of the consolidated author and the connoisseur’s ability to differentiate between distinct hands. This article sets out what the shifting terrain of authorship in eighteenth-century France might tell us about much more recent developments in academic discourse around the figure of the author.

Fifty years after its publication, Roland Barthes’s 'The Death of the Author' (1967) remains a touchstone for current studies of authorship. Here Barthes argued against 'the image of literature to be found in contemporary culture [that] is tyrannically centred on the author' and in favour of an anti-biographical approach that recognizes writing’s independent existence (as 'l’écriture').¹ Michel Foucault responded with his equally pivotal 'What is an Author?' (1969), an essay that pointed to the pragmatic role of the author function as a means of organizing cultural production that already distinguishes between person and writer.² Notably,

I am tremendously grateful to Charlotte Guichard and Valérie Kobi for their meticulous, insightful comments on an earlier draft of this article.

² First published as Michel Foucault, 'Qu’est-ce qu’un auteur?', *Bulletin de la Société française de Philosophie*, 63:3, 1969, 73–104.
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Foucault situates the development of the author as an entity (apart from his or her biographical existence) as an eighteenth-century phenomenon, one related to legal issues of censorship and copyright in a reading of culture not far from his *The Order of Things* (1966) and exactly contemporary *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1969). As it would do for printed works in the history of art, publishing brought legal issues to the fore and helped to codify them. More recently, Roger Chartier has tightened this argument around the eighteenth-century literary author in *The order of books* (1994) and to the specifically material aspects of authorship in *The Author’s Hand and the Printer’s Mind* (2014). Here he identifies a shift in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Europe towards the value of the author’s manuscript copy – with its corrections, modifications and other jewels for critiques génétiques – above an abstracted, printed text.\(^3\) The consolidation of painters’ authorship discussed appears to crystalize – or at least undergo an intensified cultural appreciation – in exactly this historical moment. As will become apparent there are pragmatic reasons for the emergence of a consolidated author in art history – in no small part due to the often under played reality of the art market in shaping its terms. As the art dealer Edme Gersaint would express in 1745, there is tremendous economic pressure to identify not a painting’s geography or period but an individual artist’s name when offered for sale. As John R. Searle posited, the proper name is both richly connotative (a ‘shorthand description’) and entirely content-less (in that it refers only to a single example and does not, therefore, operate in a conventional semiotic system).\(^4\) And it is, of course, around the proper name that the connoisseur sustains his or her reputation in the faith that particular uses of crayons, pencils or brushes remain forever irreducibly themselves, always true to defining one author over another.


\(^{4}\) John R. Searle, *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969, 162–174. For the author, however, as conceived by Foucault the proper name did enter into a broader system of recognition with the contours of the author’s presence the focus of his enquiry. This body of theory around authorship has resulted in waves of response too vast to discuss here, but digested with useful historical and critical distance in Seán Burke, *The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992.
A single study has not outlined in an integrative way the phenomenon of the consolidated author in eighteenth-century Europe in the specific context of art history, even if recent work on France in particular has identified compelling pieces of evidence. The history of collecting – pioneered for this period and geography by Francis Haskell, Antoine Schnapper and Krzysztof Pomian – should be credited with leading to the relatively recent articulation of this important historical shift for the period before the French revolution, when the concerns around authorship and copyright change the stakes vis-à-vis legal protections in particular. In Pomian’s ‘Marchands, connaisseurs, curieux à Paris au XVIIIe siècle’ (1979) (later included in Collectionneurs, amateurs et curieux. Paris, Venise: XVIe–XVIIIe siècle [1987]), sales catalogue texts were examined as a genre, with the 1730s marked by a rapid rise in the precision and length of entries on works of art. From the ‘absurd conciseness’ of earlier descriptions, Pomian described the evolution of detailed commentary on dimensions, condition, provenance and authorship. Painters’ names, origins and occasionally identification of their masters or students were all given new attention. Pomian identified Pierre-Jean Mariette and Gersaint (both motivated by entrepreneurial ambition) as determining figures who would eventually incorporate more superfluous aesthetic commentary (thereby bolstering the textual real estate of exceptional paintings in a given sale) and whose handling of the sale served to underwrite the authorship they proposed in print. Pierre Remy’s foreword to the Pasquier sale of 1755 is cited as a turning point in which the dealer expressed responsibility to buyers for what was set forth in the catalogue, thereby asserting his own authority rather than simply reporting what connoisseurs or tradition stated. A consequence of this trend, Pomian notes, was the tendency to form large lots at the end of the sale consisting of un-attributable works. Pomian’s approach was developed in depth by Guillaume Glorieux in À l’enseigne de Gerstaint. Edme-François Gersaint, marchand d’art sur le pont Notre-Dame (1694–1750) (2002). Beyond Gersaint’s part in shifting to more excursive, substantive entries, Glorieux credits him with the term and phenomenon of the ‘catalogue raisonné’ (used when cataloguing collections to a higher degree of precision, not, as often today, indicating a complete

7 Pomian, Collectors and curiosities, 148–149.
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list of works by a given artist). He quotes the *Mercure de France*’s response to Gersaint’s catalogue of the Quentin de Lorangère sale in 1744, in which it was relayed – following wording used three years prior to describe Pierre-Jean Mariette’s catalogue of Pierre Crozat’s collection – that ‘this is not merely a dry and sterile catalogue, that does nothing but announce different effects which come along, but a curious, instructive, varied and interesting detail’. Gersaint stopped short, however, of holding himself legally responsible for attributions. In the same sale, Gersaint’s preface included the disclaimer ‘I do not wish to take it upon myself to decide affirmatively on these works, assuming the title of sovereign judge’; for the Antoine de La Roque sale in 1745, Gersaint asked, ‘Do we not see every day those who present themselves as infallible connoisseurs, fooled in the judgment that they carry on paintings (...) It is true that the curieux want an author’s name for a painting that they research, no matter how beautiful it may be; they are not satisfied when one designates only the school from which one suspects it to have come’. Gersaint reveals the fraught territory of an art market driven by the desire for proper names, a constellation of knowable, identifiable personalities that functioned as consolidated authors.

---


9 I am very grateful to Valérie Kobi for this observation. The earlier citation is *Mercure de France*, January 1741, 115.

10 ‘ce n’est point ici un catalogue sec et stérile, qui ne fait qu’annoncer les different effets qui doivent être venus, mais un detail curieux, instructif, varié et intéressant’, *Mercure de France*, February 1744, 342 cited in Glorieux, *À l’enseigne de Gersaint*, 389.

Authorship at the Salon

Though readily accessible, the Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture’s Salon livrets have received little comprehensive study as a genre that might indicate their role in consolidating authorship.\textsuperscript{12} Between 1869 and 1872, Jules Guiffrey republished the livrets with meticulously detailed, individual publication histories for the official Salons held between 1673 and 1800.\textsuperscript{13} While Ruth Legrand has convincingly positioned the livrets as instruments of state power, Richard Wrigley has described their physical role at the Salon with great precision and The National Gallery of Art Library produced a beautifully illustrated history of the livret as an object, these accounts have largely avoided the more conceptual question of authorship in the manner of Pomian’s work on sales catalogues.\textsuperscript{14} Outside of these scholar’s attention, the livrets’ repetitive, bare-bones format has led, instead, to statistically driven analysis tracking trends of competing genres of painting and the character of exhibitors in pre- versus post-revolutionary Paris. A preliminary survey via Guiffrey suggests, however, that the increased precision and demand for information apparent in the sales catalogue genre is also evident here, albeit to a more subtle degree that kept the livret at a reasonable size and price. Changes to the livrets seem to have responded to the public’s increasingly familiarity with encountering works of art outside religious or government structures – that is, in spaces like the Salon or sales room in which the status of the painting as art-object was being foregrounded – equipped with a precise vocabulary.\textsuperscript{15} Beginning with the first regularized Salon in 1737, paintings were given a numbering system in the livret (prior to this, listings followed the hang in a more narrativized format) and


\textsuperscript{13} Jules Guiffrey, Collection des livrets des anciennes expositions depuis 1673 jusqu’en 1800, Paris: Liepmannssohn et Dufour, 1869–1872.


from 1743 were listed numbered but ordered according to artists’ rank. The frustration of this arrangement, which made locating paintings in the room difficult, attests to the livrets’ multiple roles, including reinforcing professional status and as a document for after the Salon had closed. Dimensions were not listed for paintings before 1737, when the livret’s preface stated that only exceptional dimensions would be included in order to aide visitors in lining up paintings with numbered text and, by extension, author.\(^{16}\) This phrasing was kept with little or no alteration until 1763 when it was simply omitted, presumably because of the public’s familiarity with how livret and Salon hang related; however, dimensions were not included routinely for all works in the livret until the mid-1740s.

Regularized means of reference settled alongside a more regularized type of paintings on display: rectilinear (or more rarely oval), autonomous easel painting. What may now seem obvious was not so until the rise of the Salon. While irregularly framed or shaped canvases intended for insertion into rocaille boiseries appeared regularly in Salons from the 1730s through 1740s, the term most frequently employed in reference to them (chantourné) appears in the livrets for the last time in 1751.\(^{17}\) Despite the presence of works painted by multiple hands on the art market and in many collectors’ cabinets, as we will see, authorship, too, was consolidated in the Salon context. For the livrets of 1673 through 1800 no work was listed with more than one author. As they appear in the livret – and, from what we can tell, the Salon itself – paintings were, rather, figured increasingly as autonomous objects by singular authors not something produced by larger teams of craftsmen or fragments of complex, multi-media decorative schemes.

Current studies’ general failure to link the language of the market to changes in the official description of the Salon perpetuates the Académie’s own self-mythologizing as somehow impervious to commercial practices. The overall development of sales catalogues and livrets, however, mirror each other. Imbrication in the market is, moreover, attested to by the seemingly unwitting (or perhaps simply tacit) role of the livret as a document used by dealers, collectors and connoisseurs. As Yuriko Jackall recently noted, the provenance of significant groups of surviving livrets indicates that they were collected as a form of reference in the art market.\(^{18}\) The same was true of sales catalogues for painting, shells and natural history objects.\(^{19}\) When Gabriel de Saint-Aubin died in 1770, his after-death


\(^{19}\) Glorieux, À l’enseigne de Gersaint, 395–396.
inventory listed one hundred sales catalogues to which he had added illustrations and notes, much in the manner of his famous Salon *livrets*. In this instance, the catalogues passed as a group to the *amateur* and collector Louis-Guillaume Baillet, baron de Saint-Julien.\(^{20}\) Colin B. Bailey’s revisionist work on Saint-Aubin’s hand-illustrated Salon *livrets* and sales catalogues reinforces the idea that these were not eccentric or personal doodles by the artist, but working documents probably produced for collectors, dealers and *amateurs*.\(^{21}\) Saint-Aubin’s are the most spectacular examples, but when considered alongside more familiar, annotated sales catalogues listing prices and buyers – which are found in sizeable numbers in the after-death sales of dealers and collectors – it becomes clear that they were part of a practical system of textual description that anchored paintings within a series of known signs that included, side-by-side, author and economic value.

Eighteenth-century France also saw, of course, a complimentary interest in artists’ *œuvres*, either assembled as *recueils* of discrete prints for collectors or published as comprehensive wholes. In *Mariette and the Science of the Connoisseur in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (2014), Kristel Smentek demonstrates the long-lasting historiographic underpinning that this process established for art historians – particularly in the conceptual development of attribution to a given hand as an organizational principal of art historical knowledge.\(^{22}\) Developments in documenting *œuvres* reinforced a longer-standing literature on *maniera* or hands, itself closely related to the rise in the appreciation of drawing in which the artist’s mark was seen as particularly transparent. From the sizeable eighteenth-century literature, the connoisseur’s role in their identification was articulated with particular influence in the comte de Caylus’s ‘Discours sur les dessins’ (1732), Mariette’s catalogue of the Crozat collection (1741), Antoine Dezallier d’Argenville’s ‘Discours sur la connaissance des dessins et de tableaux’ in his *Abrégé de la vie des peintres* (1745) and Michel-François Dandré-Bardon article devoted to drawing in his *Traité de peinture. Suivi d’un Essai sur la Sculpture* (1765).\(^{23}\) Martha Woodmansee’s


David Pullins  

The individual’s triumph: the eighteenth-century consolidation of authorship and art historiography

attempt to tie ostensibly disinterested, eighteenth-century aesthetic theory to art objects and the market in The Author, Art and the Market. Rereading the History of Aesthetics (1994) – allowing neither category to dominate – might well be heeded as a productive caution here. As with the sale catalogue and Salon livret, a mutually informative and productive relationship most likely obtains. This clear-eyed commitment to thinking across the connoisseurial mind as both abstracted eye exercising taste and attuned to concrete economic realities is brought forward in Smentek’s work on Mariette.

The centrality of eighteenth-century connoisseurship to the concept of the author is a rich, expansive field that crosses a number of domains; however, a few publications that reached a wider audience and solidified these developments might be emphasized here. As several scholars have recently argued, Jean de Jullienne’s massive publication effort between 1726 and 1735 brought together the figure of Antoine Watteau in an unprecedented fashion: some 495 prints gathered the artist’s paintings and, most remarkably, his drawings. This multi-part publication not only consolidated a diverse body of work, but also made it available for further dissemination, one marketed through a kind of celebrity authorship or name-recognition consistent with advertisements that promoted prints. While less frequently cited, the printmaker-publisher Gabriel Huquier performed a similar feat of consolidation for his contemporary Juste-Aurèle Meissonnier in a massive, deluxe publication in 1748 that compiled designs for furniture, metalwork and architecture.


Figure 1 Gabriel Huquier, *Design for a tradecard*, 1749, pen and brown ink and graphite, brown wash and watercolour with white highlights on paper, 23.5 x 14.8 cm. © Paris: École nationale supérieure des Beaux-Arts. Photo: RMN-Grand-Palais.

Between 1748 and 1751, Huquier completed a similarly ambitious project documenting the *œuvre* of Gilles-Marie Oppenord. Based on Huquier’s trade-cards dated 1749 (figure 1), Bailey has proposed that similar efforts were afoot for *œuvres* of Huquier’s contemporaries Charles-Joseph Natoire, Jacques de Lajoüe and François Boucher.25 Such projects would have brought Huquier more fully into the realm of fine art rather than ornament, itself a distinction undergoing rapid redefinition over the course of Huquier’s career. These artists’ names appear just below those of Rubens, Jordeans and Van Dyck, whose *œuvres* had taken shape posthumously and largely through their prints. As a textual compliment to these

kinds of *recueils* of printed images, during the early 1770s Charles-Antoine Jombert produced ambitious catalogues raisonnés (in our modern sense) of printed works by his friend and contemporary Charles-Nicolas Cochin (1770), Étienne de la Bella (1772) and Sébastien de Le Clerc (1774). These compilers of others’ work seem easily to move between an historical approach to the deceased artist and the work of their own contemporaries, notably those who might be thought to play a role in forging a French school. Much like his fellow publisher Huquier, Jombert seems to have relied in part on the extant plates held in stock as a convenient record and preliminary basis for establishing complete lists of these artists’ works. In this sense, practitioners of one media were more easily catalogued than those in another. As Charlotte Guichard has argued for Gersaint’s pioneering *Catalogue raisonné de toutes les pièces qui forment l’œuvre de Rembrandt* (1751), acts of connoisseurship were built into both the preparation of such publications and their eventual use by *amateurs* comparing prints with text. The appearance of a *Supplement* to Gersaint’s publication by Pierre Yver in 1756 attested, of course, to the essential instability of a given *œuvre*, even for the deceased, and to the Sisyphean task of the committed connoisseur.

### The objects in question

Increased attention to authorship in discourse on painting had a direct impact on the production and physical treatment of the objects themselves. Bailey’s evidence of ‘patriotic taste’ beginning in the 1750s demonstrates that the French school took shape not only in text, but also through hanging and framing practices that established a new network of proper names. France’s place alongside the traditional ‘trois écoles’ was apparent in patterns of collecting and a move from comparative or mixed hangs towards taxonomic arrangements. Around 1762, a pioneer in collecting contemporary French art, Ange-Laurent La Live de Jully, constructed a townhouse in the rue de Richelieu for which he also commissioned a corresponding guidebook prepared by Mariette, his *Catalogue historique* (1764), and frames that prominently presented painters names on cartouches (figure 2).

---


30 Also see McClellan, *Inventing the Louvre*, esp. 2–8.
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According to La Live de Jully’s preface to the Catalogue historique, ‘For each work I place the name of the author, because it is entirely possible to know the Arts very well and to be ignorant of the name of the artist’. This mode of presentation may have been taken from the mounts previously given to drawings, an arena considered especially germane to exercising connoisseurship. The most obvious precedent would be Mariette’s celebrated mounting practice, itself inherited from

Figure 2 Jean-Baptiste Greuze, The Laundress, 1761, oil on canvas, 40.6 x 33 cm (excluding frame). © Los Angeles, CA: J. Paul Getty Museum.

been cited as an example commissioned by La Live de Jully. While this has recently been questioned, it remains an eighteenth-century testimony to the declarative naming of contemporary authors in the manner intended by its original owner.
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Figure 3 Girolamo Francesco Maria Mazzola (called Parmigianino), *Man Standing Beside a Plinth on Which He Rests a Book, and a Study of Saint Luke*, c. 1530–1540, pen and brown ink, brown wash over black chalk or graphite on paper, mounted by Pierre-Jean Mariette, 16.4 x 9.9 cm. © New York, NY: The Morgan Library & Museum.

what Mariette knew of Vasari’s drawings collection (figure 3). As Bailey notes, La Live de Jullly’s approach to framing paintings was later adopted by the comte d’Angiviller, *directeur des bâtiments du roi*, who in 1777 writes in a letter to the *premier peintre du roi*, Jean-Baptiste-Marie Pierre, of using ‘a cartouche for putting the name of the author, my intention being to make all the frames more or less the same’.  


34 ‘un cartouche pour mettre le nom de l’auteur, mon intention étant de faire faire tous les cadres sur un modèle à peu près pareil’, Marc Furcy-Raynaud, ed., ‘Correspondance de l’abbé Terray, contrôleur général des Finances et directeur général des Bâtiments du roi, et de M. d’Angiviller, directeur des Bâtiments du roi, avec le premier peintre du roi, Jean-
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Contemporary painters’ names had been included only intermittently on frames at the Salon: in 1738 the Académie experimented for the sole time during the ancien régime in uniform labels on paintings, while improvised labels were provided erratically by the public or by painters themselves (notably Philippe-Jacques de Loutherbourg’s name combatively ‘written on the frame in large characters’ in 1763 according to Denis Diderot in remarks suggestive of its exceptional nature).35

Only relatively recently have art historians emphasized the historical specificity of adding signatures to paintings. In 1974, André Chastel edited a special issue of La Revue de l’Art devoted to the question across a broad historical remit.36 Some of the most provocative contributions – notably Jean-Claude Lebensztejn’s, republished in his Annexes-de-l’œuvre de l’art (1999) – took approaches from literary theory, in which the attribution of authorship and the author-function as a category had been undergoing sustained inquiry. Béatrice Fraenkel’s book-length La Signature. Genèse d’un signe (1992) worked through the signature in more exhaustive fashion, but outside the proper domain of art history and closer in its methods to anthropology and literary theory. In 2008, Fraenkel contributed, however, to a special issue of Sociétés & Représentations subtitled ‘Ce que signer veut dire’ that included studies of early modern painting by Charlotte Guichard, Nathalie Heinich and Catherine Lanoë.37 Guichard has since taken up study of the signature in depth through several publications that position eighteenth-century France as an insightful period of transition. The signature, she argues, denoted painting in a particular way in relation to the individual artist, a phenomenon she describes as existing in a mutually determining relationship with developments in the art market and theories of connoisseurship.38 While prints provided the public with the artist’s


37 Along with numerous insightful articles on the signature more broadly. See Sociétés & Représentations [special issue ‘Ce que signer veut dire’], 25:1, 2008.

name as a matter of course, it was only with a relative delay that the signature became a standard feature of contemporary art making and was only regularized in the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{39} Guichard notes that the signature gained importance in relationship to an understanding of the art of the past and the crystallization of historical œuvres. Consolidation of authorship was crucial here. She points in particular to the phenomenon of the compendia of signatures that appeared in eighteenth-century Europe, notably the archaeologist Johann Friedrich Christ’s Anzeige und Auslegung der Monogrammatum, einzeln und verzogenen Anfangsbuchstaben de Nahmen (1747), translated into French in 1750. This kind of instrumental tool fit into a wider phenomenon of publications aimed as much at dealers and collectors as they were at an abstracted, connoisseurial eye.\textsuperscript{40} A copy of one such publication, Antoine Harms’s schematic Tables historiques et chronologiques des plus fameux peintres anciens et modernes (1742), annotated by Huquier, provides insightful clues as to how such knowledge took shape for a dealer of both contemporary and old master prints and drawings (figure 4). Much like Mariette’s more celebrated Abecedario, Huquier’s

\textsuperscript{39} Again the legal concerns regarding print and the privilège du roi in their development should be underscored, however, as in Scott, ‘Authorship, the Académie and the Market in Early Modern France’.

\textsuperscript{40} On instrumentalization and connoisseurship, see Griener, La république de l’œil, 216.
copy of Harms includes corrections, additions (notably of Meissonnier, but also earlier artists), citations of other authors (Jean-Baptiste Descamps, André-Bardon, d’Argenville and Carl Heinrich von Heineken) and frequent indications of whether someone was also a print-maker or ornementiste, categories Harms did not employ but of personal relevance to Huquier.\footnote{Huquier adds both Watteau and Boucher in the columns listing artists’ masters, but oddly does not give them their own entries (neither appears in Harms’s text). The last death date Huquier adds is Jean Restout, 1 January 1768. The manuscript copy of Antoine Harms, 	extit{Tables historiques et chronologiques}, Paris: Bronsvic, 1742 is in the Bibliothèque Jacques Doucet (INHA), Folio Rés. 176.}

A book-length study could be conducted articulating more fully the host of forces both abstract and remarkably concrete whereby authorship was consolidated in eighteenth-century France – not, perhaps, uniquely, definitively or even for the first time, but with a particular vigour crucial for the understanding of painting by the opening of the nineteenth century and the emergence of art history as a discipline. This shift can be located at the intersection of market forces, questions of accessibility (notably the Salon and sales room) and thoroughly abstracted, connoisseurial theory. All of these factors came together to ready painting, in a sense, for the realities of a rapidly expanding, open market for contemporary art in which packaging included an individual author’s name – ideally identified on the work itself through the newly consistent use of the signature. Recent work on Boucher by Katie Scott and Ewa Lajer-Burcharh has pointed precisely to the way in which the artist’s name was, itself, a form of commodity marketable in multiple arenas.\footnote{Scott, ‘Reproduction and Reputation’, 91–132; Lajer-Burcharh, ‘Image Matters’, 277–303; Lajer-Burcharh, 	extit{The Painter’s Touch}.} Scott argues for Huquier’s branding of Boucher’s name in prints, suggesting that it could serve as a kind of ‘shorthand’ (to follow Searle) for a particular visual language and subject matter. In the concise advertisements taken out in the 	extit{Mercure} and elsewhere, ‘François Boucher, peintre du roi’ was a known quantity, albeit one shaped heavily by Huquier. Lajer-Burcharh has taken this position further in order to argue that the internal consistency of Boucher’s language was deliberately developed by the artist himself as a professional strategy for his extremely effective self-dissemination – one might even say infection – across eighteenth-century visual culture.

Where in eighteenth-century France might this consolidation of authorship be compromised? Elsewhere, I have explored the way in which multi-authored works during this period became associated increasingly with the realms of decoration on one hand and the most dangerous effects of large studios on the other.\footnote{David Pullins, ‘Stubbs, Vernet & Boucher Share a Canvas: Workshops, Authorship & the Status of Painting’, 	extit{Journal18}, 1, Spring 2016, unpaginated [http://www.journal18.org/334]; David Pullins, ‘Images as objects: the problem of figural ornament in eighteenth-century} These contexts were those against which fine art actively defined itself and
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contemporary references to decoration and distribution of hands in order to expedite production almost invariably appear as warnings against them. Another context in which authorship was diffused rather than consolidated (almost as a function of the medium) was printmaking, specifically ornamental printmaking. In something of the flipside to Jullienne’s consolidation of Watteau as author, work on Huquier’s transformation of his stable of artists, including Scott on Boucher, Martin Eidelberg on Watteau and Jean-François Bédard on Oppenord, has shown that in the realm of print-making authorial identity could also be broken down as bits and pieces of an artist’s œuvre were packaged for consumption by the market.44

For autonomous paintings executed in oil on canvas – the ostensibly safe purview of fine art – multiple hands take on a particular character that stands somewhat apart from earlier, Flemish iterations of the practice. Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century divisions of the surface were organized above all by specialties by genre between contemporary painters in the same city, which fit with the practical considerations of workshop labour and studio assistance.45 As Anna Tummers argues perceptively in The Eye of the Connoisseur (2011), our current fixation on the fully autograph work may be entirely incompatible with seventeenth-century notions of authorship in which the signature alone might signify a work otherwise untouched by the master or in which a master’s passages of paint over key portions of the canvas were his only mark.46 As a pivotal moment in period understandings of authorship and the acceptability of the shared canvas according to genre specialization, Tummers notes Gérard de Lairesse’s disapproval in his Groot Schilderboek (1707) of specialist assistants, indicating that in fact it was
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better for one artist to execute the entire surface even if he was not equally talented in all the genres of which the composition was composed. Here he prefigures Jean-Baptiste Oudry’s remarks to students at the Académie royale in 1749, even if in practice Oudry ran his large studio according to the expedient methods of this older tradition. Indeed, it is perhaps in the course of the eighteenth-century through such voices as Lairesse’s and Oudry’s that today’s notion of the autograph work with its indexical link to the artist was born.

While these practices continued into the eighteenth century, albeit largely unremarked upon for even leading artists like Oudry and Boucher, favour instead fell to an appreciation of juxtapositions of chronologically or geographically distinct authors on a single canvas. On the whole, from what can be uncovered, the provenance of such works also situates them in circles that prided themselves on connoisseurial skill and familiarity with contemporary French painting: either among artists (who were often called upon as legal experts or might exchange such paintings as marks of friendship) or collectors (notably those shaping a French school). In these milieux, it seems that the presence of multiple hands did not confuse authorship but could actually function in order to draw out their individual consolidation. Opposition rather than overlap could shape identity. As outlined in depth by Melissa Percival, in the language of eighteenth-century French connoisseurs and collectors this kind of juxtaposition pivoted on a cultural appreciation for pastiche. Like the period’s broader fascination with masquerade

48 Jean-Baptiste Oudry, ‘Réflexions sur la manière d’étudier la couleur en comparant les objets les uns avec les autres’ (1749), Le Cabinet de l’Amateur et de l’Antiquaire, 3, 1844, 41.
50 Melissa Percival, Fragonard and the Fantasy Figure. Painting the Imagination, Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012, 91–120. For Fragonard’s sophisticated position in his so-called portraits de fantaisie, see Mary Sheriff, Fragonard: Art and Eroticism, Chicago: University of Chicago, 1990, esp. 169–172.
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(literal and metaphoric), values of pastiche played on the potential to be fooled, but ultimately it relied on recognising reality behind appearance. The mondaine Parisian, like the well-trained connoisseur, operated in this finite space defined by limits in knowledge. As Percival notes, pastiche thus fit into a more general appreciation of painting and, in particular, Marian Hobson’s assertion that interest in artifice was central to the eighteenth-century aesthetic theory.\textsuperscript{51}

The multi-faceted field of multiple hands in eighteenth-century painting is too vast to cover here, though following Percival’s work on pastiche, the ultimate knowledge of distinct hands seems to have been crucial to the derivation of pleasure and, indeed, value for such paintings. In an important article ‘The Beholder as a Work of Art: A Study of the Location of Value in Seventeenth-Century Flemish Painting’ (1995), Elizabeth Honig has drawn this conclusion for the much more pervasive phenomenon of multiple hands in seventeenth-century Antwerp collections.\textsuperscript{52} She describes the performance of the viewer and the participatory game of the multi-authored canvas for connoisseurs as central to their popularity. Much as Honig’s collectors were coming to grips with the development of their own, local school, so too in eighteenth-century France were collectors like La Live de Jully positioning a new set of authors into a larger constellation of proper names, or hands, that related both to a history of art and the realities of the art market. Rochelle Ziskin’s comprehensive study of the comtesse de Verrue’s collection describes examples of pastiche (be it in juxtaposing pendants, multiple hands or one artist feigning another) as a kind of educational game or joke that might elucidate knowledge – or call out the false connoisseur. In this context, Ziskin notes Verrue’s particular fondness of Bon de Boulogne, a painter whom Dezallier described ‘a Proteus in the art of painting, a man who transforms himself into all manners, a painter who knows so perfectly all the different manners that he fools the most able men’.\textsuperscript{53} Among Verrue’s most celebrated paintings were two canvases attributed to Rembrandt, one of which, a Nativity (1640; musée du Louvre), she reportedly had
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copied in order to test visitors. This copy was, according to Dezallier, ‘so beautiful that it fooled all the connoisseurs’. Only Nicolas Lancret – himself a regular contributor of fashionable female figures to seventeenth-century kitchen scenes by Willem Kalf – recognised it as a forgery.

Paula Radisich has recently revised our understanding of Jean Siméon Chardin by bringing the insights of Percival and Ziskin to bear on Chardin’s genre subjects, pointing to their deliberate engagement in the games afforded by pastiche and their close relationship to the changing fields of connoisseurship and the art market of his time.

Mariette’s remarkable manuscript essay ‘Sur l’imitation’ (1763) suggests, however, that the joys of pastiche and games of authorship on which it depended were potentially hazardous to the painter who practiced them. In a discussion of the chameleon-like Christian Wilhelm Ernst Dietrich (who mimicked with equal ease Rembrandt, Adriaen van Ostade and Watteau among others) Mariette praised Dietrich’s abilities yet insisted that inspiration from nature would be the key to any lasting fame for this artist.

Describing a visit to Pierre Louis Paul Randon de Boisset’s collection, Mariette noted that his companion, Boucher, agreed that Dietrich was at his best when he practiced his art before nature rather than other painters. In masquerading as others, Dietrich came too close to being a servile copyist of the kind associated with the mercantile Pont Notre-Dame, rather than an intelligent pasticheur who would leave a deliberate authorial gap between his work and that of his model.

Paintings by Boucher in the cabinet of La Live de Jully might serve as one from many possible examples of the practice of shared hands within this world. Though lost today, in the Catalogue historique Mariette describes pendant canvases: ‘A painting by SERVANDONI (…) representing ruins. The figures are by BOUCHER, in the manner of SALVATOR ROSA’ and ‘A painting by SERVANDONI (…) representing ruins. This painting is regarded as one of the most beautiful of this master, & even superior to those of JEAN-PAUL PANINI, Italian, famous architecture painter. The figures of this painting are by LE MOINE’. When catalogued for sale in 1770, they


58 ‘Un tableau de SERVANDONI (…) représentant des ruines. Les figures sont de BOUCHER, dans le goût de SALVATOR ROSE’; ‘Un Tableau de SERVANDONI (…) représentant des ruines. Ce tableau est regardé comme un des plus beaux de ce maître, & supérieur même
were listed under the Italian school, as ‘The ruins of an ancient palace, & other edifices. Servandoni made this painting for the painter among his close friends; one is unable to deny that there is little that can match its beauty. François Le Moine, also a friend of this painter, enriched it with seven figures, which render this painting important’ and ‘Another good painting by Servandoni, made for the owner of this cabinet; it represents ruins; M. Boucher, first painter to the king, placed in it three Roman soldiers. Salvatore Rosa, if he were alive, would be flattered that one would attribute these figures to him’. The dense series of proper names plays a clever relay of artistic influence: Servandoni, providing the Italian ground (the paintings appear for sale under the École d’Italie) to which first François Le Moine and then his pupil, Boucher, contributed. While Servandoni is said to rise to the level of Panini, Boucher operates in the guise of Rosa.

None of these works is known today, but a painting with an anonymous landscape ground that strongly suggests Rosa with figures and cattle attributed to Boucher evokes the kind of game played by such multi-authored surfaces (figure 5). When sold from Auguste-Gabriel Godefroy’s collection in 1785, it was described as ‘A landscape in the manner of Salvatore Rosa’ entirely by Boucher, an attribution followed recently by Patrice Marandel.

As Alexandre Ananoff and others have

d’ouvrages [sic] de JEAN-PAUL PAMINI [sic], Italien, fameux Peintre d’Architecture. Les figures de ce tableau sont de Le MOINE’; ‘Un autre bon tableau de Servandoni, fait pour le propriétaire de ce Cabinet; il représente des Ruines; M. Boucher, premier Peintre du Roi y a placé trois Soldats Romains. Salvatore Rosa, s’il vivait, seroit flatté qu’on les donnat pour être de lui’, Bailey, ed., Ange-Laurent de La Live de Jully [Catalogue historique], 17–18.


Notably, these were the only two paintings by Servandoni owned by La Live de Jully, whose commitment to the contemporary French school is apparent in his ownership of an additional six paintings by Le Moyne (including a Self-portrait) and three paintings by Boucher. La Live de Jully perhaps enjoyed this kind of game played out with the willing participation of Boucher, for he also owned a landscape by the generally leaden Pierre Patel to which Boucher added figures. See Bailey, ed., Ange-Laurent de La Live de Jully [Catalogue historique], 59–60 and Bailey, ed., Ange-Laurent de La Live de Jully [Catalogue raisonné], 25–26 (lot 40). The work is listed in the un-numbered collaborative canvases in Ananoff, François Boucher, vol.2, 327.

Christie’s, New York, 23 October 1998, lot 90.

Jean-Baptiste-Pierre Lebrun, Catalogue de tableaux italiens, flamands, hollandois et francois, dessins, estampes, gouaches, aquarelles, miniatures, émaux, figures en marbre en terre cuite & en
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Figure 5 François Boucher and an anonymous landscape painter, *Mountain landscape with peasants resting*, c. 1735–1740, oil on canvas, 129.5 x 97.2 cm. Private collection.

Figure 6 François Boucher, *Two male figures and a dog*, c. 1735–1740, black and white chalk on paper, 19.3 x 27.4 cm. © St. Petersburg: The State Hermitage Museum.
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Figure 7 Jacques de Lajoüe and François Boucher, *Pastoral landscape with pyramid*, c. 1735–1740, oil on canvas, 80 x 98.7 cm. © Douai: musée de la Chartreuse.

suggested, however, the ground is probably by someone working in the manner of Rosa (if not the master himself) to which Boucher simply added discrete, isolated figures. Indeed, the painting can be read as actually foregrounding a gap left deliberately between the two manners of handling paint that results in an unsettling failure of figure and ground to coalesce.  

63 A drawing for the figures (c. 1730–1735; State Hermitage Museum; figure 6) relates them to Boucher’s interest in Abraham Bloemaert’s figures during the 1730s.  

64 The similar subject matter described in La Live de Jully’s collection suggests such *bambochade* figures with their further ability to evoke a relay of proper names – all the while testimony to Boucher’s time in Italy – was part of the appreciation of those paintings. For a canvas now in Douai, Boucher seems to have supplied figures characteristic of his early period in order to fill out a fantastical landscape of ruins painted by his contemporary, Lajoüe (figure 7). Here the distinction was less clear: Lajoüe’s theatrical language is wholly his own, while Boucher only sings through if the viewer is familiar with his early, rustic figures derived from Bloemaert. Appropriately, then, the painting has gone through

---

63 Ananoff, *François Boucher*, vol.2, 328.  
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a series of attributions from the eighteenth century through the present. Such paintings elicit, then, exactly the kinds of games proposed in Verrue’s circle, a means of staging discussion and, eventually, one-upmanship according not to a blending of identities but actually retaining identities split between discrete hands on a given work. Indeed, it is through the relays of discrete identities that discussion is effectively nuanced and enriched: the actors named here are students and pupils, family relations or schools that, for the well-versed connoisseur, shape themselves, one against the other. As Jean Cailleux convincingly demonstrated, this kind of *pastiche* of multiple hands could even be ingested by a single artist in order to create their own work. Extracting figures from one painter’s composition for use in one’s own was a longstanding practice (employed with particular vigour early in the century by Watteau after artists like Rubens and Veronese) but Cailleux identifies in particular Lajoüe and Hubert Robert’s use of figures by Boucher as staffage in their landscapes.

No singular moment, place or work consolidated authorship in eighteenth-century Europe: obviously, its emergence was halting and unfolded over decades if not at least the full century. A sense of the state of affairs at mid-century on which this foray might conclude, however, is encapsulated in a remarkable, composite object created by Jean-Baptiste Glomy from drawings by Boucher and Edme

65 When sold from the collection of Nicolas-Charles de Silvestre in 1778, it was listed as painted by Boucher only, though in her catalogue raisonné of Lajoüe Marianne Roland Michel reattributed the entire canvas to Lajoüe in 1983. See Marianne Roland Michel, *Lajoüe et l’art rocallle*, Neuilly sur Seine: Arthena, 1984, 202. This contradicted the description of this painting as a collaboration between Boucher and Lajoüe by Ananoff (*François Boucher*, vol.2, 328), a division of hands that seems most convincing and has been recently endorsed by Françoise Joulie and Xavier Salmon. See Xavier Salmon, ed., *Danz ez, embrassez qui vous voudrez: fêtes et plaisirs d’amour au siècle de Madame de Pompadour*, Milan: Cinisello Balsamo, 2015, 166 (no. 94).

66 Jean Cailleux, ‘Robert a pris modèle sur Boucher’, *Connaissance des Arts*, 32, October 1959, 100–106; Jean Cailleux, ‘Personnages de Watteau dans l’œuvre de Lajoüe’, *Bulletin de la Société de l’histoire de l’art français*, 1957, 101–111. Issues that open onto much broader questions of artistic practice and discussed for Lajoüe in Roland Michel, *Lajoüe et l’art rocailile*, 71–78; David Pullins, *Cut & Paste: the Mobile Image from Watteau to Robert*, PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 2016. In most instances this probably was a practical solution (one suggested by Diderot’s chastising of Robert’s figures that would lead this architecture painter to seek out an appropriate figure painter’s repertoire). For the well-versed connoisseur, however, they may also have incited discussion of the way in which one painter had ingested the *œuvre* of another, yet retained on his canvases the ulterior identity in order that it could be detected at a later stage. Through such practices artists could – deliberately or not – build into their works the kinds of games that appealed to connoisseurs. See Christian Michel, *Le ‘célèbre Watteau’*, Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2008, esp. 204–207. As always, of ultimate importance for such readings is the understanding of the social milieu in which a work was first received.
Bouchardon (figure 8).\textsuperscript{67} It brings forth key features of the consolidated author, positioned between the proper names of contemporaries and the legacy of past masters; true to the mondaine milieu of eighteenth-century connoisseurship, it does so with a tongue-in-cheek mode of address reliant on juxtaposition in its own kind of foolery or trompe l’œil that foregrounds Glomy’s professional skills in manipulating paper.\textsuperscript{68} Taking Bouchardon’s drawn frame of a Spirit of Learning holding an unfurled (originally empty) piece of fictive paper or canvas, Glomy neatly inserted an irregularly cut drawing by Boucher depicting a putto drawing a bust, supervised by one of his brethren, who gently guides his hand in a subtle extension of Bouchardon’s allegorical figure just above.\textsuperscript{69} Bouchardon appears to have made his drawing as a frontispiece to the catalogue of the library of Claude

\textsuperscript{67} Sotheby’s, New York, 25 January 2012, lot 63.

\textsuperscript{68} For a full list of references on Glomy, see the updated entry L.1085 in the Lugt Collection database of marks: http://www.marquesdecollections.fr/detail.cfm/marque/7111 (accessed 26 April 2017).

\textsuperscript{69} Engraved by Johann Martin Preissler with alternate title text in Catalogue des livres du cabinet de M. De Boze, Paris: Gabriel Martin, 1754.
Gros de Boze, a member of multiple scholarly societies in Paris and curator of the king’s Cabinet des médailles, in which capacity he knew Bouchardon. As Édouard Kopp has argued, Bouchardon engaged vigorously with this institution as a place of not just economic remuneration but also scholarly development.\(^\text{70}\) Glomy’s Boucher ‘addition’, probably came to Boze, Bouchardon or Glomy himself in the manner of Huquier’s re-use of workshop scraps built up to ready them for the market. Not sufficiently saleable on its own, Boucher’s drawing was here incorporated into Bouchardon’s empty frame and built out to achieve a more complicated composition worthy of a full page. In this context of learning about the arts, \textit{maniera} and tradition, this newly forged object engages playfully with authorship. The larger sheet is signed ‘Bouchardon Fecit. 1738’, while the insert is signed on a portfolio of drawings ‘f. Boucher’. There is little question of the two hands: the concreteness of Bouchardon, famous for building up webs of meticulously executed hatch-marks between strong contour lines, contrasts with Boucher’s more fluid, rippling handling. Figure types, too, diverge between Bouchardon’s typical androgynous youth and Boucher’s typical plump putti. But the overall context is one of learning in the abstract, even learning after the masters if the head being copied is a stand-in for the tradition of drawing after plaster and original antique sculpture. To what degree was this learning merely mimicry? Was it a positioning of oneself in relation to artists past and present? Or, finally, as the bust’s distinctly Boucher-like features suggest, a wholly independent process of self-discovery to reveal what was irreducibly the student-artist’s own all along?

The kind of game that Glomy plays here recalls Boucher’s own, earlier etching for Julienne, his frontispiece to the recueil, \textit{Portrait of Antoine Watteau, after a self-portrait by Antoine Watteau} (1727), in which the artist, holding his \textit{porte-crayon}, fingers a portfolio doubly signed ‘Watteau’ at left and ‘Boucher’ at right, a pairing echoed outside the frame with ‘Watteau pinx.’ and ‘Boucher Sculp.’\(^\text{71}\) As Alastair Laing has recently proposed of the much-attributed drawing from which Boucher’s print derives – first to Watteau, then to Boucher – it is most plausibly by Julienne himself, who led the publication of Watteau’s \textit{œuvre} and as an \textit{amateur} appropriately took up the artist’s celebrated \textit{trois crayons} technique in order to copy a now lost oil painting.\(^\text{72}\) Moraine’s verses printed below the portrait framed Watteau’s authorship

---


\(^{72}\) The drawing also appears in François de Troy’s \textit{Portrait of Jean de Jullienne}, 1722 (Valenciennes: musée des beaux-arts). See Bailey, ”Toute seule elle peut remplir et satisfaire l’attention”, 69–70; Alastair Laing, \textit{Boucher’s Drawings: Who and What were They for?}, New York: The Drawing Institute at The Morgan Library & Museum, 2016, 63–64; Lajer-Burcharz, \textit{The Painter’s Touch}. 

as unique, a far cry from Dietrich. Nature rather than other masters is the timeless source by which he secured his fame: ‘Watteau, par la Nature, orné d’heureux talents / Fut tres [sic] reconnaissant des dons, qu’il reçut d’elle: / Jamais une autre main ne la peignit plus belle, / Et ne la sçut montrer sous des traits si galants’. But the relays of authorship also foreground the multiple discursive frames that tightened around eighteenth-century artists. Far from Nature, in fact, these frames structured juxtapositions and created networks of discrete artistic personalities for which identification – indeed, ‘naming’ – appeared increasingly necessary.
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