

# Neil Jeffares, *Dictionary of pastellists before 1800*

## Online edition

NB: This article is divided into the following pdfs:

- Part I: **Essays and autportraits**
- Part II: **Named sitters A–E**
- Part III: **Named sitters F–L**
- Part IV: **Named sitters M–R**
- Part V: **Named sitters S–Z**
- Part VI: **Unidentified sitters etc.**

Follow the hyperlinks for the remaining sections.

*v.g.* Genealogies, *s.v.* Liotard; Collectors; Exhibitions, Paris 1771, London 1773

### LIOTARD, Jean-Étienne

Geneva 22.XII.1702–12.VI.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 Gardelle (1679–1753, a distant relative through the Mussard family); according to his autobiography he stayed only four months, and already worked in miniature, enamel, oil and pastel (there is no obvious inspiration for the use of pastel in Geneva at the time, and the claim, like others in his autobiography, 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 was in fact one of “allouage”, 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 (1675–1733), who had sublet an apartment from Massé, place Dauphine, six months before. (There is no indication that he encountered his sister’s brother-in-law, Philippe Mialhe de Lavergne, who had been in Paris in 1720.) Although resident in Paris, Le Double was a Genevan and continued to pay taxes there; he was closely associated with Jean Dassier, selling his medals in Paris (*Journal historique et littéraire*, .VI.1724, p. 397). In Massé’s studio Liotard may have seen work by Carriera, Lundberg and Nattier, but his autobiography suggests that he was disappointed to have to work as a copyist.

The following nine years are obscure: Liotard did not complete a traditional French training, and must have set up independently by 1726 (as a pupil of an academician for three years, the decree of parlement from 1664 might have allowed him to do so without admission to a guild, but there is no minute of the grant of the necessary certificate in the procès-verbaux). In 1732 (not 1735 as appears in all sources before corrected here in 2015) he submitted a history painting for the prize competition at the Académie royale, the topic that year being *Le grand prêtre Achimelech remet à David l’épée de Goliath* (he was already far older than most competitors: Boucher, Natoire, Pierre, Carle and Louis-Michel Van Loo all won under the age of 21). His being a Protestant would have been an obstacle to membership, but not an insuperable one (Massé was also a Protestant, but no objection had been raised). (Liotard later – in 1752 – chose to

exhibit a Tête de la Vierge, perhaps an attempt to signal religious flexibility.) But in any case he did not secure a prize with his rather wooden religious piece (to judge from the surviving old photograph; it is unnecessary to postulate Massé’s enmity for this, as Marandet 2003b suggests; Massé valued Liotard’s enamel copy of his self-portrait mentioned in his will): the Académie (*Procès-Verbaux*, 31.VIII.1732) “n’a jugé aucun tableau digne du premier prix”, and awarded a second prize to Parrocel.

Few works survive from this period: enamels and oils outnumber pastels, by far the best of which was his portrait of Jean Dassier, of uncertain date. His curiosity and ambition were evident in the announcement for his prints of Voltaire and Fontenelle in the *Mercur de France* (.VI.1735, pp. 1392f): this claimed that his technique of colour printing was a “genre de peinture [qui] peut avoir la fraîcheur du Pastel et la force et la durée de la Peinture à huile.”

Following his failure in Paris, in 1735 he travelled with the marquis de Puyseux 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, thought Liotard’s “the better likeness”; see the discussion *s.v.* Carriera); the Stuart papers in the English royal archives contain several references, including, in .XII.1737 (White account book, vol. 38)–

Pagati a Liotard 54 zecchini per Tre Ritratti in Pastella del Re, Principe e Duca, et une miniature del Principe:21= 553:10

Later (.IV.1738) there are separate payments to the carpenter and to the gilder:

Pagati a Senti falegname  
Tre cornice p.l. Ritratti del Re Principe e Duca, in  
Marzo 38 72:10  
Pagati a Vasselli indoratore p. aver indorato le de 3  
cornici 39 22:10

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 Valenti Gonzaga when he died in 1756, but the artist’s name was mistranscribed as Liu... and Leonardo 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 (Ponsonby), Viscount Duncannon (later 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Bessborough), whom he accompanied to the Levant, leaving Naples 3.IV.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 doctoral theses which 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, Highmore etc. were however made after, or at least conscious of, Liotard). The La Tour pastel of Mehmed Said Paşa 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 (Richer de Rhodes, engraved 1734) was not the first to portray Europeans in Turkish costume, and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu’s travels would have stimulated British interest in the theme.

In 1743, after a trip to Moldavia, Liotard travelled to Vienna; he met instant success at court (their appetite for pastel may have been whetted by Carriera’s visit 13 years previously), 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 (*v. infra*) his profile of Maria Theresia. The celebrated Belle Chocolatière J49.1342, 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 louis d’or – is preserved in a private collection), and later (13.II.1751) described it to Mariette:

È questa pittura quasi senz’ ombra in un campo chiaro, e prende il lume da due finestre, la immagine delle quali si vede riflessa nel bicchiere, tutta lavorata di mezze tinte, e di perdimenti di lume insensibili, e di un ammirabile rilievo. Ella esprime una natura per niun conto manierata; e tutto che pittura Europea, piacerebbe sommamente a’ Cinesi medesimi, nimici giurati, come ella sa, dell’ombrire. Quanto all’ estrema finitezza del lavoro, per recar le molte parole in una, elle è un Olbenio 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 (Lehninger 1782) described it as “d’une grande vérité & propreté de couleur; c’est dommage que les contours sont un peu trop tranchans.” 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, *q.v.*, 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 by 1733: the 1746 pastel of their daughter Marianne as La Liseuse is justly famous. R&L identified her with a much older sister, Anne (1717–1788), but (as published here in 2023), there was a younger sister Marie-Anne, dite Marianne (1734–1809), a more credible 12 at the time of the picture. The family business was

as bankers, commissaires and négociants en soie, the commodity for which Lyon was celebrated; several sons were active: Jean was the eldest (and was an homme de lettres and officer in the local music society, the Société des beaux-arts), while Jacques-Antoine was probably the one depicted in the 1752 double portrait called L'Écriture, 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 piece [J.49.2441](#)). Voltaire refers to them a number of times in his correspondence, noting (letter of 8.V.1773) that "un de ces Lavergne ... joue parfaitement la comédie", while in a letter to Trudaine (12.IV.1776) he describes his friend Lavergne, "excellent auteur, dit on, dans les comédies de société", who had been gravely ill and had travelled to Nice for a cure. This was Jean but Liotard was also in communication with Jacques-Antoine, who subsequently committed suicide. One of his numerous sisters and a niece appeared in the 1754 pendant, Le Déjeuner Lavergne, made on a subsequent trip (*v. infra*). The abbé Perneti, whom Liotard also portrayed that year, mentioned the artist and "Mrs Lavergne, établis ici, & connus par leurs talens" (*Les Lyonnais dignes de mémoire*, 1757, p. 255). The Swiss traveller Jean-Jacques Juventin also provided described the family's Swiss manners which he contrasted with those of the French: Liotard's pastel retains too a distinctive Swissness.

By 1747 Liotard's fame was such that a treatise on international commerce noted (in connection with Geneva) that "On ne trouveroit que peu de Peintres dans l'Europe qui pourroient l'emporter sur un Liotard dans l'art de Peindre, & de se mettre" (Jean Larue, *La Bibliothèque des jeunes négocians*, Lyon, 1747, p. 521).

By early 1748 he had returned to Paris, this time with a long beard. In an exchange of letters of 9/10.VII.1748 between Coytel and Lenormant de Tournehem, it emerges that Liotard had borrowed La Tour's portrait of Louis XV to copy, and had already kept it for too long. An entry in Joseph Vernet's address book, for "M. Liotard, rue de la Corderie près le Temple à Paris" (Lagrange 1864, p. 437), confirms the address given on the prints he offered of Turkish drawings and portraits of the Austrian rulers (*Mercure*, .IX.1750, p. 153f). Soon after, Maurice de Saxe (Friedrich August's coeval half-brother) introduced him at court; the duc de Luynes recorded (.X.1749): "Sa Majesté entra chez Madame la Dauphine où on lui fit voir les portraits par le nommé Liotard, peintre habile... Il a peint Madame Infante, Mesdames toutes trois et l'infante Isabelle...il a fait aussi un portrait de Madame la Dauphine, mais qu'il n'a pas réussi." (Confusions among the various portraits of Mesdames abound.) This passage confirms the account in Liotard's autobiography of the involvement of the Dauphine (Maurice de Saxe's niece); the subsequent progression to Turin of eight of the pastels and the issue of copies and repetitions remains confused. It is notable that the Stupinigi version of Louis XV is quite different in technique from the remainder of the group (although the composition is entirely typical): on paper (the others all on parchment), the execution is far more French, no doubt because Liotard copied it from the lost pastel by La Tour that he borrowed in early 1748. Several versions of the portrait of the duc de Chartres seems to have been made, and relate to full length portraits associated with Nattier's workshop; the version engraved by Vispré shows

the duc wearing the same coat as the pastel of the dauphin. The royal portraits were priced between 300 and 360 livres (one at 800), far lower than La Tour but typical of Parisian rates for ordinary portraitists at the time. (Indeed three miniature copies of Liotard's royal portraits made by Le Brun were invoiced for 900 livres.) A receipt for the balance of 1980 livres for "dix portraits de la famille Royale que j'ay livré à Madame de Beringham", received from Monsieur Bonnet (evidently Claude Bonnet (1711–1772), trésorier du duc de Parme, who later supplied pastels for Isabelle de Bourbon-Parme), signed by Liotard in Paris, 1.VI.1751 (collection Santarelli, XCII) is not widely reported (Eugène Müntz, *Courrier de l'art*, VI, 1886, p. 298). Mme de Beringhen was no doubt the wife of the premier écuyer du roi. This suggests that the Stupinigi versions were commissioned as a group.

On 29.I.1750 Liotard used the title "peintre du roi" when he was witness to a marriage contract (of one Nicolas-Sylvain Petitjean, sieur d'Arzillières, ancien directeur des Aides, receveur des octrois de Calais, and Marie Robert Mamielle or Mamiet: AN MC XXVIII/315). Admitted 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 "rapsodie sans valeur".)

His clientèle in Paris was not confined to the French: Augustus Hervey, later Earl of Bristol, sat to him in Paris, probably for a miniature, noting that "tho' the likeness he took looked well, yet I think him no painter... I gave 16 louis for a small picture of me" (.I.1750); three months later, he and Mme Caze sat for Liotard "for three hours almost every morning and had our pictures done over and over again for each other" (*Journal*, 1954, pp. 97, 101, 107). When Philip Yorke (soon to become Lord Royston, later 2nd Earl of Hardwicke) travelled to Paris in 1749, his wife, Lady Jemima, 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 owe me yourself again with interest? Besides if you leave me without some image at least of yourself to comfort me while you are far from me.

(Godber 1968, p. 49). Perhaps Jemima had seen the letter of 7.IX.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 pieces of common-life, and upon 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.IX.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, & I will not answer that He will succeed better than others, but It shall not be my fault if He does not. He is a very odd Fellow, & always wears the Turkish Dress with a long Beard w<sup>ch</sup> reaches down to his middle. He has lately

drawn a very good Picture of Ml 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 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 w<sup>th</sup> the Original" (Bedfordshire and Luton Archives, L30/9/113/26,28,30, signalled by Natasha Simanova, 2020).

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.VI.1751 [old style, i.e. 24.VI.1751], and noting 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 œuvre.

Between 1748 and 1757 Liotard purchased a number of annuities, suggesting a certain financial success (e.g. AN MC ET/LXII/426, 3.XII.1751, rente viagère sur le roi; *v. Marandet* 2003b). However he was never admitted to the Académie royale: Mariette, the abbé Le Blanc, Cochin and Pierre were unanimous in despising his work (*v. infra*). The exhibitions of the Académie de Saint-Luc did not receive the same critical attention as those of the Académie royale; the single anonymous critic of the 1751 exhibition noted the "respectables portraits de M. Liotard", and while both 1752 critiques mentioned him, that in the *Affiches* preferred to lavish praise on Louis Vigée. Saint-Yves (1748, p. 114) however lamented the absence from the Louvre exhibitions at least of Liotard's enamels, an art which the French had allowed to die since Petitot brought it to perfection, and which "M. Liotard vient de nous rendre. Pourquoi le Public est il privé du plaisir d'en voir les ouvrages au Salon?"

In 1753, perhaps at the invitation of Duncannon (although Northcote says that it was Sir Everard Fawkener who persuaded him to come), he travelled to London, where he stayed for two years. Although Walpole records his arrival in London (letter to Sir Horace Mann of 5.III.1753), it has hitherto (until 2014; Jeffares 2015b) escaped attention that he was presented to the royal family almost immediately, but there can be no doubt of the identity of the artist described in this notice in *Old England's journal*, 31.III.1753:

This Week a Turkish Gentleman, lately arrived here, who is very eminent in Portrait Painting, and known to Sir Everard Faulkner in Turkey, was introduced to his Royal Highness the Duke of Cumberland, and graciously received. This gentleman is dressed in the Habit of his Country, and remarkable by his Beard being long, curiously sharpened and curled.

(Fawkener had been appointed secretary to the Duke of Cumberland in 1745). By 5.VI.1753 Sir Joshua Reynolds reported to Joseph Wilton that "Liotard is here and has vast business at 25 Guineas a head in crayons" (the figure is confirmed by a payment of 25 gns that month

for J.49.1417); much cited, the comment was from a 29-year old about a much older artist rather than an immediate rival (for Reynolds's later views *v. infra*). It was no doubt Liotard's stock which was advertised in the *Public advertiser*, 21.XI.1753–

*To be Seen, at Two Shillings a-piece*

At the House next Door to Monsieur Leotard's, the Golden Head, in Golden-square.

A Collection of PORTRAITS in crayons, most of them Originals.

A longer advertisement appeared in the *Public advertiser*, 11.I.1754 (repeated the following day), significantly addressed–

To the CURIOUS

The Eagerness which the Public expresses, to see Mr LIOTARD's Performances, engages him not to neglect any Thing that can give the Curious some farther Satisfaction; consequently he has added to his Works an original Picture of the Czar Peter the Great, done from the Life, while he was in Holland; a Picture of the Empress Queen on Horseback, dressed as she was at her Coronation at Presbury, as Queen of Hungary; an Original Drawing of the last Pope; another Original Drawing of the famous Achmet Pacha, Count de Bonneval, and several other Drawings of Turkish Figures, all done from the Life at Constantinople.

☞ His Friends are welcome to see the Paintings gratis.

(For Liotard as dealer, *v. infra*.) Soon after another advertisement appeared in the same journal (28.II.1754, repeated 1, 2.III.):

The Three Graces, drawn at Rome by Mr Liotard, after the Antique Marble Group in the Prince Borghese's Villa and coloured here after Life, are to be seen with his other Paintings at the Two Yellow Lamps in Golden Square.

(The enamellist Jean-Adam Serre, "Portrait Painter to the Empress Queen", also advertised from the same address in the *Public advertiser*, 15.XII.1753 and the two following weeks, offering his *Essais sur les principes de l'harmonie* as well as his miniatures of the Austrian and French royal families, Mme de Pompadour, Fontenelle, Crébillon etc.; although it is generally assumed that Serre copied Liotard, a note in a letter from Fontenelle to Vernet of 16.VII.1750 reveals that Serre had just painted the author from life.)

Among his customers was the celebrated connoisseur Dr Richard Mead, who owned a Liotard miniature of Maria Theresia which appeared in his posthumous sale (11.III.1755, Lot 56). Other curiosities include the Roman cameo-styled pastel profiles of Fawkenner and the future Lord Bessborough: considered to be derived from Natter's cameo of the latter (New York, MMA), they may also owe something to Dassier's medallion of Montesquiou (1753) and to Rupert Barber's pastel of Dean Swift, publicised through engravings from 1751 on and itself said to be based on Swift's own cameo ring.

From another notice in the *Public advertiser*, 13.III.1755 (repeated 14, 15.III.) 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 many to be his masterpiece – Liotard himself mentioned it in his 1760 autobiographie 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, and one of his wife, which might be the pastel in La Chau-de-Fonds. Le Déjeuner Lavergne is known to have been executed in Lyon in 1754; the other he mentions was no doubt the 1752 L'Écriture mentioned above. If the latter may be described as "tout imprégné de rêverie mélancolique", the impassivity of the female faces on the pendant shifts our attention onto the still life on the lacquer table. Evidently this stay in France was rather longer than known hitherto. The two pictures (and the 200 guinea price for one of them) are both mentioned in Moücke's 1762 life of the artist for the Uffizi series.

The Earl of Cork and Orrery, in a letter from Italy of 30.X.1754 published in the *Gentleman's magazine*, .XI.1773, p. 681, "I smiled to see *Liotard* there [the the Uffizi], in his *Turkish* habit; a dress which has imposed upon many English christians, who thought him an excellent painter, because he appeared to be a *Turk*. He has exhibited himself in crayons, and in remarkable disproportion."

His celebrity was rapid: writing in *The world*, 2.I.1755 (and copied as widely as in the *Maryland gazette*, 8.V.1755), Lord Chesterfield, denouncing English women's overuse of cosmetics, adds: "It is even whispered about town of that excellent artist, Mr Liotard, that he lately refused a fine woman to draw her picture, alledging, that he never copied any body's works but his own and GOD ALMIGHTY'S." It seems likely that Dr Johnson had Liotard in mind when he referred to hearing "every day of a wonderful performer in crayons and miniature" (*The Idler*, 64, 7.VII.1759).

Liotard was commissioned by Augusta, Princess of Wales to make a series of pastels of the royal family (still in the Royal Collection). Bubb Dodington's diary records that Augusta was sitting to Liotard on 14.II.1754; a receipted invoice, dated 15.VIII.1755, shows that four of these pastels (including frames and glass) cost 108 guineas (three miniatures and a frame were mentioned in addition in the invoice: Royal Archives Add. MS 55448). Lord Duncannon paid 200 guineas for the Déjeuner Lavergne, the highest price Liotard received in his lifetime (roughly £40,000 in 2015 value; four times the price of the Chocolatière). He is estimated to have made between £6000 and £7000 in London in a single year (somewhat improbably, as this would imply several hundred portraits): the unnamed indignant English artist reported by Whitley (without reference) added "when at the same time we had a Cotes who in crayon painting infinitely excelled him." John Shebbeare made the same comparison, but with Soldi, in his 1756 attack on the unnamed Liotard (*Letters on the English nation*), where he denounced the English people for measuring "the value of his works by the length of his beard" (the *barba tenus sapientes* principle): "This singularity of dress has given him an air of superiority, and credit of being a singular good painter; he has had double the price of all others; and yet, if it was not for his beard, he would not be a better painter, nay not so good, as many who reside in London." Shebbeare had already attacked Liotard by name in several passages in his 1755 novel *Lydia*: "Prithee, *Ishmael*, does that Beard assist you in your Trade, as it does *Liotard*?" The length of Liotard's beard was sufficiently proverbial to be cited in *The prater* by "Nicholas Babbie" [Edward Long], 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1757 (p. 160).

Walpole (who privately admitted to Henry Fox that he found the artist "very tedious" –

letter, 20.VIII.1753) provided an English view (*Anecdotes*, 1888, III, p. 28f):

He painted admirably well in miniature, and finely in enamel, though he seldom practised it. But he is best known by his works in crayons. His likenesses were as exact as possible, and too like to please those who sat for him; thus 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 saw before his eyes. Freckles, marks of the small-pox, every thing found its place; not so much from fidelity, as because he could not conceive the absence of any thing 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, though more faithful to a likeness, 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 effeminate protuberance about the breasts; yet her pictures have much more genius.

Elsewhere (*Anecdotes*, 1849, II, p. 429, Isaac Fuller), Walpole comes back to this theme, citing Liotard as "a living instance" of the sterility of artists who "succeed only in what they see": "he cannot paint a blue ribband if a lady is dressed in purple knots." (It was said of Cézanne that he painted faces as if they were apples.) Maximilian Joseph von Lamberg, in a curious work entitled *Mémorial d'un mondain* (1774, 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 resorted to a list of numbered features derived from other works. Northcote, no doubt reflecting Sir Joshua Reynolds's views, repeated 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 Gli Francesi hanno gli 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 begun to ridicule him, one ask'd what punishment might be due to any one who should by any means cut off his beard since twould deprive him of his support, another said he was like Samson his strength lay in his hair.

The same theme was taken up in the anonymous review (W. T. Whitley suggested it was by Joseph Moser, nephew of the enamelist George Michael Moser) of Northcote that appeared in *The European magazine* (.XI.1813, p. 425, fn):

As a portrait painter, he had all the minute discrimination of *Demer*, without one atom of his spirit.... We can remember, that he was astomished at the historical enamels of *Moser*; but we do not recollect, that that gentleman ever expressed the smallest astonishment at the pictures of *Liotard*.

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 moved on to Holland in 1755 to join his nephew Jean-Louis Maizonnet in Delft. He stayed in Amsterdam (where his brother Daniel-Louis had settled much earlier) and was in The Hague in 1755 when he was admitted to the Confrerie Pictura, as recorded by Pieter Terwesten in 1776 (the transcription in Grijzenhout 1985a is incomplete):

No. 242. J. Liotard, Geboortig van Geneve, alwaar hij zeeker ook de Kunst geleerd had, dog heeft zig veele Jaaren te Constantinopelen met de Juweel-Negotie beezig en opgehouden, terwijl hij echter ook verder de Kunst voortzette en zich daar in oeffende; Schilderde niet alleen zeer uitvoerig portretten en Moderne Stukjes, maar daar hij wel het meeste een naam meede maakte was, dat hij ook zeer uitvoerig portretten Craijnonneerden, zooals ook diverse bliken daar van zoo hier als elders nog voorhanden zijn; Vervolgens zich zoo hier, als te Delft een geruimen tydt opgehouden hebbende, is, niettemin hij altoos alseen Türck gekloeding, met een Tülband op zijn hoofd, en een zeer lange baard hadt, echter, na alvorens zijn baard te hebben doen afscheeren, nog met een Jonge Juffrouw, een Nicht van, en woon eende bij den Fransche predikant Maisonnnet te Delft vooernoemt Getrouwt, en is eenigen tijd daar na met dezelve naar zijn geboorte-plaats Geneve vertrokken; dog Anno 1771 andemaal hier weder alleen gekoomen zijnde, heeft toen echter zoo grootenopgank niet als wel eerst gemaakt nog ook niet dat aanzien gehad, en na dan wel een Jaar off Twee weder hier gebleeven te zijn, en zig veel moeitün ter verkoping van des zelfs Kabinet Schilderjen, vrugteloos <nogtans> gemaakt te hebben, is hij eindelijk van hier na London vertrokken, van waar hij (zoo men zegt) in 't laast van 't Jaar 1775. Weder verreejst zoude zijn na zijn Famielle te Geneve: Zijn de het gerügt reets geweest hij op die reijste in 't begin deezes jaars 1776. Subit overleeden zon zijn, echter is zulks niet geconfermieert geworden, en das als abusiff aangemerkt, niettemin het echter zeeker is, hij er oud genoeg toe was, als thans wel in de Zeeventig Jaaren moeetende zijn.

There is a slightly puzzling entry in Pictura's financial register, which normally simply shows the amount paid. Here we get:

De Heer Liotard, constschilder, heft sijn meestergelt betaelt tot 18 glds welke door den Deeken Kint is verrekent mij present.

H. Verschuring, Secretaris

Liotard remained in The Hague until at least 24.VIII.1756, when, as Terwesten noted, he sacrificed his beard 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 Karl Graf Zinzendorf, 3.X.1764: unpublished diaries; the report in the *European magazine*, 1783, p. 272, added a further embellishment, that the beard was deposited in a special box with due ceremony.) In fact of course there is no mention of the beard in the marriage contract, signed 13.VIII.1756, although the "tableaux de peinture et desseins" belonging to the artist were explicitly excluded from the communauté des biens. The banns were read in Amsterdam on 5.VIII.1756 and in Delft two and three days later; the Amsterdam register indicates that a licence was issued on 22.viii.1756; the actual marriage took place in the Waalse Kerk two days later. During his stay in Holland, he made a large number of pastels of Dutch sitters, perhaps introduced by Bentinck, of whom Liotard had drawn a portrait in England the year before.

Liotard returned to Geneva in 1757. There were further trips to Vienna (1762), Paris (VI.1770; XII.1770–71), The Netherlands (1771–73), London (1772–74, during which he travelled to Birmingham in 1773), and again to Vienna

(1777–78). However Catherine the Great's attempts to lure him to St Petersburg were unsuccessful; his letter to prince Dmitri Mikhailovich Galitzin, Russian ambassador in Paris, of 12.III.1763 (Karp 2024) cites the rigours of the Russian winter, but offered to copy one of Empress's portraits and to produce one "qui seroit plus ressemblante et beaucoup mieux peinte; dans toutes les occasions on l'on m'a fait copier des portraits, mes copies ont toujours été plus ressemblantes que les tableaux que je copiois", and boasted in particular his ability to make enamels of 18x15 pouces in size. (Galitzin appears to have owned a chalk drawing by Liotard, of an unidentified comte de Hontvor, which appeared in an 1848 catalogue of one his descendants: v. Karp 2024.) Liotard returned to this in a further letter of 8.III.1769 to an unidentified Russian diplomat (Karp 2024); he had copied "aux deux crayons" an engraving of the Empress, which had been praised as superior to the print; if this met with her approval he asked for a full-length portrait to be sent from which he would make an improvement in oil, pastel or enamel; he again blames the Russian winter and his age as preventing the journey. He took the opportunity to offer his van Huysum and other old masters (v. *infra*), and mentions his enamel with Voltaire in a group copied after Huber, but including his own portrait of Voltaire from life. Neither of these letters is in R&L (they were first published in Karp 2024), but both illuminate Liotard's copying practice. It seems from his letter of 13.VI.1783 to Vergennes's secretary Hennin that he had sent Catherine two fruit pictures in .X.1782 which she had not acknowledged; he also sent another two to Vergennes, and hoped to induce him to commission a portrait, reminding him that he continued to paint portraits in various media, including on porcelain.

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, François Tronchin seems only to have owned one other pastel by Liotard (that of an unknown Mlle de La Croix which 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 at Saint-Pierre), and from a ribald remark about Mme Tronchin Liotard made in the company of Voltaire and others in 1764 (Zinzendorf diaries, 8.X.1764, unpublished). Tronchin also prepared a manuscript catalogue of Liotard's collection of old master pictures (Bibliothèque de Genève, Arch. Tronchin 195). It is likely that while doing this he commissioned the tracing of the Dresden pastel of La belle chocolatière, later owned by Tilanus and now in Geneva.

Tronchin's cousin Théodore, the celebrated physician, attracted a number of important clients to Geneva for his services, and during their enforced leisure in the city many turned to Liotard for their portrait. Thus Mme de Vermenoux and her protégée, Suzanne Curchod; Mme d'Épinay; the future Earl Stanhope; and presumably the Earl of Albemarle whose health was broken by his service in Cuba (English newspapers report his travels to the south of France in the first half of 1768): Liotard's

portrait of him shows a figure far older than his 43 years.

In Geneva c.1765 Liotard took on the 14-year old Louis-Ami Arlaud (*q.v.*), his only recorded apprentice (to whom he was also related: Liotard's sister-in-law Jeanne Mussard 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 involved in attempts to have 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 with 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; he presumably stayed with his nieces, the Mlles Lavergne; and it was at their suggestion that the unhappy sitter during that visit, Pierre-Nicolas Grassot, wrote seven years later to complain about deterioration in the pastel. Liotard continued on to Paris, where correspondence with Bertin (not in R&L; see Vuaflart & Bourin 1910, II, pp. 61f) reveals "son logement rue de Richelieu, vis-à-vis la fontaine, chez la Baronne de Sralhen" from 21.IV.1770 (this must be Hélène-Geneviève Lemau de La Jaisse (1710–1789), widow of Julien, baron Stralenheim, chambellan de l'Électeur palatin). On 22.VI.1770, Charles Burney recorded having dinner with him, Grétry and the abbé Arnaud, but oddly said 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 unnamed pastellist – perhaps Bréa? – in the rue de Grenelle, 13.XII.1770, was the high point of his journey). A further trip to Paris in .XI.1770 was undertaken at the explicit command of Maria Theresa, to paint the Dauphine in full *parure*, not *en négligé*, nor in male costume. Liotard was at work on the portrait between .XII.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.*).

While in Paris, somewhere between the place Vendôme and the rue Saint-Thomas-du-Louvre (where he seems to have been lodging between a luthier and a tobaccoist), Liotard lost a red portfolio with the word Constantinople embellished on the front, containing his passport and other important documents, as well as a miniature of the Dauphine. He advertised in the *Annales, affiches et avis divers* a week later (25.III.1771) offering one louis for its return.

It is perhaps surprising that Liotard did not make a surviving portrait of Voltaire, although there are frequent confusions in the literature (v. *s.n.* Bayreuth pastellist; de Wyl). 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 "parla de son portrait qu'il disoit pas fait pour être peint." Presumably Voltaire relented, as a small chalk drawing (not a pastel), "dessiné d'après nature en 1765", was exhibited by the artist in Paris in 1771 (v. *infra*). This was presumably the work Liotard referred to in his letter of 8.III.1769 (v. *supra*) as having been used in his enamel copy of a Huber scene offered to Catherine the Great.

Liotard's reputation was already sufficient to merit an entry in Pilkington 1770, in which the author concluded that "His colouring in crayon,

enamel and miniature, is equally excellent; with an astonishing force, and beauty of tint; with a striking resemblance of his models; a remarkable roundness and relief; and an exact imitation of life and nature, in all the subjects he painted.”

Although the dates of Liotard’s second trip to London are normally given as 1773–74, we know that he was already in the capital by late 1772 from the minutes of the Society of Arts. Charles Pache had submitted his crayons for approval, and the committee sought views on their merit from the “most eminent” pastellists. The secretary reported on 27.XI.1772 that Liotard, whom he had approached, had not yet had an opportunity to compare the crayons with his own (did he mean ones he made himself, or those he purchased from Stoupan?); but Liotard later issued a certificate (presented to the Society on 4.XII.1772) declaring that “the Crayons of Mr Pache are as good as those of Stoupan, and that the dark Browns are rather more beautiful.”

Mr Henry’s house where Liotard stayed was probably 50 Great Marlborough Street (long since demolished). Among his neighbours were Mrs Thomasset, a Swiss widow who had moved to London c.1749 with at least four of her daughters, and established a school for young ladies. One of the daughters, Hélène, took up embroidery in the manner of Mary Linwood (*q.v.*) and made copies of English and old master pictures, including the Liotard 1773 self-portrait acquired by Bessborough. The Ponsonby family later visited the Thomassetts after their return to Orbe in Switzerland.

Liotard was also a collector–dealer in old masters. In 1761 Reifenstein (*q.v.*) visited his studio on behalf of Caroline Luise von Baden (*q.v.*), producing a list of 17 paintings by mainly Dutch masters from the collection from which the Markgräfin was to choose five; Reifenstein describes his pleasure in Liotard’s praise of his own works. The two flower and fruit still lifes by Jan van Huysum were the pieces that stood out for Zinzendorf when he visited the artist’s studio, 8.X.1764; Liotard had already tried to sell them to Bessborough (letter of 28.VI.1763), and would later offer them to Catherine the Great (1769; *v. supra*). 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 précepteur* by Liotard after Rosalba). The pastels are listed under EXHIBITIONS, Paris 1771. 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 *St James’s chronicle*, 6–9.II.1773 and other journals:

Mr Liotard, at Mr Henry’s, in 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, Sundays 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 15–16.IV.1774 (advertised, for example, in the *Daily advertiser*, 9.IV.1774). Comparing the Paris 1771 and London 1773 exhibitions (the latter with its two catalogues) with the Christie’s sale catalogue, a striking feature is the confidence with which his pictures are integrated among the old masters. In a number of cases it is hard to 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: Zinzendorf saw it at Liotard’s in 1764, and wrote of it as though it was autograph (he also failed to identify the van Huysum 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 allemands, la tête d’après 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 devideuse la tête en pastel, la tête peinte par Liotard” (R&L p. 143). A portrait of Peter the Great, mentioned in his English advertisement in 1754 and apparently by him, is revealed as a work of “le chevalier Moore” [Carel de Moor] in the liste d’Angiviller (*v. infra*, De Moor’s portrait was widely copied, and one in pastel was in a French sale in 1818, but unlikely to be the same).

Liotard was back in Geneva by 23.XI.1774, when Johann Bernoulli (1777, II, p. 9f) encountered him, still wearing Turkish dress. Among the numerous visitors who visited the famous painter was Joseph II., travelling incognito: Mme Liotard’s letter and their son’s journal record the meeting on 14.VII.1777 (R&L p. 636); the *Nouvelles extraordinaires de divers endroits*, 1777, p. 492, also recorded the visit, “où il fit également admirer son affabilité”; this sufficed to persuade the elderly artist to make one further visit to Vienna, absent from Geneva from 14.X.1777 to 16.VI.1778.

When Sophie von La Roche and a companion visited Liotard in Geneva in 1784 (La Roche 1787, p. 230), 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 Huysum, as well as Liotard’s own peaches, which her 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 Premier peintre 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. Levett 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 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 preparing paper similarly, 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 the rough side, have led to persistent 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 remain some cases where the thickness of the surface preparation makes it impossible to determine the support visually).

Surprisingly little is known about Liotard’s frames (the best account is given in a [post](#) on the Frame Blog, 9.I.2016). The payments for the lost Stuart pastels are discussed above. Unlike the 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 similar frames, while a few are still in various English rocaille frames. Liotard would later portray Isaac Gosset, and may well have employed him (Gosset owned a chalk self-portrait of Liotard, included in a sale at Christie’s 11.V.1799, Lot 39). A group of frames for pastels made in Geneva must have been made locally (the smaller Mountstuart; the Winterthur Thellusson pair; Jean Tronchin and his wife and several others): they are in elaborate French-inspired rococo frames with abundant vine decoration. Pictet paid Liotard 120 florins for “mon portrait en crayon y compris le cadre” in 1761 (de Herdt and R&L assume this is the known small chalk drawing rather than a lost pastel). Only for the group in the Stupinigi has the maker been identified: they were made in Parma in 1754 by Marc Vibert (R&L p. 377; González-Palacios 1996; the invoice for 1436 lire is reproduced, p. 359). But the version of Madame Infante made in Lyon in 1755 was evidently shipped unframed, as it bears the injunction “Il faut observer quand on mettera une bordure au tableau de la fixer avec des visses, a fin qu’il ne receive aucun coupe de marteau.” (González-Palacios 1996, p. 381f).

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, and particularly when coupled with the luminosity of parchment resulted in the very particular appearance of his work.

There is limited information about which suppliers Liotard used for his pastels, and it is natural to assume that he used Stoupan’s pastels (R&L, p. 111f), as they were recommended to Caroline Luise. In a letter to her eldest son, 13.X.1778, Mme Liotard indicates that her husband liked “encore mieux” the pastels made by Stoupan’s successor, presumably Helmholdt. The 1772 minutes of the Society of Arts (*v. 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'Écriture*) 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 difficult to know if 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. In others tin white has been detected, probably as an intermediate layer; although Chaperon mentions it, earlier writers did not (Mayer thought it was not a painting pigment at all, as it discolours readily), and it is not known to have been used by other pastellists; Liotard may have learned of it as an enamellist, and hoped its pearly effects could be obtained in pastel. It also indicates that Liotard is likely to have made at least some of his own pastel sticks.

His highly personal 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, I, 60), but this concealed a fear of the extraordinary meticulousness and truthfulness of the autodidact’s work which Reynolds pejoratively termed “neatness”, echoing Liotard’s own thesis in his *Mercur 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 (he thought the composition “plutôt un tableau qu’un portrait”); visiting the artist’s studio, he observed that Liotard was noted for his “fini précieux & la fidélité de l’imitation”, adding “Il fait gloire de ces deux qualités qui sont sans doute bien estimables, mais qui ne suffisent pas pour mettre un homme au rang des grands peintres.”

Antipathy in France was also profound (as Reynolds had observed): for Mariette, “On estima ses pastels pour ce qu’ils valaient; on les trouva secs et faits avec peine; la couleur tirait presque toujours sur celle du pain d’épice; de plus, ses têtes parurent plates et sans rondeur, et si la ressemblance y parut assez bien saisie, on crut reconnaître que cela ne venait que de ce qu’il avait plutôt pris la charge que la véritable forme des traits qu’il imitait.” The abbé Le Blanc wrote to La Tour (8.IV.1751) from Florence, where he had seen Liotard’s self-portrait which he found scandalous, calling the artist a “chianlit” and noting that the pastel was “le plus mauvais qu’il ait fait. Il est plat, plat, plat, trois fois plat, et tout ce qui a jamais existé de plus plat.” Tocqué perhaps expresses most clearly why French connoisseurs reacted thus: in his lecture to the Académie royale in 1750 (Doria 1929b, p. 277), he recommended scrupulous realism in portraiture – but never a minute treatment: “cette sorte de fini, miserable fruit d’un travail où l’intelligence et le goût n’ont aucune part.” Pierre described Liotard as “une espèce de charlatan” (letter to d’Angiviller, 18.V.1785), while Cochin lamented the success of drawings he thought overworked, heavy and unintelligent (“sans esprit”) in a way that would only appeal in England or Germany (*Lettres à un jeune artiste peintre*, [1774], pp. 75f). His use of vellum, and the effects he obtained with it, was itself disapproved of by French connoisseurs:

“Cette sorte de canevas plaît aux personnes qui ont moins le vrai goût de l’art que celui du léché, & qui regardent une propreté froide comme le premier mérite d’une peinture. ... La couleur ... plaît davantage aux mauvais connoisseurs; & c’est, pour les mauvais artistes, un avantage qui n’est point à dédaigner.” (Watelet & Lévêque 1791, p. 709).

Whether in response to criticism of this nature or for other reasons, Liotard often ignored his strictures against visible hatching, even in his early Uffizi self-portrait, where his cheek is modelled by minute but bold strokes in black chalk. Later Liotards occasionally adopt a stiffness of composition that would be deplored in the work of a lesser talent. Indeed many of the earlier works also have indications of such weaknesses in his drawing that would not have been tolerated with a more rigorous training; and because so much of Liotard’s appeal lies in the perfection of his surfaces, these deficiencies can be troublesome and can endanger the hyper-realist programme. Lady Fawkener, for example, is at first sight one of the most beautiful pastels ever made: but her hands are awkwardly modelled and oddly lit. In a number of otherwise flawless pictures, there are often details that do not seem to be as intended: mouths in particular are sometimes disturbingly wrong, the shadows formed apparently with a stump with unpredictable effects (this may well be the result of specific losses – *n. infra*). Other characteristic errors include a tendency to split faces vertically, with the half in shadow occupying a different plane (Lady Anne Conolly; Thellusson; in at least one example, Miss Bacon, with a perspective from a different vanishing point). A predilection for the lost look may have avoided the difficulty seen with the eyes of some sitters. Not all these deficiencies can be attributed to conservation problems or inept restoration; they sit oddly with the many demonstrations of virtuoso draughtsmanship that we see in other works, including his trois crayons portraits.

While Liotard is lauded for his candour and unflinching attention to detail, some of his portraits demonstrate the “mièveté” of which, for example, the Thellusson couple have been accused: in the two versions of these the attention is directed away from the facial expressions to the brilliant still-life of the draperies (the faces however are notably different between the two sets). In a number of other cases Liotard’s clients appear markedly less intelligent than in his contemporaries’ portraits of the same subjects: for example it is difficult to find in either portrait of Mme Necker the intellectual salonnière with whom Gibbon fell in love and whose intelligence sparkles in Duplessis’s hands. Zinzendorf, who saw it in Liotard’s rooms in Vienna when the artist was making a copy in 1778, thought the subject had the air of an “énergumène”; the copy sent to Necker elicited only a polite letter of thanks and modest payment of 25 louis rather than the job Liotard sought for his eldest son. Walpole noted that Marivaux’s “countenance is a mixture of buffoon and villain.”

Compositions were often repeated with only the faces changed: the various portraits of “Lady Coventry”; Milliken–Bute; Northampton–Hawke etc. (One of his late oils, Richard Owen, is derived from a print after Van Dyck with the face taken from a miniature by Richard Crosse.) In the case of “Miss Bacon”, a name taken from a label which may be that of an owner rather than the sitter, the dress is stitch-for-stitch identical to that of Lady Egremont, and the faces so similar that only the condition precludes

reidentifying the sitter with confidence. Liotard experimented constantly with the mise-en-page of his sitters, frequently adding strips to one or more sides of the works (since the support was already mounted, these entailed the addition of battens of wood fixed to the strainer behind the strips). Many of his compositions were far more ambitious than those of contemporary pastellists: they are not always convincing in terms of perspective, nor is the appearance of large areas of empty space entirely successful. (Liotard’s departures from conventional notions of perspective, when they appear in his later still-lives, are often discussed in terms of anticipation of later movements in art. Those from earlier on might perhaps be cited as evidence of his exposure to oriental art; but this seems scarcely credible as a conscious programme in view of his writing – perspective is only discussed in relation to landscapes, but with approbation – and belief that the “ignorant”, or common viewer, was the best judge of art.)

For the composition of the large Lord Mountstuart, Liotard followed the vocabulary of Ramsay’s 1758 portrait of the sitter’s father, probably from Rylands’s 1763 engraving. The influences on the composition of *Mme de Vermeux remerciant Apollon* (1764) perhaps share with Reynolds’s *Lady Sarah Bunbury* (Chicago) earlier *offrandes* by Carle Van Loo, Coytel etc. For subject matter, *La Belle Chocolatière*, which seems so original, was made the same year as Faber published his engraving of Philippe Mercier’s girl with a tea-tray, and owes something to Chardin – as do his later trompe-l’œil and still-lives, although the underglass paintings of the Vispré brothers may not be coincidental (François-Xavier Vispré had engraved a number of Liotard pieces). Numerous portraits (Garrick, Constable and the late self-portrait in numerous versions), with a prominent arm in the foreground, pointing, all make reference to La Tour’s 1737 autoportrait à l’index (which in turn echoes Rosalba’s famous morceau de réception). The interplay of the hands in Lady Fawkener echoes Mme Crozat by Liotard’s contemporary, Aved (Salon de 1741).

Vellum is particularly prone to mould, but Liotard’s self-taught technique (and perhaps his own pastel manufacture, *n. supra*) may be responsible for the other condition issues which affect a large number of his works today. Areas with red lake pigments in particular are often found apparently unfinished, but probably with extensive losses: Chaperon’s treatise warned especially of the need for care in choosing red lake: “rejettez celle qui ne s’attache pas bien au papier.” (1788, p. 38). This was specifically noted in a letter of 17.VI.1777 from Pierre-Nicolas Grassot to Liotard reporting damage to his pastel J.49.1613 executed just seven years previously, where he reported not only pastel falling from the background onto the face and clothing, but also “la chute du pastel des lèvres qui en laissant le velin à découvert et par conséquent trop de blanc”, which thus “altère le dessein et la ressemblance.” It was also noted by Charles Giron in his review of the 1886 Liotard exhibition, discussing one of the self-portraits:

Liotard s’est servi souvent d’une couleur brune-laquée qui lui a joué de mauvais tours; elle n’a pas tenu, ce qui nous explique l’absence d’accents vigoureux dans les bouches et les narines de plusieurs portraits; ce même brun-grenat a été employé dans les ombres de l’habit rouge de son portrait; cette couleur n’ayant pas résisté, les traits d’ombre ont coulé et l’habit s’en est aplati.

Lakes are notorious for fading in light: George III is a well-known example where the



red coat has lost its colour, but both versions (to different degrees) of the portraits of Maurice de Saxe show the fading of the yellow pigment (probably stil-de-grain) accounting for the blue appearance of the green coat of his dragoon regiment. (A mid-nineteenth century pencil copy of the Dresden version by Adolph Menzel is helpfully annotated with the colours; it records the coat as “hell blau”, while the helmet is noted as “grün”.) Some of Liotard’s works may have suffered as a result of being fixed by Jurine (*q.v.*), notably some of those owned by Lord Bessborough: it appears from the much-quoted 28.VI.1763 letter to Bessborough about this that Liotard did not himself fix his pastels (although the opposite inference is widely found in the literature); in the London 1773 exhibition, no. 27 – Apollon et Daphné, his earliest pastel – is explicitly described as “en pastel fixé”, implying that the other pastels were not. However at least one of the nine pastels at Roehampton listed by Sir William Musgrave in 1785 (BL Add MS 6391, ff199–200) made after Jurine’s departure also presents condition issues, while others have disappeared. (The Rev. Daniel Lysons (1792) noted “in the breakfast room [at Roehampton] are several [portraits] in crayons of English gentlemen, principally in Turkish dresses, by Liotard.”) The 1777 Grassot letter cited above also confirms that Liotard had not used any effective form of fixing for his 1770 pastel (presumably by then, if not long before, he had concluded that none was satisfactory).

Liotard’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 this area. 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 Mariette and his contemporaries. Scepticism persisted in France even among critics of the post-Goncourt generation. For Henry de Chennevières (1858–1946), a conservateur at the Louvre, “Ses pastels, tant vantés par ses contemporains et ses compatriotes, n’égalent pas le moindre ouvrage d’un élève de Perronneau” (*Gazette des beaux-arts*, XXIX, 1884, p. 63). Even François Fosca (1928) recognised that the œuvre was uneven, and that Liotard lacked La Tour’s brilliance and Perronneau’s “science des nuances”. Louis Réau (1881–1961) writing (1938c, p. 253) about the differences between French and Germano-Swiss artists, offered this among other examples:

Comparez un pastel émaillé, porcelainé, de Liotard à un pastel velouté de Perronneau...vous devinerez sans erreur possible lequel des deux est l'étranger. Malgré un vernis français prompt à s'écailler, Liotard reste Genevois... Une gaucherie trop appuyée, un idiotisme helvétique... suffisent à [le] dénoncer.

Ratouis de Limay 1946 deplored Liotard’s “coloris doucereux [qui] fait songer à la peinture sur porcelain.” (It was not until 1982 that a pastel by him entered the Louvre.) In 1957 Louis Aragon, discussing the Dresden museum with Jean Cocteau, thought that Liotard was “un peintre absolument pas mis à sa place” (Aragon & Cocteau 1957, p. 135), and the rehabilitation was complete when the Museum of Fine Arts in Houston bought a Liotard for a reported \$12 million. Liotard’s pastels have since consistently

achieved the highest prices in the salerooms and attract museum curators who are normally unenthusiastic about pastel; and the literature devoted to him is far larger than for any other eighteenth century pastellist (and not far short of that of all other pastellists put together). The Liotard brand has proved far stronger than French objections. It is unlikely that users of this *Dictionary* will agree with both parts of the assessment by a curator of the 2015 UK exhibition that Liotard is “the greatest 18<sup>th</sup> century artist whom nobody knows”: since there are roughly 70 Liotard pastels conserved in British collections (many private), the exhibition focused on a pastellist far better known than competitors who are barely if at all represented in the UK.

Inevitably the question of replicas, copies and fakes arises. Despite their extraordinary accuracy, the autograph repetitions (of which there are around 30) do not seem to have been made from tracings (comparisons between versions of pastels such as Lady Tyrell or the Thellussons reveal local accuracy but with more distant spatial relations cumulatively inaccurate). Some autograph repetitions were evidently intended as studio *ricordi*, and were unfinished to a surprising degree. The enamellists Serre, Rouquet and Francis Sykes, who copied Liotard portraits, are not known to have worked in pastel, but others in Liotard’s immediate circle who may have done included Kobler and Schuncko (*q.v.*; might they be the authors of his equestrian portrait of Maria Theresia?). Unlike La Tour, however, Liotard did not create a school or movement: other artists may have reacted against him, but seldom followed him (ignoring the innumerable copyists).

In a different category are Liotard’s copies of his own works made much earlier, examples being the repetition of Mme Necker, also in pastel, and Le Déjeuner Laverne, copied this time in oil. Copying in his later career seems to have developed into an obsessive recreation of minute detail, hoping to improve on the original – even when the work copied as not his own, as he offered to do in his correspondence with Catherine the Great’s ambassadors. That he indicated he could do so in oil, pastel or enamel suggests a surprising flexibility as to medium. Remarkable too, given his disgust with the role of copyist during his time under Massé, was his willingness to follow other masters’ work – whether La Tour’s portrait of Louis XV, Huber’s Voltaire scene, or any portrait of Catherine.

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 R&L *n* (references to the earlier, 1978 summary catalogue are given as L&R *n*); copies and variants are cited by page (R&L p. *x*).

#### Monographic exhibitions

- Liotard 1885: *J.-E. Liotard, te Geneve*, Amsterdam, Groote Gehoortaal, 1885  
 Liotard 1886: *Exposition Jean-Etienne Liotard (1702–1789)*, Geneva, Société des Arts de Genève. Summary printed cat.; more detailed manuscript by A. Revilliod, Société des Arts. Review Giron 1886  
 Liotard 1925: *Liotard*, Geneva, musée d’Art et d’Histoire, 1925. cat. in Baud-Bovy 1925  
 [Liotard 1948: *v.* Paris 1948d; Geneva 1948 (with different exhibits)]  
 Liotard 1978: *Jean-Etienne Liotard, Genf 1702–1789: Sammlung des Musée d’Art et d’Histoire*,

- Genf*, Zurich, Kunsthaus, 16.VI.–24.IX.1978. Cat. Felix Baumann & Romy Storrer  
 Liotard 1985: *Liotard in Nederland*, Centraal Museum, Utrecht, 24.VIII.–13.X.1985. Cat. Frans Grijzenhout  
 Liotard 1992: *Dessins de Liotard*, Geneva, musée d’Art et d’Histoire, 17.VII.–20.IX.1992; Paris, musée du Louvre, 15.X.–14.XII.1992. Cat. Anne de Herdt  
 Liotard 2002a: *Jean-Étienne Liotard 1702–1789 dans les collections des musées d’art et d’histoire de Genève*, 22.V.–27.X.2002. Cat. Claire Stoullig, Isabelle Félicité Bleeker & al.  
 Liotard 2002b: *Jean-Étienne Liotard (1702–1789)*, Rijksmuseum, 2.XI.2002 – 25.V.2003. Cat. Duncan Bull  
 Liotard 2006: *Jean-Étienne Liotard (1702–1789): Swiss master (masterpieces from the musée d’Art et d’Histoire of Geneva and Swiss private collections)*, New York, Frick Collection, 13.VI.–17.IX.2006. Cat. Liotard 2002a, with changes, ed. Colin B. Bailey & al.  
 Liotard 2015a: *Jean-Étienne Liotard*, Edinburgh, Scottish National Gallery, 4.VII.–13.IX.2015; London, Royal Academy of Arts, 24.X.2015 – 31.I.2016. Cat. MaryAnne Stevens & al.  
 Liotard 2015b: *Jean-Étienne Liotard: a cosmopolitan artist*, Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, 20.X.2015 – 24.IV.2016. No cat.; *v.* Jeffares 2015f  
 Liotard 2018: “Das schönste Pastell, das man je gesehen hat.” *Das Schokoladenmädchen von Jean-Etienne Liotard*, Dresden, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, 29.IX.2018 – 6.I.2019. Cat. Roland Enke, Stephan Kojka, Susanne Drexler & al.  
 Liotard 2023: *Discover Liotard and the Laverne family breakfast*, London, National Gallery, 16.XI.2023 – 3.III.2024. Cat. Francesca Whitlum-Cooper

#### Bibliography

- Francesco Algarotti, *Opere scelte*, Milan, 1823, III, p. 166, letter to Mariette, 13.II.1751; Anderson 1994; Apgar 1995; Baker 2023; Baltimore 1984; Bellier de La Chavignerie & Auvray; Bénézit; Breffny 1987; Charles Burney, *The present state of music in France and Italy*, London, 1771, p. 46; *Music, men, and manners in France and Italy 1770*, London, 1969, p. 223; Buysens 1988; Daniel Catton Rich, “A portrait by Liotard”, *Bulletin of the Art Institute of Chicago*, XXX/6, .XI.1936, pp. 73–76; Corp 2011; Darier 1935; Dréolle de Nodion 1856, p. 143; Dumont-Wilden 1909; Fanti 1767; Ford 1989; Fosca 1928; Fosca 1956; Gabburri, *Vite di pittori*, p. 1412-III-C201V; Gielly 1926; Gielly 1933; Gielly 1935; Giron 1886; Grijzenhout 1985a; Grijzenhout 1985b; Guiffrey 1915, pp. 35, 101, 373; Herdt 1993; Herdt 2003; Frederick Whiley Hilles, *The literary career of Sir Joshua Reynolds*, Cambridge, 1936; Hofstetter 2008; Holleczeck 2001; Hugues 2004; Humbert, Revilliod & Tilanus 1897; Jeffares 2009; Jeffares 2015b; Jeffares 2015c; Jeffares 2015f; Jeffares 2015h; Jeffares 2015i; Jeffares 2016a; Jeffares 2022e; Karlsruhe 2015; Kapı 2024; Klingsöhr-Leroy 2002; Koos 2007; Koos 2014; Laing 1992; Laing 2016; Lajer-Burcharth 2003; Lemoine-Bouchard 2008; Liotard 1762; Liotard 1781; Loche 1973; Loche 1976; L&R; Rev. Daniel Lysons, *The environs of London: county of Surrey*, London, 1792, I, p. 433; Manners 1933; Mantz 1854; Marandet 2003b; Mariette 1851–60; Michel 1993; Möücke 1762; Naef 1975; Nagler 1835–52; New York 1999c; New York 2013b; Niculescu 1982; Northcote 1819; Oresko 2010; Oxford DNB; Nicole Parmentier-Lallemand, in Grove 1996; Pappé & al. 2008; Perez 1980; Perez 1997; Pilkington 1770; Previtali 1966; Ratouis de Limay 1946; Reuter 2015; Rigaud

1849, pp. 63–71; Roethlisberger 2001; Roethlisberger 2014; Roethlisberger 2017; R&L; Rosenberg 2007; Russell 2004; Sanchez 2004; Sauvage 2015; Sauvage & Gombaudo 2015; John Shebbeare, *Lydia: or, filial piety*, 1763 ed., III, p. 80; [John Shebbeare]. *Letters on the English nation*, London, 1756, II, pp. 43–45; Sinner 1787, pp. 38, 41; Smentek 2010; Staring 1947; Staring 1948; Staring 1959; Stein 2023; Stuart Wortley 1948; Tarabra 2008, pp. 295ff; Terwesten 1776; Toledo 1975; Trivas 1936a; Trivas 1936b; Trivas 1937; Trivas 1940; Vaillat 1912; Vienna 1980; Walpole 1828, pp. 176ff; Warsaw 2009; Waterhouse 1981; Whitley 1928, I, pp. 268f; Williams 2012; Zinzendorf 2009; Zinzendorf 1764 [ed. H. Watzlawick & G. Klingenstein, forthcoming]

GENEALOGIES [Liotard](#); COLLECTORS; EXHIBITIONS, Paris 1771, London 1773

### Salon critiques

Anon., *Lettre de M. H... à M. P..., son ami en province, au sujet du concours en peinture et sculpture de MM. de l'Académie de Saint-Luc, ouvert dans une salle des Grands-Augustins, à Paris, le 20 février 1751*.

MM. les peintres de portraits, tant à l'huile qu'en pastel, viennent ensuite et font en bonne partie les honneurs de la salle; mais ce qui frappe le plus, ce sont le portrait du Roi et de M<sup>me</sup> la Dauphine, de M<sup>me</sup> Adélaïde et de M<sup>me</sup> Victoire; on y admire, avec un plaisir mêlé de respect, les traits de S. M., la grandeur et la bonté, ses principaux attributs, et ceux de son auguste famille. Ces respectables portraits sont de M. Liotard, de même que *la Charmante Liseuse*. Mais, depuis que j'en suis à l'article des portraits, je ne puis m'empêcher d'observer un avantage qu'on a toujours considéré dans ceux qui sont sortis du pinceau de Rubens, de Vandik et autres fameux peintres. C'est qu'on a eu soin, pour l'habillement des deux sexes, de suivre la mode présente, en sorte que, dans le cours des siècles à venir, on verra avec plaisir de quelle manière nous étions habillés, et notre coiffure, qui n'est point trop chargée d'ornemens inutiles, n'y perdra point du côté de la simple nature. Si on avoit toujours eu cette attention, on ne verroit pas aujourd'hui, dans une maison royale, une *Purification de la Vierge* où le velours est prodigué jusqu'au bedeau de ce temps-là. L'abbé de Villiers, auteur du poème de l'art de prêcher, n'auroit pas été dans le cas de froncer dans ses vers deux de nos peintres fameux en les appellant marchands de drap d'or et de soie.

Anon., "Exposition publique de tableaux & de modèles de sculpture de l'Académie de Saint-Luc", *Journal oconomique*, IV.1751, p. 99:

Les pastels ont été admirés, & l'on a été sur-tout charmé d'une Liseuse & d'une Sultane, qui sont des morceaux achevés pour l'expression & le fini.

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

Les ouvrages de MM. Liotard Peintre du Roi & Conseiller de l'Académie; *Vien* Conseiller; *Vigés*, *Paugin de S. Aubin*; & de plusieurs autres, qu'il seroit trop long de nommer, attirent sur-tout les yeux du Public.

Anon. [DANDRE-BARDON], "Exposition des tableaux de l'Académie de Saint-Luc commencé le 15 mai dans les salles de l' Arsenal", *Journal oconomique*, 1752, p. 78: Le pastel a paru dans ce Salon avec un avantage distingué; mais quoique M. de la Tour, de l'Académie royale, ait porté ce genre de peinture à une telle perfection qu'il l'a rendu précieux, cependant comme il laisse encore derrière lui ceux qui courent la même carrière & que peu de personnes sont capables d'en mesurer les différentes distances, on peut dire que le règne du pastel, qui devient si fort en vogue, annonce la décadence de la peinture à l'huile. Ce triste présage ne nous empêchera pas de rendre la justice qui est due aux talents des artistes dans ce genre. Ceux qui ont le plus mérité les suffrages du public sont,

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

### Pastels

J.49.1001 AUTO PORTRAIT, pstl/ppr gr.-bl., 37.5x25, sd ↓ "Gio:Stefanus Liotard Genevra/fatto da se medesimo l'anno 1737 in Firenze", Florence 1737 (Geneva, mA, inv. 1934-12. Acqu. Francesco Maria Gabburi 1737, Florence. ?London, Christie's, 1848; 7.; Graves, London? Acqu. c.1893 in pawnbroker's shop, City of London, F. William Cock, Well House, Appledore, Kent, 10/- Bernard Naef, Geneva; Louis Dunki, dealer; acqu. 1934, Swfr3800). Exh.: Geneva 1948, no. 3; Zurich 1978, no. 1 repr.; Liotard 2002, p. 31 repr. Lit.: *Connoisseur*, XCII, 1933, p. 38; Loche 1976 repr.; L&R 27 repr.; Buysens 1988, no. 186; Liotard 2006, p. 27 repr.; R&L 36, fig. 34; Williams 2012, fig. 3; Liotard 2015a, fig. 30 φσ



J.49.1003 AUTO PORTRAIT, pstl/pchm, 61x49, sd × "J E Liotard/de Geneve Surnommé/le Peintre Turc peint/par lui meme a/Vienne 1744" (Uffizi, inv. 1980, no. 1936. Franz Stephan, Vienna; sent to the Granduca in Florence a.1753). Exh.: Florence 1977, no. 16 repr.; Milan 2003, no. I.95 repr. cl; Karlsruhe 2015, no. 35 repr., & p. 52. Lit.: Pierre-Augustin Guys, *Voyage littéraire de la Grèce...*, 1776, II, p. 323; Humbert, Revilliod & Tilanus 1897, no. 96 n.r.; Manners 1933, pl. II; Ratouis de Limay 1946, pp. 131f; L&R 72 repr.; Berti 1979, A537 repr. cl; Gregori 1994, no. 795 repr. cl; Holleccek 2001, pl. V; Denk 1998, fig. 96; Holleccek 2001, pl. V; Liotard 2002b, repr. p. 9; Bonfante-Warren 2006, p. 259 repr. cl; Joachimes 2008, fig. 4; R&L 128, fig. 212; Holleccek 2010, fig. 756; Williams 2012, fig. 4; Burns & Saunier 2014, p. 98 repr.; Williams 2014, fig. 68; Koos 2014, p. 154 repr.; Liotard 2015a, fig. 31; Liotard 2018, p. 48 repr.; Liotard 2023, fig. 11; Kapri 2024, p. 12 repr.; Salmon 2024, fig. 422 φσ



Zoomify

Photo su concessione del Ministero dei Beni e le Attività Culturali; reproduction forbidden

~grav. Gregori. Lit.: R&L p. 322, fig. 213

~grav. Joh. Caspar Füssli. Lit.: R&L p. 322, fig. 214  
~cop. Giovanni Arrichetti, 1782. Lit.: Borroni Salvadori 1987, p. 122  
~cop. Carlo Lasinio, 1783. Lit.: Borroni Salvadori 1987, p. 122  
~grav. Carlo Lasinio. Lit.: R&L p. 322, fig. 215  
~cop. Giuseppe Pera, dessin, 1792. Lit.: Borroni Salvadori 1987, p. 122  
~grav. anon. Lit.: R&L p. 322, fig. 216  
~grav. anon. Lit.: R&L p. 322, fig. 216  
~cop. Jean-Jacques de Boissieu, crayon noir, 28.3x17.9, sd "JDB/1784" (Nicos Dhikeos; Paris, Christie's, 16.XII.2005, Lot 87 repr.). Lit.: R&L p. 322 n.r.

J.49.10013 ~cop., pstl, 61x48 (PC 2022)φκ

J.49.1011 AUTO PORTRAIT à la toque moldave, pstl/ppr, 60.5x46.5, inscr. verso "Liotard de Genève/peint par Lui même Surnommé/Le Pintre Turc 1746" (Dresden P159. ?Duc de Richelieu 1747; acqu. a.1765). Exh.: Liotard 2018, no. 14 & p. 17 repr. Lit.: Riedel & Wenzel 1765, p. 243; Hübner 1856, no. 1945; Humbert, Revilliod & Tilanus 1897, no. 95 n.r.; Brieger 1921, p. 100 repr.; Posse 1929, no. P159 repr.; Ratouis de Limay 1946, pl. III/77; L&R 74 repr. cl. pl. XIII; Marx 1992, p. 437 repr.; Denk 1998, fig. 70; Bell 2000, p. 209 repr. cl; de Herdt 2003 repr.; Marx 2005, I, p. 674, II, p. 623, no. 2277; Henning & Marx 2007, pp. 101ff repr.; Koos 2007, fig. 1; Tarabra 2008, p. 295 repr.; R&L 158, fig. 262; Koos 2014, p. 155 repr.; Liotard 2015a, fig. 34; Reuter 2015, fig. 2; Warsaw 2015, p. 57 repr. φσ



~photo repr. (Mme Menard, Bez, Gard). Lit.: L&R 73, as pstl; R&L p. 361 n.r.

J.49.1014 AUTO PORTRAIT à la barbe, pstl/ppr, 97x71, 1751–52, Salon de Saint-Luc 1752, no. 69, Geneva 1789, no. 44 (Geneva, mA, inv. 1843-5. Liotard; legs 1789, Bibliothèque de Genève; dep. 1843). Exh.: Liotard 1886, no. 44; Geneva 1948, no. 17 repr.; Liotard 2002a, p. 27 repr. Lit.: Champney 1891, p. 270 repr.; Humbert, Revilliod & Tilanus 1897, no. 97, repr. frontispiece; V. & L. Adair 1971, p. 126 repr.; Loche 1976; L&R 102 repr. cl. pl. XXIII; Buysens 1988, no. 172; Denk 1998, fig. 71; Holleccek 2001, fig. 3, as pnt; Renard 2003, p. 73 repr. cl; de Herdt 2003, repr.; Liotard 2006, p. 25 repr.; R&L 196, fig. 323; Koos 2014, p. 156 repr.; Liotard 2015a, fig. 3; Liotard 2023, fig. 4; Baker 2023, fig. 2; Brahm 2023, fig. 4 φσ





J.49.1016 ~étude préparatoire/repl., pstl/pchm, 79x62.5 (Winterthur, Museum Oskar Reinhart am Stadtgarten. Rodolphe Dunki, Geneva; acqu. 1946). Exh.: Berlin 1993a, repr. p. 22; Winterthur 2001, no. 16; Karlsruhe 2015, no. 44, repr. p. 76. Lit.: Zelger 1977, p. 228, no. 106; L&R 103 repr.; R&L 197, fig. 324; Sauvage 2015, fig. 5 Φσ



Photo courtesy Christie's

J.49.1023 AUTO PORTRAIT en chapeau rouge, pstl, 46x39, inscr. verso "...Liotard Pinxt", "Liotard par lui meme à 65 ans en 1767", "Monsieur de Liotard fameux/Peintre en Pastel et Email/née à Geneve en 1702." (desc.: famille de Fernex, Turin; Dapples; PC 2024). Lit.: Humbert, Revilliod & Tilanus 1897, s.no. 99 n.r.; L&R 272 n.r.; R&L 443 n.r.φv

J.49.1024 ~repl., pstl/soie, 43.5x37.5, 1768 (Liotard, exh. Paris 1771, no. 25; ?London 1773, no. 73; don: Samuel Voute, Amsterdam, 1778. J. W. R. & C. B. Tilanus, Amsterdam; Laurent Rehous, Geneva, 1934; Jacques Salmanowitz, Geneva, 1978; PC 2008). Lit.: Humbert, Revilliod & Tilanus 1897, s.no. 99 n.r.; Loche 1973; L&R 270 repr.; R&L 440, fig. 649 φ



J.49.1025 ~other version (Sir Ashley Ponsonby, London, 1897). Lit.: Humbert, Revilliod & Tilanus 1897, s.no. 99 n.r.


J.49.10252 ~other version (Lord de Manley, London, 1897). Lit.: Humbert, Revilliod & Tilanus 1897, s.no. 99 n.r.

J.49.1026 ~étude, pierre noire, graphite, crayons bleu et rouge/pchm, 12.1x10.2 (Geneva, mAHI, inv. 1976-334. Liotard. New York, Parke-Bernet, 4.XII.1975, Lot 360 n.r., \$900. Baskett & Day, exh. 16-30.III.1976, no. 1 repr.). Lit.: L&R 269 repr.; Day 2008, pp. 227ff, fig. 61; R&L p. 583, fig. 648 φσ




J.49.1028 ~version, pstl/pchm, 63x51, 1768 (Geneva, mAHI, inv. 1827-20; dep.: Bibliothèque de Genève depuis 1843. Louis Odier-Lecoigne, 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; Humbert,

Revilliod & Tilanus 1897, s.no. 99 n.r.; L&R 271 repr.; Buysens 1988, no. 170; Buysens 2006, pp. 146, 149 repr.; Liotard 2006, p. 29 repr.; R&L 442, fig. 647; Oresko 2010, fig. 1; Williams 2012, fig. 5; Koos 2014, p. 158 repr.; Liotard 2015a, fig. 33 φσ



J.49.103 ~version, pstl/pchm, 50x41 (Jean-Jacques Sellon, Geneva, cat. c.1795, no. 36; desc. Revilliod de Murali; Manderot-Revilliod; Robert Naef 1948; Bernard Naef, Geneva, c.1950; PC 2008). Exh.: Paris 1948d, no. 24; Geneva 1948, no. 40; Liotard 2006, no. 39 repr. Lit.: L&R 273 repr.; R&L 441, fig. 650; Williams 2012, fig. 6 φ



~repl., enamel (Geneva, musée Patek Philippe, inv. E-196). Lit.: R&L 444, fig. 651

~grav. J. R. Schellenberg. Lit.: R&L p. 585, fig. 654

~cop., miniature/ivory, 4.2x3.2 ov. (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Sammlung Habsburg; dep.: Miniaturenkabinett, Hofburg). Exh.: Vienna 1905, no. 564. Lit.: Keil 1999, no. 579 repr.

~other copies in various media

J.49.1035 AUTO PORTRAIT âgé, la main au menton, pstl/ppr, 63.5x51, c.1770-73, Royal Academy 1773, no. 176 (Geneva, mAHI, inv. 1925-5. Lord Bessborough, London, c.1773; ?Roehampton, 1785, Musgrave's lists; desc.: Claude A. C. Ponsonby; London, Christie's, 28.III.1908, Lot 7, 120 gns; Colnaghi; acqu. 1925). Exh.: Liotard 1925; Geneva 1942, p. 24; Geneva 1943, no. 841; Paris 1948d, no. 31; Geneva 1948, no. 52; Liotard 1978, no. 25; Geneva 2007; Geneva 2019. Lit.: Fosca 1956, pl. XIX; Loche 1976; L&R 281 repr.; Buysens 1988, no. 183; Denk 1998, fig. 83; Liotard 2006, p. 32 repr.; R&L 447, fig. 658; Williams 2012, fig. 7; Koos 2014, p. 161 repr.; Liotard 2023, fig. 15 φσ

Photo courtesy Museum Oskar Reinhart am Stadtgarten, Winterthur

J.49.1019 ~variant, pstl/ppr, 68x55 (Rodolphe Dunki, Geneva; B. Naef, Geneva, 1978; PC 2008). Exh.: Liotard 2006, no. 11 repr. Lit.: L&R 104 repr.; Liotard 1992 repr.; R&L 198, fig. 325 φ



J.49.1021 ~cop. Mme Louis Sordet, née Marie-Amélie Vignier (1828-), arrière-petite-fille de l'artiste, pstl, 99x73, XIX<sup>e</sup> (Stansted Park. Desc.: Tilanus, Amsterdam, 23.X.1934, Lot ?1034/?1039. Hausammann, Zurich. PC; Paris, Christie's, 27.XI.2002, Lot 212 repr., attr. Mme 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 Φκσ



- ~étude, dessin (Geneva, mAHI, inv. 1960-32).  
Lit.: Denk 1998, fig. 84; Debric & Salmon  
2000, p. 61, ill. 23; Liotard 2006, p. 33 repr.;  
R&L p. 589, fig. 659
- ~grav. Liotard. Lit.: Baltimore 1984, repr.
- ~cop. Hélène-Louise Thomasset, needlework,  
64x52 [c.1773] (Vevey, musée Jenisch). Lit.:  
R&L p. 590, fig. 660; Jeffares 2016e
- J.49.1042 AUTO PORTRAIT, [??]crayons, in a large  
square shagreen case [gch./pshm, 4.2x3.8]  
(Farmington, Lewis Walpole Library. Mrs  
Delany; left in her will of 22.II.1778 to  
Duchess of Portland, who died before the  
testator; legs by codicil, .VII.1785: Horace  
Walpole; Strawberry Hill sale, 10.V.1842;  
Forster, for R. R. Preston. London, Phillips,  
12.VII.1949, Lot 9, £78; Sabin; acqu. Lewis  
1954, £85). Exh.: New Haven 2009, no. 164,  
fig. 342. Lit.: R&L 445, fig. 656; Jeffares 2009;  
Koons 2014, p. 157 repr.
- 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)