Carle and Louis-Michel Van Loo all won under than most competitors: Boucher, Natoire, Pierre, (he was already far older parlement from 1664 might have allowed him to French training, and must have set up was disappointed to have to work as a copyist. a premium). A letter of authority for the miniatures and enamel painter, and there is no doubt made the introduction to Massé: Pierre travel with the marquis de Puysieux to Rome and to Naples, where he remained for four months, returning to Rome 23.III.1736. There, in 1737, he made lost pastels of the exiled James Stuart and his sons (James, comparing the portrait of Prince Charles with Rosalba's, Stuart and his sons (James, comparing the portrait of Prince Charles with Rosalba's, the marquis de Villefranche, 50 livres. Pendant probably after the Liotard, was sent by Edgar to portraits of Charles Edward and Henry, Duke of York were in the collection of Cardinal Silvio Valentino Gonzaga when he died in 1756, but the artist's name was mistranscribed as Liu... and Liotardo in the 1756 and 1760 inventories, and the pair valued at only 20 scudi. Miniature versions survive. Liotard also visited Florence in 1737. In Italy he attracted the attention of William (Pomsonby), Viscount Duncannon (later 2nd Earl of Bessborough), whom he accompanied to the Levant, leaving Naples 3IV.1738. During his four year stay in Constantinople, Liotard was taken up by the British ambassador, Sir Everard Fawkener. He famously adopted Turkish dress, thus providing fuel for numerous artists who seek to explore oriental influences on his art and character. It may be argued that this has distracted attention from his true genius, which is firmly rooted in the tradition of Western European portraiture. This can be seen by the evident similarity of his Turkish portraits to those of his exact contemporary Aved, who never travelled outside Europe (although not often remarked upon; the English paintings of Knapton, Higmore etc. were however made after, or at least consciously of, Liotard). The La Tour pastel of Mehmed Said Pasha has not survived, but the critical interest it and the Aved portrait of the Turkish ambassador received in Paris in 1741/42 indicate how receptive Europeans were to this exoticism. La Tour voyage to Rhodes, 1743 (engraved, 1744) was not the first to portray Europeans in Turkish costume.

In 1743, after a trip to Moldavia, Liotard travelled to Vienna; he met instant success at court, and painted the imperial family. The importance of these images is underlined by the number of repetitions and inevitably copies, but is also indicated by the fact that he retained and engraved for his Traité of 1781 (ex infra) his profile of Maria Theresia. The celebrated Béll Chocolatière, probably painted in Vienna but taken to Venice, so impressed Algarotti that he bought the pastel for the Dresden collection of Friedrich August II. (II.1745: Liotard's receipt for the price of 120 zecchini – about 36 lour d’or – is preserved in a private collection), and later (13.I.1751) described it to Mariette: Ét pigea quast sezn’ ombre in un campo chiauro, e prende il lume da due finestre, la immagine delle quali si rilevrebbe nel bicchiere, tuta lavorata di meze tinte, e di perdimenti di lume insensibili, e di un ammimibile rilievo. Ella esprime una natura per nissi contorno manierato; e tuto che pintura Europea, piacebbe ssonnemente s’ Cinesi medesimi, nimici giurati, come ella sa, dell’ombra. Quanto all’estesa finitezza del lavoro, per recar le molte parole in un, cli c’un Obelino in pastello.

This is a rather curious observation: there is a prominent shadow cast by the figure on the floor and wall, and the Chinese reference is not to do with orientalism. Another near-contemporary assessment (Rihninger 1782) described it as “d’un grande vérité & propéreté de couleur; c’est dommage que les contours sont un peu trop tranchants.” Both critics are simply alluding to Liotard’s distinctive use of bright, uniform light in his works, so much at variance with prevailing approaches to portraiture. A set piece for art students in Dresden, this genre picture spawned a plethora of later copies and reproductions in various media which insinuate a trivialisation of Liotard’s art.

From Venice Liotard returned to Vienna, accompanying the court to Frankfurt for the coronation of Franz I. Stephan in IX.1745. He then moved on to Bayreuth and thence to Darmstadt (where Caroline Luise, g.r., took lessons from him for six weeks). He had returned to Geneva by 1746. A trip to Lyon took place later that year, to stay with his sister Sara, whose husband, François Lavergne, négociant, had settled in Lyon: the 1746 inventory of their daughter Anne as La Liseuse is justly famous. The elder son Jean was also a négociant, while Jacques-Antoine, a banquier, was depicted in the 1752 double portrait called L’Ecriture, shown with a boy sometimes described as Lavergne’s nephew, but identified by the artist as “un laquais” (the braided coat may well be livery; possibly the same boy appears in profile, again with a candle, in another portrait which refers to them a number of times in his correspondence, noting (letter of 8.V.1773) that “un de ces Lavergne... jous parfaitem ent la comédie”, while in a letter to Trudaine

---

Neil Jeffares, Dictionary of pastellists before 1800

Part IV: Named sitters M–R

LIOTARD, Jean-Étienne

Geneva 22.XII.1702–12.VII.1789

Liotard was the youngest son of a marchand tailleur from Montélimar who had settled in Geneva (bourgeois 1701). He initially studied miniature and enamel painting there, and was apprenticed briefly to Daniel Gaudelé (1679–1753, a distant relative through the Mussard family); according to his autobiography he stayed only four months, and already worked in miniature, enamel, and oil pastel (there is no obvious inspiration for pastel in Geneva at the time, and the claim seems improbable). Liotard went to Paris in 1723 and was placed for three years with Jean-Baptiste Massé (q.v.; although usually described as a contract of apprenticeship, the document published by Marandet 2003b in fact one of “allowance”, for three years, with no premium). A letter of authority for the arrangement from Liotard’s father mentions two Genevan engravers with businesses in Paris who no doubt made the introduction to Massé: Pierre Gevray (1679–1759) and Jacques Le Double (1675–1735), who had sublet an apartment from Massé, place Dauphine, six months before. Although resident in Paris, Le Double was a Genevan and continued to pay taxes there; he usually described as a contract of apprenticeship, the document published by Marandet 2003b. It seems that copies were made (although the accounts are not always clear): one of James, probably after the Liotard, was sent by Edgar to the marquis de Villefranche, 50 livres. Pendant portraits of Charles Edward and Henry, Duke of York were in the collection of Cardinal Silvio Valentino Gonzaga when he died in 1756, but the artist’s name was mistranscribed as Liu... and Liotardo in the 1756 and 1760 inventories, and the pair valued at only 20 scudi. Miniature versions survive. Liotard also visited Florence in 1737.

In Italy he attracted the attention of William (Pomsonby), Viscount Duncannon (later 2nd Earl of Bessborough), whom he accompanied to the Levant, leaving Naples 3IV.1738. During his four year stay in Constantinople, Liotard was taken up by the British Ambassador, Sir Everard Fawkener. He famously adopted Turkish dress, thus providing fuel for numerous artists who seek to explore oriental influences on his art and character. It may be argued that this has distracted attention from his true genius, which is firmly rooted in the tradition of Western European portraiture. This can be seen by the evident similarity of his Turkish portraits to those of his exact contemporary Aved, who never travelled outside Europe (although not often remarked upon; the English paintings of Knapton, Higmore etc. were however made after, or at least consciously of, Liotard). The La Tour pastel of Mehmed Said Pasha has not survived, but the critical interest it and the Aved portrait of the Turkish ambassador received in Paris in 1741/42 indicate how receptive Europeans were to this exoticism. La Tour voyage to Rhodes, 1743 (engraved, 1744) was not the first to portray Europeans in Turkish costume.

In 1743, after a trip to Moldavia, Liotard travelled to Vienna; he met instant success at court, and painted the imperial family. The importance of these images is underlined by the number of repetitions and inevitably copies, but is also indicated by the fact that he retained and engraved for his Traité of 1781 (ex infra) his profile of Maria Theresia. The celebrated Béll Chocolatière, probably painted in Vienna but taken to Venice, so impressed Algarotti that he bought the pastel for the Dresden collection of Friedrich August II. (II.1745: Liotard’s receipt for the price of 120 zecchini – about 36 lour d’or – is preserved in a private collection), and later (13.I.1751) described it to Mariette: Ét pigea quast sezn’ ombre in un campo chiauro, e prende il lume da due finestre, la immagine delle quali si rilevrebbe nel bicchiere, tuta lavorata di meze tinte, e di perdimenti di lume insensibili, e di un ammimibile rilievo. Ella esprime una natura per nissi contorno manierato; e tuto che pintura Europea, piacebbe ssonnemente s’ Cinesi medesimi, nimici giurati, come ella sa, dell’ombra. Quanto all’estesa finitezza del lavoro, per recar le molte parole in un, cli c’un Obelino in pastello.

This is a rather curious observation: there is a prominent shadow cast by the figure on the floor and wall, and the Chinese reference is not to do with orientalism. Another near-contemporary assessment (Rihninger 1782) described it as “d’un grande vérité & propéreté de couleur; c’est dommage que les contours sont un peu trop tranchants.” Both critics are simply alluding to Liotard’s distinctive use of bright, uniform light in his works, so much at variance with prevailing approaches to portraiture. A set piece for art students in Dresden, this genre picture spawned a plethora of later copies and reproductions in various media which insinuate a trivialisation of Liotard’s art.

From Venice Liotard returned to Vienna, accompanying the court to Frankfurt for the coronation of Franz I. Stephan in IX.1745. He then moved on to Bayreuth and thence to Darmstadt (where Caroline Luise, g.r., took lessons from him for six weeks). He had returned to Geneva by 1746. A trip to Lyon took place later that year, to stay with his sister Sara, whose husband, François Lavergne, négociant, had settled in Lyon: the 1746 inventory of their daughter Anne as La Liseuse is justly famous. The elder son Jean was also a négociant, while Jacques-Antoine, a banquier, was depicted in the 1752 double portrait called L’Ecriture, shown with a boy sometimes described as Lavergne’s nephew, but identified by the artist as “un laquais” (the braided coat may well be livery; possibly the same boy appears in profile, again with a candle, in another portrait which refers to them a number of times in his correspondence, noting (letter of 8.V.1773) that “un de ces Lavergne... jous parfaitem ent la comédie”, while in a letter to Trudaine...
travelled to Paris in 1749, his wife, Lady Jenima, wrote to him from Wimpole:

I have a command which I wish don't make you repent your offer – your picture by Liotard. After so long an absence, don't you think you may yourself again with interest? Besides if you leave me without some image at last of yourself to comfort me while you are far from me.

(Godber 1966, p. 49). Perhaps Jenima had seen the letter of 7.x.1749 from Daniel Wray to her husband, advising him on things to be done in Paris: “Call in too at Chardin’s, who paints little copies and repetitions of Liotard (but he is the Colonel’s painter), admirable in crayons”, acknowledging however that they were more expensive than British artists like Pond. Several weeks later Wray added: Give me leave to correct a mistake in my last letter. The Crayonist whom I meant to commend (from Hogarth’s testimony) is La Tour. I confounded him with Liotard the Miniature-painter.

In the event, Yorke went to Liotard. His first attempts to get a sitting failed because Liotard “has been so taken up at Versailles!” (23.5.x.1749, new style), but he managed to sit to him between 30. IX. and 7.x.1749 in a portrait (now lost) as he explained to his wife:

He tells me I have a difficult face to hit, and I will not answer that He is a very odd Fellow, & always wears the Turkish Dress with a long Beard w’re Richmond has not. He has a middle. He has lately drawn a very good Picture of Mr Saxe, & is now painting all the Mesdames, but He tells me, the Lady is not his Friend.

Was this a reference to the Dauphine? In the next letter (7.x.1749) he added:

My Picture at Liotard’s is finished, such of my acquaintance as have seen it tell me it is like, but it will not please me, if you are not of the same opinion.

As the case he put it in is too large, I have ordered another, but as that will awate a little delay, I believe it will be the safest to bring it with me.

In a third letter, back in London (14.x.1749), he announced that he “will bring down Liotard with me [to his wife in Bath] that you may compare it with Liotard the Miniature-painter. Hogarth’s testimony) is La Tour. I confounded him with Liotard the Miniature-painter.

This trip may have been the occasion when the portrait of Hyde, later seen by Walpole in Lord Royston’s house, was made. Garrick, a friend of Yorke’s brother Charles, went to see Liotard’s pictures on 13.x.1751 (old style, i.e. 24.vi.1751), and noted that they were “indeed very like” (from which we may infer that he had been so told before), sat for his own on five mornings over the following week during a very short visit to Paris. The result, reflecting the compressed timescale, the use of paper as a support and condition issues, is so different from Liotard’s normal style as to have led some to question the attribution of one of the best documented works in the oeuvre.

Between 1748 and 1753, Liotard purchased a number of annuities, suggesting a certain financial success (e.g. AN MC 17.1XX/426, 3.13.1751, rente voyage sur le roi; v. Marandet 2003b). However he was never admitted to the Académie Royale – perhaps because he was not a member of the Confrérie des Peintres – and so could not profit from the privileges of that institution. Liotard had been a member of the Confrérie des Peintres before he was elected to the Académie de Saint-Luc, he exhibited in 1751 (as “peintre ordinaire du roi”), 1752 (“as peintre du roi, conseiller de l’Académie”) and 1753; one of his pastels was in the Académie’s collection at its dissolution in 1774. (A later fictional account of the arrival of the duchesse d’Orléans during a session in which Liotard was already painting a fermière générale can be dismissed, the source being a “rapport” rather than a document.)

His clientele in Paris was not confined to the French: when Philip Yorke (soon to become Lord Royston, later 2nd Earl of Hardwicke)
appeared in his posthumous sale (11.III.1755, Lot 56). Other curiosities include the Roman cameo-styled pastel profiles of Fawkener and the future Lord Bessborough considered to be derived from Natter’s cameo of the latter (New York, MMA), which they may also owe something to Dassier’s medallion of Montesquieu (1753) and to Rupert Barber’s pastel of Dean Swift, published through engravings from 1753 onwards itself to be said based on Swift’s own cameo ring.

From another notice in the Public advertiser, 13.XII.1755 (repeated 14, 15.II.), we learn that Liotard returned to France in the summer of 1754:

Mr Liotard gives Notice that he is come back to London, chiefly in order to finish some Portraits he had begun before he went to France last summer, and therefore does not intend to make here a longer Stay than will be required for that purpose.

He has brought over a couple of large Conversation Pieces in Crayons of his highest finishing.

He lives in the same house in Golden Square.

Undoubtedly one of the conversation pieces he mentions was Le Déjeuner Lavergne, considered by Reynolds to be apocryphal – Liotard himself mentioned it in his 1760 autobiography as one of his “principaux ouvrages”, together with its pendant, a self-portrait with beard, probably the pastel in Geneva, but perhaps that in the Uffizi or even the enamel in the Royal Collection, one of his wife’s, which might be the pastel in La Chaux-de-Fonds. It is known to have been executed in Lyon in 1745; the other he mentions was no doubt the 1752 L’Ecriture mentioned above. Interestingly this stay in France was not longer than known hitherto. The two pictures (and Duncannon’s 200 guinea price for one of them) are both mentioned in Moreau’s 1762 life of the artist for the Uffizi series.

His celebrity was rapid: writing in The world, 2.1.1755 (and copied as widely as in the Maryland, S.V.1755, Lord Chesterfield, denouncing English women’s overuse of cosmetics, adds: “It is even whispered about town of that excellent English women’s overuse of cosmetics, adds: “It was known by his works in crayons. His likenesses were as exact as possible, and too like to please those who sat for him, than he had great business the first year, and very little the second. Devoid of imagination, and one would think of memory, he could render nothing but what he had seen in his eyes. Freckles, marks of the small-pox, every thing found its place; not so much from fideity, as because he could not conceive the above described thinking that appeared to him. Truth prevailed in all his works, grace in few or none. Nor was there any ease in his outline; but the stiffness of a bust in all his portraits. Thence, through more faithfulness, his heads want air and the softness of flesh so conspicuous in Rosalba’s pictures. Her bodies have a different fault; she gave to men an effect of presence about the breasts; yet her pictures have much more genius.

Elsewhere (Anecdote, 1849, II, p. 429, Isaac Fuller), Walpole comes back to this theme, citing Liotard as “a living instance” of the sterility of artists who “success is, what they see”: “he cannot paint a blue ribbon if a lady is dressed in purple knots.” (It was said of Cezanne that he painted faces as if they were apples.). Maximilian Joseph von Lamberg, in a curious work entitled Mémoire d’un musée de portraits (Geneva, 174, p. 50), described the artist’s problem when required to paint the Princess of Wales “qu’Il ne vit qu’assise dans sa Tribune”, suggesting that he reported to a list of numbered features derived from other works.

Northcote, in his interview with Sir Joshua Reynolds, described Walpole’s passage, adding “His likenesses were very strong, and too like to please those who sat to him; thus he had great employment the first year and very little the second. Devoid of imagination, he could render nothing but what he saw before his eyes… Minuteness prevailed in all his works, grace in none; nor was there any ease in his outlines, but the stiffness of a bust in all his portraits. Thence his heads want air and the softness of flesh.” Reynolds made further remarks in his commonplace book (Hilles 1936, p. 18): those who are not capable of judging for themselves I think might smell something of the Quack from his appearance the long beard [and Turk’s dress which as well] as his behaviour is of [the] very essence of Imposture. a few nights ago some Italians talking about Liotard of the Great Success he met with in England in comparison of what he did in France, one of them opening his Eye with one of his fingers says Gi Francis baroni gi occhi aperti, the French have their eyes open and can see through imposture, with much more good humour than I fear I have shown in this Letter they began to ridicule him, one asld what punishment might be due to any one who should by any means cut off his beard since would deprive him of his support, another said he was like Samson his strength lay in his hair.

The impoverished artist in Hogarth’s 1751 engraving Beer Street “in a truly deplorable plight; at the same time that he carries in his countenance a perfect consciousness of his talents in this creative art” was said to be a caricature of Liotard (John Ireland, Hogarth illustrated, 1806, II, p. 78; repeating Biographical anecdotes of William Hogarth, 1781, p. 115); chronologically improbable, the passage nevertheless reflects contemporary artists’ views of their rival.

Liotard was moved on to Holland in 1755 to join his nephew Jean-Louis Maizonné in Delft. He stayed in Amsterdam (where his brother Daniel-Louis had settled much earlier) and The Hague at least 1758-1759, where he was supposed to marry Marie Fargues, the daughter of a French Protestant merchant living in Amsterdam. (The story of the Mme Liotard’s demand was widely told: even by Voltaire to whom appeared in his 1801 sale; he did own a Rosalba pastel). It is clear too that there was a close personal friendship, both from the fact that François Tronchin was godfather to Liotard’s second daughter Marianne (baptised 10.VIII.1767, 10.VIII.1770-71, 20.VIII.1771, 21.VIII.1771, 31.VII.1772, 23.VII.1772, 7.VII.1773), and again to Vienna (1777-78).

Liotard’s most important connection in Geneva was perhaps François Tronchin, the banker, magistrate, writer and collector whose portrait he painted in 1757. It was followed by numerous other portraits, in pastel or chalk, of members of the Tronchin family who were central to cultural life in Geneva; but curiously, apart from his own portrait and that of his wife, he seems only to have owned one other pastel by Liotard (that of an unknown Mlle de La Croix who he did own a Rosalba pastel). It is clear too that there was a close personal friendship, both from the fact that François Tronchin was godfather to Liotard’s second daughter Marianne (baptised 10.VIII.1767, 10.VIII.1770-71, 20.VIII.1771, 21.VIII.1771, 23.VII.1772, 7.VII.1773), and again to Vienna (1777-78).

Liotard’s portrait of him shows a figure far older than his 34 years. In Geneva c.1765 Liotard took on the 14-year old Louts-Ami Arlaud (a&), his only recorded patron (to whom he owed the portrait of Jeanne Musard). Arlaud’s sister-in-law Jeanne Musard was Arlaud’s first cousin, twice removed; within two years the boy had left for Paris. Another unidentified pastellist, also described as a pupil of Liotard, was several hundred guineas for a pastel portrait made of Rousseau in 1764 but withdrew when his father died (this pastellist cannot have been Arlaud, whose father lived until 1806); Liotard’s offer to step into his pupil’s shoes was deferred by Rousseau, possibly because John Wilkes was to come to him. The pastel which Liotard made of Rousseau in Lyon in 1770 must have been made before Rousseau
left the town on 8.VI.1770. Liotard continued on to Paris, where, on 22.VI.1770, Charles Burney records having dinner with him, Grétry and the abbe Arnaud, but oddly says nothing about the portrait (Burney later adapted Rousseau’s music; his nephew and son-in-law was named Charles Rousseau; Burney’s meeting with Rousseau, on his return from Italy, in a house belonging to an unknown artist’s wife). The Dauphin wished to have a portrait of Voltaire, but apparently the great writer did not agree (cf. 16.VIII.1764 de Grenelle, 13.XI.1770, was the high point of his journey). A further trip to Paris in XI.1770 was undertaken at the explicit command of Madame de Grenelle (then about the Dauphin’s “Amour de l’ame” in full flower; not en vogue, not in male costume). Liotard was at work on the portrait between XI.1770 and III.1771; a version reached Schönbrunn by 7.V.1771 to the disappointment of the Empress; she hoped that a larger, apparently equestrian, portrait would be better, but Mercy appears instead to have supplied one by Kranzinger (q.v.).

It is perhaps surprising that Liotard did not make a surviving portrait of Voltaire, although there are frequent confusions in the literature (e.g. Bayreuth pastellist; de Wy). Perhaps the key to this is found in Graf Zinzendorf’s account of his visit with Liotard and François Tronchin to Voltaire on 8.X.1764; apparently the great writer was not so pleased (what else?) – perhaps his long beard, In 1771 Liotard exhibited his collection in Paris, producing a catalogue of 126 numbers, including both old masters and his own pastels, drawings and miniatures (including an Amour précipité by Liotard after Rosalba). The pastels are listed under EXHIBITIONS, Paris 1773. Admission was at a charge of 24 sols (a policy defended in the introduction). Most of the items were unsold, and reappeared. In 1773 another sale was organised in London, from his own house, as advertised in the R.S.D. de Jumeau’s directeur, 6–9.IV.1773 and other journals:

| Lot | Mr Liotard, at Mr Hériti's, 8. Great Marlborough Street, facing Blenheim-street, opened on Monday last, an Exhibition of Pictures, by the most admired Masters. This Capital Collection may be seen every Day, excepted, from the Hours of Ten till Three, on the same Conditions with those of the Annual Exhibitions of Pictures. NB Descriptive Catalogues may be had on Admittance. |

The following year, Christie’s were instructed for a sale that took place 15–19.IV.1774 (advertised, for example, in the Daily adverstir, 9.VII.1774). Christie’s, Paris 1771 and London 1773 exhibitions (the latter with its two catalogues) with the Cristie’s sale catalogue, a striking feature is the confidence with which his pictures are integrated among the old masters. In a number of cases (e.g. in the list below) we know where the boundaries lie: when is a Titian an original, or when is it a copy by Liotard? An equestrian portrait of Maria Theresia holding the sword of St Stephen (medium unknown, but probably oil) is a good example of showing what it was like at Liotard’s in 1764, and wrote of it as though it was autograph (he also failed to identify the Van Huysem still-lifes); it was exhibited in Paris 1771, no. 33, apparently as autograph (but carefully read, no artist is given); but in London 1773, no. 24, it was by “deux alemans, la tete d’apres Liotard”. At the Christie’s sale, 15.IV.1774, Lot 39 (29 was printed in error), it is under Liotard, as though autograph, but the line ends with a hanging “from”, which presumably refers back to the headline Liotard. Why Liotard would exhibit such a work is hard to understand. Similar uncertainties arise with “une devisse de la tete en pastel, de la jeune portree par Liotard” (R&L p. 14). A portrait of Paul-Germain Great, mentioned in his English advertisement in 1754 and apparently by him, is revealed as a work of “le chevalier [Karel de] Moore” in the liste d’Angiviller (r. 1773).

Liotard was back in Geneva by 23.XI.1774, when Johann Bernoulli (1777, ii, p. 9) encountered him, still wearing Turkish dress. When Sophie von La Roche and a companion visited Liotard in Geneva in 1784 (La Roche 1787, p. 250), she picked out a picture by Rosalba for particular praise (the Diana listed in Liotard’s estate inventory). They were also shown flower and fruit pictures by Van Huysem, as well as Liotard’s pastels, which his companion preferred. By 1785 he attempted unsuccessfully to sell some 53 paintings to d’Angiviller for the French royal collection (the Liotard works on the list, with caustic annotations by the painter J.-B.-M. Pierre, are reproduced under collectors, Liotard, and referred to as liste d’Angiviller 1785 below). A final list which also provides important details is Liotard’s posthumous inventory, the inv. p.m. of 1789.

Liotard worked in a range of media including enamel and oil painting, but it is in his remarkable pastels where his pre-eminence is most evident. As many as 15 self-portraits are known, in various media; the 1744 version hung in the Uffizi during his lifetime “(notre ami Liotard…saute aux yeux avec sa longue barbe”, wrote the traveller Pierre-Augustin Guys in 1776; he owned the famous oil of M. Levet et Mlle Hélène Glavany), while his self-portrait shown at the Royal Academy in 1773 was described by Walpole as “very bold”. From around 1783, he executed a series of extraordinary still lifes in pastel.

His portraits depict his models against plain backgrounds with astonishing directness and a great use of light. The Christ for the Thomassets (1755) is a striking resemblance of his models; a remarkable force, and beauty of tint; with a characteristic lighting; many of his works are highly finished on vellum, leaving a smooth, porcelain effect. Liotard also used paper, perhaps when suitable vellum was not available. In a perhaps a dozen cases (the earliest perhaps Bessborough, 1754, but he was still using the technique in a still-life of 1783) he worked directly on prepared canvas (the technique had been pioneered in 1753 by Reifenstein, who visited Liotard in 1761: Liotard’s recipe for in similar paper, similar, including ground pumice stone and fish-glue, was provided in a manuscript found among his papers). Such preparations, as well as the technique of scraping the smooth surface of vellum instead of drawing on “as rough a side, as that of paper,” are then met with frequent confusions in the cataloguing of his supports: there are numerous discrepancies between R&L and Liotard 2015a, and further rectifications in the list below; there remains the possibility that the thickness of the surface preparation makes it impossible to determine the support visually.

Surprisingly little is known about Liotard’s frames, and work of lesser pastellists, a good many of Liotard’s pastels have been reframed by dealers. Some of the earlier English examples remain in their Kent frames, but the series of portraits in the British royal collection are in the Maratta frames for which payment was included in a 1751 invoice (but without the name of the maker); other pastels from both English trips are in improved frames, while a few are still in various English rocaille frames. Liotard would later portrait Isaac Gosset, and may well have employed him (Gosset owned a chalk self-portrait). His works in Geneva must have been made locally, perhaps a dozen cases (the earliest perhaps Parma in 1754 by Marc Vibert (R&L p. 377; González-Palacios 1996; the invoice for 1436 lire is reproduced, R&L p. 359). But his portrait of Infante. Liotard was in London in 1755 was evidently shipped unframed, as it bears the injunction “Il faut observer quand on metera une bordure au tableau de la fixer avec des vis, a fin qu’il ne reçoive aucun coup de marteau.” (González-Palacios 1996, p. 381).

Liotard is known for his stated abhorrence of visible strokes of pastel: these are not found in nature, and must be eliminated from faithful representations, as he argued in his Traité des principes et des règles de la peinture (1781), which included a print he made after a Dutch master in which he omits the brushstrokes to illustrate this
point-de-touches doctrine. To achieve his highly enamelled finish, Liotard compressed the pastel deeply into the support using the stick itself rather than a conventional stump (as we learn from Caroline Luise's notes; this avoided the inadvertent transfer of colour which can lead to a muddy effect). The pressure altered the reflectivity of the pastel compared with lighter application when coupled with the luminosity of parchment resulted in the very particular appearance of his work.

There is limited information about which supports Liotard used for his pastels, but it is natural to assume that he used Stoupain's pastels (R&L, p. 111), as they were recommended to Caroline Luise. In a letter to her eldest son, 13.X.1778, Mme Liotard indicates that her husband liked "enonce miusos" the made by Stoupain's successor, presumably Helmholdt. The 1772 minutes of the Society of Arts (s. supra) suggests that he may have made pastels himself.

Some of his early portraits (e.g. the series of French royal portraits, but also L’Troc) show highlights made with small, raised dots like gouache (as La Tour used in lace), while other show short impasted strokes made with the wet end of a pastel stick; without chemical analysis it is impossible to say what appears to be gouache is in fact ground pastel mixed with liquid. In a few cases tiny dry highlights may have used lead white.

Liotard's follower's style was no doubt in part the result of his not having been trained in a conventional way: for example, the juxtaposition of the shadowed part of the face of Wilhelmine von Brandenburg-Bayreuth against the darker background broke the basic rule (which La Tour wrote about) requiring just this part of the background to be lightest. Sir Joshua Reynolds said "his pictures are just what ladies do when they paint for amusement" (Northcote 1819, 1, 60), but this concealed a fear of the extraordinary meticulosity and truthfulness of the autodidact's work which Reynolds pejoratively termed "naive", echoing Liotard's own thesis in his Mémoires de France article of 1762: "les qualités les plus agréables et les plus essentielles dans la peinture sont la netteté, la propreté et l'uni". Sinner, on his trip to Geneva c.1781, admired Tronchin's portrait with his Rembrandt; visiting the artist's studio, he observed that Liotard worked "contra la maxim "Finir précieux menant à la faute" (a reference to his three crayons portraits. Antipathy in France was also profound (as v. supra), and it is difficult to know if what appears to be an inadvertent transfer of colour which can lead to a muddy effect. The luminosity of parchment resulted in the very particular appearance of his work.

The influences on his style were often repeatedly mentioned, including his three crayons portraits. Liotard's contemporary, Aved (Salon de 1741), showed short impasted strokes made with the wet end of a pastel stick; without chemical analysis it is impossible to say what appears to be gouache is in fact ground pastel mixed with liquid. In a few cases tiny dry highlights may have used lead white.

Elizabeth Sheraton's style was no doubt in part the result of his not having been trained in a conventional way: for example, the juxtaposition of the shadowed part of the face of Wilhelmine von Brandenburg-Bayreuth against the darker background broke the basic rule (which La Tour wrote about) requiring just this part of the background to be lightest. Sir Joshua Reynolds said "his pictures are just what ladies do when they paint for amusement" (Northcote 1819, 1, 60), but this concealed a fear of the extraordinary meticulosity and truthfulness of the autodidact's work which Reynolds pejoratively termed "naive", echoing Liotard's own thesis in his Mémoires de France article of 1762: "les qualités les plus agréables et les plus essentielles dans la peinture sont la netteté, la propreté et l'uni". Sinner, on his trip to Geneva c.1781, admired Tronchin's portrait with his Rembrandt; visiting the artist's studio, he observed that Liotard worked "contra la maxim "Finir précieux menant à la faute" (a reference to his three crayons portraits. Antipathy in France was also profound (as v. supra), and it is difficult to know if what appears to be an inadvertent transfer of colour which can lead to a muddy effect. The luminosity of parchment resulted in the very particular appearance of his work.
Inference is widely found in the literature); in the London 1773 exhibition, no. 27 – Apollon et Duphné, his earliest pastel – is explicitly described as “un pastel flou”, implying that the other pastels were not. However at least one of the nine pastels at Rochamont listed by Sir William Musgrave in 1785 (BL, Add Ms 6391, f.113r) – Juttin’s catalogue was without condition clauses, while others have disappeared. The Rev. Daniel Lysons (1792) noted “in the breakfast room [at Rochamont] are several [portraits] in crayons of English gentility, principally in Turkish dresses, by Liotard.”

Liottard’s concern with surfaces may however have been at the expense of psychological insight, and it is difficult to see him as the equal of La Tour in these geniuses. Perhaps the real point is that Liotard, reinventing portraiture on his own, adopted a system of showing every part of his surface in strongly and evenly lit detail which simply skipped a century of art history, ignoring the discoveries of the baroque (Wölfflin’s “Unklarheit”), which were part of the collective understanding of all sophisticated French artists. Two centuries later this anachronism no longer shocks in the same way, and modern viewers seem more tolerant of drawing errors than Mrs. Mariette and his contemporaries. Scepticism shocks in the same way, and modern viewers “Unklarheit”), which were part of the collective understanding of all sophisticated French artists. Two centuries later this anachronism no longer shocks in the same way, and modern viewers seem more tolerant of drawing errors than Mrs. Mariette and his contemporaries. Scepticism shocks in the same way, and modern viewers

The definitive catalogue, by Marcel Roethlisberger and Renée Loche (“R&L”), came out in 2008 (Roethlisberger 2014 contains several additions, and a number of further trouvailles are noted here). Catalogue numbers have been added in the form L&R n (references to the earlier, 1788 catalogue summary are given as L&R as; copies and variants are cited by page (R&L p. s). The present state of music in France and Italy 1770


Monographic exhibitions


GÉNÉALOGIES Liottard; COLLECTORS; EXHIBITIONS, Paris 1771, London 1773
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Purification de la Vierge où le velours est prodigué jusqu’au boudoir de ce temps-là. L’abbé de Villiers, auteur du poème de l’art de prêcher, n’aurait pas été dans le cas de fonder ses vers deux de nos peintres fameux en les appelant marchands de drag d’or et du soie.

Anon., Affiches, annonces et avis divers, 1752, p. 27.

Les ouvrages de MM. Liotard Peintre du Roi & Conseiller de l’Académie; l’abbé Concessier; l’abbé Pujos, de S. Aubin; & de plusieurs autres, qu’ils seront trop long de nommer, attirent sur-tout le yeux du Public.

Anon. [DANDRE-BARDON], “Exposition des tableaux de perfection qu’il a rendu précieux, cependant comme il royal, ait porté ce genre de peinture à une telle mesure les différentes distances, on peut dire que le carrière & que peu de personnes sont capables d’en laisser encore derrière lui ceux qui courent la même règne du pastel, qui devient si fort en vogue, annonce la talens des artistes dans ce genre. Ceux qui ont le plus décadence de la peinture à l’huile. Ce triste présage ne tête de Vierge, le portrait de mademoiselle de Paully & M.

Le pastel a paru dans ce Salon avec un avantage jusqu’au bedeau de ce temps-là. L’abbé de Villiers, Connoisseur 1978, no. 1 repr.; Liotard 2002, p. 31 repr. Lit.:


Liotard, dont les principaux morceaux ont été une tête de Vierge, le portrait de mademoiselle de Pauly & le sien propre.

Pastels


Joachimedes 2008, fig. 4; R&L. 128, fig. 212; Williams 2012, fig. 4; Burns & Sautnier 2014, p. 98 repr.; Williams 2014, fig. 68; Koos 2014, p. 154 repr.; Liotard 2015a, fig. 31; Liotard 2018, p. 48 repr. φ


Photo courtesy Museum Oskar Reinhart am Stadtgarten, Winterthur

Photo courtesy Museum Oskar Reinhart am Stadtgarten, Winterthur

Dictionary of pastellists before 1800

Dictionary of pastellists before 1800
Vignier, est. €8–12,000 London, Christie’s, 2.VII.2013, Lot 60 repr., as by Mme Vignier, est. £5–8,000, b/i London, Christie’s, 2.X.2013, Lot 210 repr., est. £2500–4000; London, Christie’s South Kensington, 21.I.2014, Lot 51 repr., est. £1500–2500, £1875; acqu.). Exh.: Liotard 1885, no. 6, as by “Mlle Vigier, petite-fille de Liotard”. Lit.: R&L p. 405, fig. 326; Michael Olding, note in Friends of Stansted summer newsletter 2014


Williams 2012, fig. 5; Koos 2014, p. 158 repr.; Liotard 2015a, fig. 33 φ


J.49.1043 AUTO PORTRAIT, Liotard the painter, in frame and glass (Sir Everard Fawkener; sale p.m., London, Ford, 27.III.1759, Lot 27)

~grav. J. R. Schellenberg. Lit.: R&L. p. 585, fig. 654
~other copies in various media

149.1013 ~version, pstl/pchm, 50x41 (Jean-Jacques Sellon, Geneva, cat. c.1793, no. 36, desc. Revilliod de Muralt; Manderot-Revilliod; Bernard Naeff, Geneva, c.1950; Pc 2008). Exh.: Liotard 2006, no. 39 repr. Lit.: L&K 273 repr.; R&L. 441, fig. 650; Williams 2012, fig. 6 φ

~grav. J. R. Schellenberg. Lit.: R&L. p. 585, fig. 654
~other copies in various media

149.1038 ~version, pstl/pchm, 63.5x51, 1768 (Geneva, mAH, inv. 1827-20, dep.: Bibliothèque de Genève depuis 1843. Louis Odier-Leconte, Geneva; sa veuve; legs 1828). Exh.: Liotard 1886, no. 33; Geneva 1936, no. 7; Geneva 1948, no. 48; Zurich 1978, no. 22. Lit.: Cat. musée Rath 1859, no. 66; L&R 271 repr.; Buyssens 1988, no. 170; Buyssens 2006, pp. 146, 149 repr., Liotard 2006, p. 29 repr.; R&L. 442, fig. 647; Oresko 2010, fig. 1;