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GENEALOGY: Huber

In 1772, just a few years before his death, the German engraver Georg Friedrich Schmidt decided to engrave a second of the self-portraits of his great friend, Maurice-Quentin de La Tour. Schmidt had worked closely with La Tour during his six years in Paris, and he
presented his engraving of La Tour’s first self-portrait (shown in the Salon de 1737) when he was agréé to the Académie royale in 1742. La Tour had reciprocated, rising (as he typically did with portraits of his closest friends) to one of the gorgeous pastel which melted the heart of André Gide when he saw it at the Cronier sale in 1905: “poussé, traqué, réduit aux abois avec quelle intelligence, quel amour! L’émotion me prenait à la gorge à contempler cette œuvre admirable.”

This time Schmidt drew on a slightly later self-portrait – the “petit Buste de l’Auteur, ayant le bord de son chapeau rabattu” which La Tour exhibited in the salon of 1742 – which is now lost, so his preliminary sanguine drawing (now in Saint-Quentin, fig. 1) and the resulting print (fig. 2) offer particularly valuable information about another great work in La Tour’s career. As one critic put it,1 “le Peintre s’est si bien représenté lui-même, qu’en regardant son portrait on évite de le louer trop, de peur de louer l’original en face, & de blesser sa modestie.”

The sanguine shows a considerable amount of detail, not only of the work it celebrates, but of the accessories in the foreground, the books and papers which await only the lettering that can only be added directly to the plate since it reverses. But there are changes to the background: one apparently minor addition to the top right of the print is the lower part of an otherwise undelineated picture, ambiguously suggesting the interior of either a salon or a studio. On the other side, however, hanging much lower, is La Tour’s celebrated pastel of his friend, the abbé Huber. This then we presume is the artist’s studio, and here is supposedly the version of the pastel which La Tour kept with him till his death. In his 1768 will, he bequeathed it to the sitter’s nephew, the soldier and amateur pastellist Jean Huber (1721–1786), “qui a tant de talens différents”, while in the 1784 version it is to go to Baron Daniel d’Hogguer in Hamburg.) It differs from the version given to Huber himself (and now in Geneva) primarily in the absence from its own background wall of a framed picture: although more heavily foreshortened in the Geneva pastel than in Schmidt’s print, the Louis XV swept frame (of the very latest fashion) is the same. Schmidt’s self-referential game would sit happily in Les Faux-Monnayeurs, and doubtless further amuse André Gide.

But if we look more closely at the detail on the left of the print (fig. 3), we note that Schmidt has made one further alteration: instead of being fixed on the book he is reading, the abbé’s eyes are raised, to look at—and perhaps after—La Tour himself. This is no random selection: Schmidt has chosen a work La Tour exhibited in the same salon as his oval self-portrait, but eschewing the drama of Dumont le romain jouant de la guitare, the bravura of the présidente de Rieux en habit de balle or the quieter beauty of Mlle Salé, “habillée comme elle est chez elle”, he elects a bibliophile, hunch-backed priest to preside over his friend. That merits deeper enquiry.

Fortunately there are a number of biographical studies covering various aspects of the man Smollett called the “little French abbé, a man of humour, wit and learning” who nevertheless perpetrated “an unparalleled piece of treachery” recounted in the pages of Peregrine Pickle.

The abbé Jean-Jacques-Clément Huber (1699–1744) was in fact Swiss, born into an important family of Protestant merchants and bankers. His father, also christened Jean-Jacques, was a Genevan négociant who had set up also in Lyon. In 1691 he married Anne-Catherine Calandrini, daughter of the recteur de l’Académie de Calvin and his wife, the niece of the mathematician and associate of Newton, Nicolas Fatio de Duillier. Huber’s elder brother Jacob (1692–1750) was linked with John Law, and in 1719 married the daughter of Jean Vasserot, a prominent Amsterdam banker; her expectations were far greater than the immediate cash dowry of 120,000 livres reported disparagingly by her uncle François Calandrini in his diary. Jacob’s son, Jean Huber (1721–1786), was the amateur pastellist who became obsessed with painting Voltaire. Two of the abbé’s sisters were the theologian, Marie Huber, and Andrienne, Mme Cannac d’Hauteville, who wrote mystical works. Perhaps in reaction to this atmosphere, the young Jean-Jacques rebelled and “ayant fait diverses friponneries chez son père” was imprisoned in a “maison de correction”. After 15 months he escaped, fled to Turin, converted to Catholicism, taking the additional name Clément (that of the current pope), and obtained a degree in theology. The convert was welcomed and he was taken up by Germain-Louis Chauvelin (1685–1762), soon to become garde des sceaux and foreign minister (replacing Rosalba’s great patron, Fleuriau de Morville), and by his wife, née Anne Cahouet de Beauvain (1695–1758), to whom the diminutive Huber was described as “abbé du boudoir”.

By 1725 Huber had joined the retinue of the bishop of Strasbourg and grand aumônier de France, cardinal Armand-Gaston-Maximilien de Rohan (1674–1749). Chauvelin sent him on

---

2 One should not confuse this with the earlier autoportrait “à l’index”: although one anecdote also links Huber to it, suggesting that the mirth arose from a practical joke in which La Tour observes Huber’s consternation as he is prevented from entering the studio (see La Tour 2004a, p. 48; E. & J. de Goncourt, L’Art du XVIIe siècle, Paris, 1881, t. p. 356, n.).

3 Lüthy 1961 provides a useful introduction to the deeper studies by Albert Rheinwald, “L’abbé Huber ou la psychologie d’une conversion”, Genova, v. 1927, pp. 93–104; Jacob M. Price, “The French farmers-general in the Chesapeake: The MacKercher-Huber mission of 1737–1738”, The William and Mary quarterly, XIV/2, IV, 1957, pp. 125–153, which discusses the American episode; and Paul Brazier, “Ce mystérieux abbé Huber”, Bulletin de la Société d’histoire et d’archéologie de Genève, XI, 1957, pp. 91–152; 1959, pp. 339–403, which provides a thorough account of his Swiss adventures but breaks off in mid career (presumably the author intended to publish further parts). These documents are not without errors, some of which are mentioned in this article. While there is enough material for a full modern biography, this article focuses on the abbé’s relationship with his portraitist.

4 À Jesuit text in the Bibliothèque municipale de Lyon, Guillaume Budé, De asso, et partibus ejus, includes an “Ex-libris J. Iacobi Clementis Huber 1721.”
various missions of diplomacy or espionage. In 1731–32 he was in London, where he visited Sir Hans Sloane’s private museum. On his return to Paris he was befriended by the fabulously wealthy fermier général Alexandre-Jean-Joseph Le Riche de La Pouplinière (1693–1762), whose household was graced by the greatest artists, writers and musicians of the day, Voltaire, Roussel and Rameau among them; but Huber also met tax farmers and even sovereigns, such as Karl I. Herzog von Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (1713–1780).

When La Pouplinière decided to marry his beautiful young mistress, the actress Françoise-Catherine-Thérèse Boutinon des Hayes (1714–1756), Huber’s opposition made of her an implacable enemy: but Thérèse’s brother was secretary to Cardinal de Tencin, and the celebrated salonnière Mme de Tencin used her influence with Cardinal Fleury to ensure that La Pouplinière was compelled to regularise the liaison, which took place in 1737. As we shall see, Huber was by then out of the country.

Several years before that, Chauvelin got Huber to conduct a secret investigation of the finances of Jean-Louis d’Usson, 2e marquis de Bonnac, French ambassador to the Swiss Grisons: malversation, and the suspicion of it, were frequent in eighteenth century diplomacy where ambassadors were expected to finance their own missions. Huber it seems also looked into the contraband trade in salt, targeted at evading the unpopular gabelle.

Based on a careful analysis of Huber’s movements, Paul Brazier reached the conclusion – which seems highly probable – that the abbé’s friendship with La Tour can be dated to the ten-month period between his return from Switzerland in August 1734 and his next foreign mission. Brazier plausibly suggests that the connection arise through the Chauvelins and may even have taken place at the château de Grosbois. Although La Tour was by then 30 years old, this is at the very start of his established œuvre and so the matter deserves careful examination.

One of the earliest portrait by La Tour is that of the curious figure Charles-Cardin Richer de Rhodes de La Morlière, chevalier du Saint-Sépulcre, former secrétaire du vicomte d’Andrezel à La Porte 1724–26. Although now an avocat in Paris, he is shown in Turkish dress in a pastel which was engraved by Lépicié in 1734. The attribution of a pastel (fig. 4) corresponding to the engraving, but in reverse, has been disputed, on the basis that the artist’s technique was poorer that in the Voltaire portraits from 1735. But the pastel may antedate the plate by several years, and it remains possible that it is the original work rather than a copy. An annotation on the BnF copy of the Lépicié engraving informs us that—

M. de la Morlière s’est fait graver en 1734, avec un habillement Turc, parce qu’il a séjourné plusieurs années à Constantinople. Il y avait passé avec M. Daudrezelle qui y a été et qui y est mort Ambassadeur du Roy. Il est fils de M. de Rodes, homme fort connu autrefois par rapport aux différentes mines dont il a fait l’ouverture en France, et il s’est ruiné à ce travail. Ce fils qui est celui dont il s’agit a passé une partie de sa vie à Paris dans les plaisirs; quoy qu’avec peu de bien. Il était fort connu de M. le Grade des Sceaux, et lorsqu’il a acheté Grosbois, il l’a étably dans cette terre pour y avoir soins des ouvrages qui s’y font et y faire prospérer la fonction de Cap.ne du château sans y avoir aucun titre.

Lépicié also engraved a Vue du château de Grosbois after Jean Rigaud.

---

8 Voltaire’s letter to his son, Karl Wilhelm Ferdinand, which discusses Marie Huber, mentions the abbé as “très-connu de monseigneur votre père.” (Lettres à sa. maje le prince de *** sur Rabelais..., 1767).
As Brazier deduced, this short period in 1734–35 must have been the date when La Tour made his first portrait of the abbé (fig. 5). Shown in academic rather than clerical costume, the pose is more reminiscent of Holbein’s Erasmus than of other La Tour portraits. Perhaps one should also note the various Jean Clouet portraits of another humanist Guillaume Budé, whose book Huber owned. The pastel is an astonishingly accomplished work for so early a date: but the evident age gap between it and the later pastels of the abbé lisant confirm Brazier’s analysis.

By May 1735 Huber was sent on another secret mission: Waldegrave, the British ambassador in Paris, saw fit to warn Newcastle of “a french Abbé called Hubert…gone for England upon some secret Errand from the Garde des Sceaux…his figure is remarkable for it is very crooked, Brownish Complexion with a sprightly Look; He is reckoned a very good for nothing Fellow, but has parts and will undertake anything for money.” Suspected of Jacobitism, he was probably closer to the Prince of Wales’s opposition and in particular to Charles, Lord Baltimore, proprietor of Maryland.

This connection proved invaluable in the next episode in his career, that which attracted Smollett’s interest. Teaming up with a Scottish adventurer, Daniel MacKercher (later known for his involvement in the Annesley peerage claim), aided by his intimate knowledge of the tobacco excise duties (which were the basis of La Pouplinière’s ferme), and facilitated by Lord Baltimore’s introductions, in November 1736 Huber obtained Chauvelin’s support for an audacious plan to allow the French to import tobacco from America via Britain so as to avoid a substantial amount of tax. Huber and MacKercher travelled to America, and attempted to persuade the suspicious Virginia and Maryland planters to accept the scheme, which would offer them higher prices than they received from British purchasers. Doubts about the scheme’s legality led to MacKercher’s return to England to obtain an explicit license from the Board of Trade. In his absence, Huber amended the terms extensively and obtain a commitment from a group of Virginia planters. With this apparently successful result, he left Chesapeake for Europe in the summer of 1738. But bafflingly the scheme was not pursued – whether rejected by the fermiers généraux themselves, or abandoned because MacKercher thought the abbé had betrayed him, is now impossible to say. Even more confusion surrounds the role of a certain George Fitzgerald who became involved in acquiring Huber’s “interest” in the Virginia tobacco to be sold the the fermiers généraux.

Back in Paris, Huber sat for the second La Tour portrait. It was shown at the salon of 1742, no. 129: [le portrait] de M. l’Abbé *** assis sur le bras d’un Fauteüil, lisant à la lumière un in -folio. Two versions were made: that now in Geneva, and the one kept by the artist and now in Saint-Quentin (fig. 6). Both are astonishing. The adventures of the abbé in the seven years since the first pastel are clearly etched on this face so vividly described by Lord Waldegrave.

---


8 Longford Castle, on loan to the National Gallery.

9 v. note supra.

10 Debrue & Salmon 2000, p. 78, note that the work does not yet present all the mastery of the later portraits, but concede that “la touche en est cependant fondue et, même à très faible distance, ne peut être décélée.”

11 Price, Lüthy and the other Huber biographers were unaware that George Fitzgerald, who died in 1744, had a nephew of the same name: see L. M. Cullen, “The two George Fitzgeralds of London, 1718–1759”, in David Dickson & al., eds., Irish and Scottish mercantile networks in Europe..., 2007, pp. 251ff.
instead of disguising his friend as a humanist from another age, La Tour is explicit about his disability, his shoulders hunched unequally, even having him perch on the arm of the chair for the myopic perusal of his book. The Goncourt brothers, in a lengthy and beautiful discussion that is deservedly well known, 12 saw a “chef-d’œuvre où, dans un cadre à la Chardin, le pastel s’élève presque à Rembrandt.” La Tour’s first biographer, the verbose abbé Duplaquet whose purple prose was too much even for the diligent B&W to include, has nevertheless a description 13 of the “tableau inimitable” of the abbé Huber lisant which may have influenced the Goncourt description, and merits inclusion here:

L’heure de la scène est la nuit; le lieu une chambre, éclairée par deux flambeaux, le sujet, un de ces Etries disgraciés par la Nature dans leur formes extérieures & qu’ordinairement la providence équitable dédommage par les qualités intérieures, qui ont bien leur prix dans la société, mais qui ne peuvent pas être l’objet de la Peinture. Joignez à ces désavantages, le costume lugubre d’un Ecclésiastique, l’attitude penchée d’un lecteur, les yeux fixés sur un livre. Représentez-vous l’obscurité, qui éteint toutes les nuances, qui confond tous les objets. Voilà les difficultés que notre Peintre choisit, pour se montrer supérieur à tous les obstacles. L’art des Rembrant acquiert une nouvelle perfection sous ses doigts. Ils nous offrent ici la Magie du clair obscur.

Tout est noir dans le tableau; cependant tout est nuancé, distingué, espacé. Au lieu de ces effets tranchants de la manière Flamande, qui court boussuement l’intervalle de l’ombre & de la lumière, c’est un passage doucement ménagé de l’une à l’autre, qui laisse jouer les reflets: la claré refletée par les surfaces polies, constraste avec celle qui est absorbée par le mât des étoffes. Le livre s’élève obliquement sur une pile d’autres livres. L’œil mesure l’espace qui les sépare & sa saillie hors du tableau. Vous voyez couler graduellement la cire & se condenser en larmes sur la bougie. L’un des deux est écorché dans toute sa longueur & sillonné par la trace du feu, sans distraire l’attention du lecteur. La vue est frappée par l’ondulation de la flamme, elle s’obscurcit vers la points, par la surabondance des parties qui n’ont pu s’enflammer, & s’échappe en tourbillons de fumée. Dans ces effets merveilleux l’artiste se pente le mouvement des corps.

Dans la figure de son ami, il peint le mouvement de l’ame. Quoique sa face inclinée se présente en raccourci, vous en saisissez le développement & la phisionomie. Ses yeux, presque cachés, annoncent pourtant le regard d’un homme d’esprit. Son visage s’épanouit, le rire est prêt à se déployer sur ses lèvres, toute sa figure s’anime. Il lit sans doute une scène plaisante de Molière.

In fact the book is not Molière, but Montaigne: Duplaquet (and the Goncourts) knew only the Saint-Quentin version where the spine of the volume is not lettered.

Huber was now within two years of his death. He undertook no further foreign travel, and it is possible (judging from the dramatic change in his appearance) that he was already sufficiently ill to make him aware of his mortality. Although critics have discussed the guttering candle only in terms of the intensity of Huber’s concentration on his book, the metaphor of a life nearing its end does not need to be spelled out.

Huber nevertheless became involved in yet another money-making project. This time it involved a monopoly of a new textile process, the moirage of silks by calender. On 7.V.1743 Louis XV granted Huber this privilege. The machine with its rollers required special premises, located on the rue Louis-le-Grand, and the following year a 30-year royal licence was obtained for the calender, to be operated by a certain André Smith. He was not “flamand de nation”, 14 but


13 Éloge historique de La Tour, Saint-Quentin,1789, pp. 29ff.

14 As Huber’s biographers have; see Paul Feuga, “Un mécanicien à Lyon à la fin du XVIIIe siècle” in Châtillon et sa région, 1992, pp. 165ff. Nine letters from the abbé Huber to Andrew Smith in Pall-Mall, London, were written between March 1742 and February 1743.
British; he had married the daughter of a goldsmith in Tours. Such business opportunities were not open to nobles (they would amount to derogation), leaving the way open for adventurers and foreigners such as Huber and Smith.

By 27 March 1744 Huber, close to death, made a will which was to have considerable implications for La Tour over many years. Huber’s death occurred in Paris a few weeks later, on 16 April 1744. The legacy however was not without complications. The principal terms of the will were as follows. Isaac Vernet was named executor, but “comme il n’est pas possible aujourd’hui d’avoir un état exact de mon bien, ayant actuellement entre les mains de M. Isaac Vernet 165 billets de la dernière loterie sur lesquels il y a des déductions à faire pour les lots échus et dont les billets doivent être éteints…de plus n’ayant point arrêté mes comptes avec M. George Fitzgerald et Compagnie depuis le 1er octobre 1743, je prie mon bon et cher ami Isaac Vernet de liquider tout cela.” These uncertainties did not however restrain the abbé from nominating a large number of specific bequests: beneficiaries included Fitzgerald and Mme Geoffrin, as well as a large number of friends, protégés, godchildren and employees. To each of his nine siblings he left 1200 livres, and two additional amounts of 1200 livres each for “mon frère aîné Jacob Huber et sa femme, ma belle-sœur, que j’ai toujours aimée”. His brother Pierre was given the calendar, with the licence and lands, subject to a pension of 800 livres p.a. for Smith and his family. To “M. Vernet, mon bon et cher ami, mon carrosse, ma chaise et mes chevaux de carrosse avec toutes leurs appartenances, mais à condition d’en faire usage et de prendre le carrosse ainsi que je l’en ai prié plusieurs fois et qu’il convient à son état”; to the contrôleur général, Philibert Orry “mon portrait peint par La Tour comme une petite marque de l’attachement sincère que j’ai toujours eu pour lui indépendamment de sa position….” Finally Huber named as his héritier universel Maurice Quentin de La Tour, “peintre du Roi”, “que j’ay toujours chéri comme mon enfant et dont je respecte autant la vertue que j’admire les talents”. Huber however had the prescience to foresee that La Tour might refuse, in which case Isaac Vernet was to receive the residue, subject to payment of a pension of 2000 livres p.a. to La Tour and to ceding to him an annuity worth 500 livres, “car je mourrais inconsolable si je le laissais dans le cas de manquer du nécessaire”.

15 There is considerable confusion over the date of his death. Debrie & Salmon 2000 (p. 78 and n.17) and La Tour 2004a, aware of the conflict with Brazier’s 16.IV.1744, decided that Fleury & Brière’s 16.IV.1747 was to be preferred, assuming that 1744 was a confusion with the date of the will. All the Swiss biographers (Lüthy, Apgar etc.) give 1744, and Rheinwald 1927 even provides an extract from his uncle’s diary a few days later (21.IV.1744): “Nous avons appris la mort de l’abbé Huber, à Paris. Il a fait un peintre son héritier, laisse à ses frères 1200 livres, et laisse à sa mère et à sa grandmère…50 livrès de chocolat.” The will, which was made on 27.III.1744, was deposited by Vernet on 16.IV.1744: AN MC L/366. The inventaire après décès was dated 8.VI.1744 & seq. (1/367: the document runs to some 49 pages), and numerous other documents in the same étude remove any doubt from the matter. Debrie & Salmon cannot have known this document.
That annuity had it seems already been bought with La Tour in mind, as evidenced by a document in the Minutier central, summarised as follows:\(^{16}\)

Constitution de 500 livres de rente viagère par le prévôt des marchands et des échevins de Paris, au profit de l’abbé Jean Hubert, licencié en théologie de la faculté de Turin, demeurant rue Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, moyennant la remise d’un billet de 300 livres de la loterie royale de 1743, auquel est échu un lot de 500 livres de rente; le bénéficiaire jouira de son vivant de ladite rente, constituée sur la tête de Maurice-Quentin de Latour, de l’Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture, demeurant rue Neuve-des-Petits-Champs, qui en aura la jouissance après la mort de l’abbé.

In the event it seems that the estate was insufficient to cover the various legacies and disputes with the Fitzgeralds and the fermiers généraux, while the profits from the calender monopoly never materialised, so that the machine was surrendered to Smith. La Tour renounced the succession universelle, but Vernet did so too. Four years later La Tour offered to surrender the annuity of 2000 livres against a single payment of 10,000 livres “par pure considération” for Huber, “et dans un esprit de conciliation”. Lüthy thought this concluded the matter, but the estate was still under discussion in 1770, where it was the subject of a bizarre letter from La Tour to Vernet.\(^{17}\) One can only imagine how many more lost letters related to this Jarndycean affair, and how much of the artist’s nervous energy was consumed by them. It is medically improbable however that such concerns precipitated the degeneration of the artist’s personality which was beginning to emerge in other correspondence.

Some idea of the complexity can be gleaned from the list of documents included in the abbé’s inventaire après décès, which also provides some colour about the abbé’s life. His servant, laying claim to some cooking utensils, testified that the abbé Huber never used the kitchen and that to his dying day, his master “s’en trouvé très peu de foin et avoine qui n’ait pas suffit a beaucoup près pour la Nourriture des chevaux”. This library was inventoried in 76 numbers of up to 30 items each, and encompassed reference, classical, literary, theological, travel, historical, scientific, and mathematical works, including a high proportion in English – among them Pope’s *Homer*; item 55 was “quatre Volumes in-quarto dont Essais de Montaigne prisés Sept livr es.” An extensive wardrobe included not only the clerical clothes – including nine rabats – of the kind shown in the later pastels, but also a coat in “camelot gris fourré de peaud de renard” which may be that shown in the earlier pastel. In the bedroom was found “un petit chandelier a deux branches et double cabochon decuivre d’or moulu” which might be that shown in the larger pastels, as could the armchair covered in “velours d’Utrecht cramoisi”. Apart from numerous prints in ebonised frames, the few pictures included “une esquisse en pastelle faite par Parrocel peintre a Paris representant une publication de paix sous glace dans la bordure a filets de bois doré prisé cent livres” – conceivably the framed picture in the background of the Geneva pastel.

The question as to which version of the *abbé lisant* was exhibited at the Salon in 1742 has recently been broached. The natural assumption is that this would have been the larger version which belonged to the sitter, while that retained by the artist was effectively a studio replica. But Debrie & Salmon 2000 (p. 79) argue that the differences in handling, and the use of a technique in the Geneva version which is found in pastels shown at salons from 1746 on, indicates that the Saint-Quentin version was that shown in 1742, and that the Geneva version was a “l’imitation autographe destinée à l’ami portraituré ou à sa famille.”

There are it seems to me several difficulties with this theory, although none is insuperable. One might argue that the reference in Huber’s will to “mon portrait” intended for Orry demonstrates that the sitter possessed only one La Tour portrait, which must be the 1735 pastel: but both this and the later Geneva pastel formed part of the disputed estate, and must have belonged to Huber unless subsequently acquired by the family. But it seems unlikely that La Tour would have

\(^{16}\) 18 November 1743; AN MC CXV/544.

\(^{17}\) It was printed by B&W but without identifying the recipient. For a fuller collection of La Tour documents see [www.pastellists.com/Misc/LaTour_chronology.pdf](http://www.pastellists.com/Misc/LaTour_chronology.pdf). Isaac Vernet makes another appearance in La Tour’s story, in 1753, when with his wife he appears to have introduced La Tour to his famous pupil Belle de Zuylen, Mme de Charrière (see Mme Prévost’s letter of 23.X.1753).
made such an important work (without even referring to it in the long 1770 letter) when his friendship was with the abbé rather than his family. For Salmon’s technical argument to be really convincing, the replica would have had to be made after a significant interval, and as close as possible to 1746. This presents no difficulty if as Salmon thought the abbé were still alive; but with the earlier date, the interval is uncomfortably short for the technical differences to be attributed to chronological development.

To this debate we can now add the additional, if also imprecise, evidence of the inventaire après décès. Immediately after the Parrocel pastel mentioned above appear the only other pastels I could find in the inventory:

A l’égard de deux tableaux en pastelle représentant portraits d’hommes sous leurs glaces dans leurs différentes bordures de bois doré étant au dessus des deux portes de lad[ite] chambre à coucher aux deux cotes de l’alcove il n’en a été fait aucune prise attendu la réclamation qui a été faite par le S[eigneur] De Latour peintre de L’académie royale de peinture et de sculpture sur le procès verbal du[s] Commissaire Daminois comme appartenans au[l] S[eigneur] De la Tour pourquoi n’en est ici fait mention que pour servir de memoire.

Of course it is not certain that these are portraits of Huber himself, nor whether they include the earlier pastel. But to me the positioning of these two as symmetric overdoors is supportive of the proposition that at least one was his version of the abbé Hubert lisant, nor would it seem from the hang that it was in the course of being copied.

The difficulty bestetting any student of La Tour’s œuvre is the artist’s astonishing flexibility in working in completely different styles at the same time. There is ample evidence of this later in his career, and I am unpersuaded that this is not the case in 1742. In any case both the Saint-Quentin and Geneva versions are wonderful, autograph tributes from this artist for whom personal friendship always coaxed additional dash. It is notable that when La Tour’s brother was trying to sell the pictures (at some stage before he made his will in 1806), the handbill he printed gave pride of place to the abbé Hubert lisant, placing it at the head of the list:

Le Portrait d’un Abbé, assis devant une table, sur laquelle il y a un in-folio, qui sert de pupitre à un autre in-folio dans lequel il lit; il est si occupé de sa lecture, qu’il ne s’aperçoit pas qu’une des deux bougies qui l’éclairent, file et fait fondre la cire qui coule le long de cette bougie, et sur le chandelier à deux branches qui est à sa droite. Ce Tableau est sans contredit le plus vrai & le plus beau qui ait jamais été fait en ce genre, il fait l’admiration de tous ceux qui le voient.

So many of La Tour’s patrons appear in this essay that it is unnecessary to list their portraits one by one. We may not have letters by which Huber introduced his friend to specific commissions, but the pattern – and the priority – of these connections, with Orry, the Rohans, Tencins, La Pouplinières and the other tax farmers is clear enough. What Huber left La Tour was ultimately far more valuable than the financial legacy that did not materialise: it was this network of contacts and credit – in the broadest sense – on which an artist’s career was founded.

Neil Jeffares

---

18 See note 15 supra as to whether Huber died in 1744 or 1747. Huber may not have needed to sit again, but our argument is that La Tour would not have made the replica for a dead friend.