

Repeat Performance: Chardin's Aesthetics of Repetition in the Paris Salons

Ryan Whyte

Volume 36, numéro 1, 2011

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1066752ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1066752ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

UAAC-AAUC (University Art Association of Canada | Association d'art des universités du Canada)

ISSN

0315-9906 (imprimé)

1918-4778 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

Whyte, R. (2011). Repeat Performance: Chardin's Aesthetics of Repetition in the Paris Salons. *RACAR : Revue d'art canadienne / Canadian Art Review*, 36(1), 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1066752ar>

Résumé de l'article

Cet article examine comment Jean-Baptiste-Siméon Chardin a tiré profit du Salon du Louvre ainsi que des gravures de reproduction et des critiques d'art que cet événement périodique suscitait pour démontrer l'originalité de son oeuvre. Dans un premier temps, nous replaçons dans leur contexte la coordination et l'exposition de ses répliques autographes et de ses estampes de reproduction en soutenant l'idée que le peintre y recourait pour attirer l'attention sur la présence et la disponibilité continues de sa production en Europe sous forme de répétitions originales. Ensuite, nous analysons leur réception en avançant l'hypothèse que le fait d'exposer ses oeuvres reproduites mettait en évidence sa capacité unique à se copier lui-même. Enfin, nous examinons les propriétés formelles des gravures réalisées d'après Chardin en relation avec l'accueil qui leur était fait pour postuler que leur réception se fondait davantage sur leur syntaxe visuelle interne que sur les qualités formelles absolues de ses peintures, ce qui confirmait paradoxalement leur capacité à véhiculer l'originalité de Chardin. En conclusion, l'examen de la pratique de Chardin nous conduit à émettre l'hypothèse que la manière dont les médias imprimés reproduisent, documentent et commentent les oeuvres d'art est à l'origine de l'esthétique moderne, avec sa tendance à mettre en avant le caractère unique de la « main » de l'artiste, l'originalité et l'authenticité de l'objet d'art ainsi que la formation du jugement esthétique par consensus.

Repeat Performance: Chardin's Aesthetics of Repetition in the Paris Salons

RYAN WHYTE, MCGILL UNIVERSITY

Résumé

Cet article examine comment Jean-Baptiste-Siméon Chardin a tiré profit du Salon du Louvre ainsi que des gravures de reproduction et des critiques d'art que cet événement périodique suscitait pour démontrer l'originalité de son oeuvre. Dans un premier temps, nous replaçons dans leur contexte la coordination et l'exposition de ses répliques autographes et de ses estampes de reproduction en soutenant l'idée que le peintre y recourait pour attirer l'attention sur la présence et la disponibilité continues de sa production en Europe sous forme de répétitions originales. Ensuite, nous analysons leur réception en avançant l'hypothèse que le fait d'exposer ses œuvres reproduites mettait en évidence sa capacité unique à se copier lui-même. Enfin, nous examinons les propriétés formelles des gravures réalisées d'après Chardin en relation avec l'accueil qui leur était fait pour postuler que leur réception se fondait davantage sur leur syntaxe visuelle interne que sur les qualités formelles absolues de ses peintures, ce qui confirmait paradoxalement leur capacité à véhiculer l'originalité de Chardin. En conclusion, l'examen de la pratique de Chardin nous conduit à émettre l'hypothèse que la manière dont les médias imprimés reproduisent, documentent et commentent les oeuvres d'art est à l'origine de l'esthétique moderne, avec sa tendance à mettre en avant le caractère unique de la « main » de l'artiste, l'originalité et l'authenticité de l'objet d'art ainsi que la formation du jugement esthétique par consensus.

Repetition and recollection are the same movement, except in opposite directions, for what is recollected has been, is repeated backward, whereas genuine repetition is recollected forward.

Søren Kierkegaard¹

Due to the persistence of nineteenth-century notions of artistic originality, modern art-historical literature has neglected the role of repetition in the development of modern aesthetics and exhibition practice.² Yet in the eighteenth century, the repetition of the format and timing of the Salon du Louvre (yearly from 1737, biennial from 1751) combined with the periodic diffusion of printed matter—that is, published images and texts including reproductive prints after Salon pictures, their advertisements in journals, and art criticism in journals or pamphlets—created a new environment of reception where the repetition of printed matter in time and space facilitated aesthetic judgement. The literature understands the creation of a periodic Salon du Louvre as a key moment in the development of modern spectatorship, the rise of modern aesthetics, and the notion of a public for contemporary art.³ Yet it ignores how this structural change in art exhibition, publicity, and marketing tied artistic originality to repetition.

This essay explores how Jean-Baptiste-Siméon Chardin (1699–1779) uniquely exploited the Salon's logic of repetition to emphasize his originality. First, it contextualizes Chardin's coordination and exhibition of his autograph replicas and reproductive prints to argue that he employed them to draw attention to the continued European presence and availability of his works as original repetitions. Second, it analyzes his reception to suggest that his exhibition of painted repetitions underscored his unique ability to copy himself and underlined his work's resistance to copying by others. Third, it examines

formal properties of prints after Chardin in relation to their reception to posit that these prints were received in terms of their internal visual syntax rather than the absolute formal qualities of his paintings, which paradoxically affirmed their ability to convey Chardin's originality. The paper concludes by suggesting that Chardin's practice demonstrates how repetition of artworks and of their documentation and commentary in print media stands at the origin of modern aesthetics, with its emphasis on the formal uniqueness of the artist's "hand," the originality and authenticity of the art object, and aesthetic judgment through consensus.

The Diffusion of Presence

Modern artistic repetition is defined by absence, where mechanically produced copies lack the aura of the original just as they attest to its originality;⁴ in contrast, eighteenth-century artistic repetition, as practised by Chardin, was defined by presence, where artisanally produced copies (prints and painted repetitions) multiplied the authenticity and originality of the artist's mind and hand.⁵ Period rhetoric and practice reflected the belief that repetitions and reproductive prints functioned as effective surrogates for Chardin's original paintings.⁶ Consequently, Denis Diderot (1713–84) could say that "Chardin a de l'originalité dans son genre. Cette originalité passe de sa peinture dans la gravure";⁷ and Charles-Antoine Coypel (1694–1752) that "les ouvrages...de M. Chardin ne perdent point au burin par leur grande pureté de dessein."⁸ For the same reasons, Chardin could sell his autograph repetitions for as much as the originals on which they were based,⁹ and even have another artist make copies of his work for such a prestigious client as the Swedish ambassador Carl Gustave Tessin (1695–1770).¹⁰

Chardin alone among Salon exhibitors addressed the disappearance of Salon artworks into European cabinets by systematically producing autograph repetitions of his own paintings and repeatedly exhibiting the same composition.¹¹ He was the only Ancien Régime artist to exhibit repetitions in the Salon, including customized repetitions, described in the Salon *livret*, or handlist of works, as “répétitions avec des changements.” The uniqueness of his practice is reflected in its unusual terminology—*répétition* was not a common term in the period, nor was its meaning fixed as it would be in the nineteenth century.¹² It is not found in the art dictionaries of Jacques Lacombe (1724–1811) and Antoine-Joseph Pernety (1716–1801).¹³ Nor is it found in Diderot’s *Encyclopédie* as a term of painting. Pierre-Charles Levesque (1736–1812) did not use the term, writing instead in the *Encyclopédie méthodique*, “Quand c’est le maître lui-même qui s’est copié, le second tableau s’appelle un *double*”—*double* implying only one repetition.¹⁴ In Pernety the verb *répéter* refers only pejoratively to painters who have become monotonous:

REPETTER, avec le pronom personnel (se) est un terme usité en fait de Peinture, pour dire qu’un Peintre n’est pas varié dans ses attitudes, ses airs, de tête, son ton, &c. Quand ses compositions & les figures de ses tableaux se ressemblent, & paroissent avoir été jettées dans le même moule. On dit dans le même sens, qu’il se *copie*.¹⁵

Similarly, the *Dictionnaire de l’Académie française* states: “On dit d’Un Auteur, d’un Poète, d’un Musicien, qui dans leurs ouvrages se servent souvent des mêmes tours, des mêmes manières, des mêmes traits, des mêmes chants, qu’*Ils se répètent*.”¹⁶ In the *livrets* to 1789, beyond Chardin’s employment of it, the word *répétition* appears only three times, twice to refer to reduced replicas (1775 and 1783), and once to refer to an enamel repetition of a painted miniature (1773).¹⁷ But it is not used in Chardin’s sense of an identical-size autograph copy with or without changes.

Beyond the unusual practice of Chardin, the multiplication of compositions in the period was limited to copies of one artist’s work by another, often of an old master and integral to academic training;¹⁸ portraitists or their studios who multiplied paintings of personages;¹⁹ state-commissioned replicas as models for tapestry;²⁰ commissioned replicas, often reduced, usually by the master’s studio or students;²¹ and reduced copies for engravers (less common in the period than drawings for engravers).²² Generally copies or repetitions were made for a highly specific clientele, as when Joseph Vernet (1714–89), working in Rome, hired copyists to make paintings for Grand Tourists. He employed the English painter Thomas Patch (1725–82),²³ Vernet’s brother Ignace (an arrangement that ended poorly when Joseph discovered that Ignace had forged his signature

on weak copies of his work),²⁴ and Vernet’s student Charles-François Grenier de Lacroix (around 1700–82), whom he paid to make high-quality, extremely accurate copies of his work for such clients as Michel-Ange Slodtz (1705–64).²⁵ There are excellent Vernet copies by Lacroix in Dijon, Versailles, Bordeaux, and Uppark (W. Sussex, U.K.), but known copies represent a handful of pictures relative to Vernet’s total production.²⁶ Typical period practice is represented by Jean-Honoré Fragonard (1732–1806), a student of Chardin before he joined the studio of François Boucher (1703–70). Although Fragonard frequently repeated figures and groupings across compositions, he made few autograph repetitions and reduced replicas relative to his total output.²⁷

Chardin both re-exhibited and reiterated his compositions to ensure that they passed into public consciousness as independent of a single owner—he edged them toward the realm of public domain. Yet at the same time he personalized these reiterations, merging repetition with customization, where slight compositional variations answered the specific needs of a given patron and collection. In the Salon of 1746, under *livret* number 71 (hereafter expressed as Salon 1746/71), he exhibited *Le Bénédicité*, which the *livret* described as “Un Tableau, répétition du Bénédicité avec une addition, pour faire Pendant à un Teniers, placé dans le Cabinet de M.***.” In so doing he publicized a composition, originally exhibited Salon 1740/61, that had disappeared into the royal collection and whose repetition would disappear into a private cabinet. Repeat exhibition of the composition made it publicly accessible again even as it reminded the public of the continued availability of autograph repetitions of it. Similarly, his exhibition Salon 1769/31 of *Les Attributs des Arts et les Récompenses qui leur sont accordées*, described in the *livret* as a “répétition avec quelques changements, de celui fait pour l’Impératrice de Russie, appart[enant] à M. l’abbé Pommyer,” though it was not a repeat exhibit, made visible a composition that had disappeared into a foreign cabinet (now in Saint Petersburg). Gabriel de Saint-Aubin (1724–80) sketched the picture exhibited Salon 1769/31, now lost, in the margin of his copy of the *livret*, its *changements* most evident in the palette and paintbrushes reversed from their position in the Hermitage picture. Finally, in Minneapolis there is a near-identical autograph repetition of the Hermitage picture. Each repeated work was at once a delocalized, ideal model in the public consciousness and a local, particular manifestation of that model.

Chardin also used reproductive prints, at once documentation and artworks in their own right, to compensate for the disappearance of his paintings into private cabinets. He is unique in the period in that his Salon entries were engraved systematically and synchronized to the periodic Salon.²⁸ His prints were popular—Pierre-Jean Mariette (1694–1774) decried their



Figure 1. Louis Surugue after Jean-Baptiste-Siméon Chardin, *Les Amusements de la vie privée*, 1747. Engraving, 32.5 x 23.6 cm. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, département des Estampes et de la Photographie (Photo: Bibliothèque nationale de France).



Figure 2. Jacques-Philippe Le Bas after Jean-Baptiste-Siméon Chardin, *L'Économe*, 1754. Engraving, 32.3 x 25.4 cm. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, département des Estampes et de la Photographie (Photo: Bibliothèque nationale de France).

vogue as pernicious to historical engraving²⁹—and anticipated in relation to each Salon. As early as September 1738, a critic remarked of Chardin's Salon entries, “Je ne doute pas qu'on ne rende bientôt au public le service de les graver.”³⁰ While the literature is divided on whether or not Chardin approved of the prints after his work—some see them as parasitic vulgarizations³¹—nevertheless they were made by his fellow academicians and required the collective approval of the Académie in sessions recorded in its *Procès-verbaux*. For example, for 30 January 1740 the record states:

Le Secrétaire [François-Bernard Lépicié, 1698–1755, who exercised this function from 1736] a présenté à la Compagnie deux épreuves d'une planche qu'il a gravée d'après un tableau de M. Chardin, Académicien, aiant pour titre *la Gouvernante*. La Compagnie, après l'avoir examiné, l'a approuvé pour faire jouir l'exposant des privilèges accordés à l'Académie par l'Arrest du Conseil d'État du 28 juin 1714.³²

The *Procès-verbaux* describe a procedure that was merely the institutional expression of a relationship that had developed over the course of months or years between printmaker and painter.

Chardin exploited the sense that prints documented vanishing artworks. When he promised *Les Amusements de la vie privée* (Salon 1746/72) for the cabinet of Louisa Ulrika of Sweden (1720–82), he asked her agent Tessin to allow him time to have it and its pendant, *L'Économe*, engraved (figs. 1, 2): “[C]es deux tableaux seront perdus pour la France Et...l'on doit quelle que chose à sa Nation...”³³ One year later the *Annonce* for Louis Surugue père's (1686–1762) print after *Les Amusements de la vie privée* found it “fâcheux que les différents tableaux de M. Chardin, tels que *La Fontaine*, *La Blanchisseuse* et *La Toilette du Matin*, passent dans les pays étrangers et soient perdus pour nous,”³⁴—the print, in other words, was an acceptable surrogate for the painting. Similarly, in 1746 Étienne La Font de Saint-Yenne (1688–1771) observed of Chardin, “Le publique avide de ses tableaux, et l'auteur ne peignant que pour

son amusement et par conséquent très-peu, a recherché avec empressement, pour s'en dédommager, les estampes gravées d'après ses ouvrages."³⁵ It was just this pressure to document Chardin's work that caused Surugue to specify in the print letter (the textual component of the print, including title, artists' names, dedications, and other associated texts) of *Les Amusements de la vie privée* that its pendant, *L'Économe*, was also in Sweden.³⁶ Further, since Chardin, under pressure from his patron had ultimately delivered *L'Économe* to Sweden before Surugue could reproduce it, in 1754 Jacques-Philippe Le Bas (1707–83) had a former student, the Swede Jean-Eric Rehn (1717–93), send him a drawing of it for engraving.³⁷

As something more than compensation for the inaccessibility of French masterpieces abroad and his proverbially limited output, Chardin coordinated the publication of reproductive prints with his production of repetitions and repeat exhibitions to draw attention to the continued presence and availability of his works. His coordination with his printmakers, manifest in the production of prints after *Les Amusements de la vie*

privée and *L'Économe*, paralleled his printmakers' coordination amongst themselves. Surugue père distributed his own, his son Pierre-Louis's (1716–72), and Lépicié's prints after Chardin (Lépicié, moreover, contributed the print verse to Surugue's *L'Instant de la méditation*);³⁸ Le Bas distributed his own and Pierre Fillœul's (1696–1754) prints after Chardin.³⁹ Laurent Cars (1699–1771), who owned repetitions of *Le Dessinateur* and *L'Ouvrière en tapisserie*, provided them to his student Jean-Jacques Flipart (1719–82) to engrave, his prints announced on December 1757.⁴⁰ Cars then lent the paintings to Chardin to exhibit Salon 1759/39, the prints acting as advance publicity for the paintings, the paintings as retrospective publicity for the prints.

Further sense of the collaborative symbiosis among academicians is evidenced in the portrait of Chardin by his friend Charles-Nicolas Cochin fils (1715–90), son of Chardin's great early engraver Charles-Nicolas Cochin père (1688–1754), which Cars engraved in 1755, perhaps in honour of Chardin's promotion to *trésorier* in March of that year.⁴¹ Cars exhibited the print Salon 1755/166. Chardin, Lépicié, Surugue père and fils, Le Bas, Fillœul, Cars, Flipart, and Cochin père and fils—all academicians except Fillœul—used their corporate association to sustain the international presence of Chardin's compositions in the absence of the original works. The parallel repetition of the artist's work, images of the artist's work, and even the image of the artist himself initiated a marketing system based on the diffusion of mutual references in space and time.

The Inimitable Copy

Chardin's artistic output represents a critical stage in the relationship between the modern original artwork and its reproduction. Walter Benjamin famously argued that modern gradations of artistic authenticity arose in response to the reproductive printing process, a thesis that Jeffrey M. Muller expanded to include the proliferation of painted replicas and copies during the rise of modern connoisseurship in the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries.⁴² The multiplication of the copy threatened the status of the original artwork and deepened its connection to a modern notion of authenticity. In the context of the Salon and via small-scale, artisanal reproduction—as opposed to the truly mechanical mass reproduction introduced by lithography and fully realized by photography—Chardin's autograph reproductions and authorized prints necessarily provoked a discourse of authenticity in his own time.⁴³

The more Chardin's work was multiplied in repetitions and prints, the more he and his critics insisted on its inimitable quality. For example, in the *Encyclopédie* article "Copie" (1754), Diderot links Chardin's originality with his inimitability:



Figure 3. Jean-Baptiste-Siméon Chardin, *La Pourvoyeuse*, 1738. Oil on canvas, 46.7 × 37.5 cm. Ottawa, National Gallery of Canada (Photo: National Gallery of Canada).



Figure 4. Laurent Cars after Jean-Baptiste-Siméon Chardin, *La Serinette*, 1753. Engraving, 40.2 × 34.2 cm. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, département des Estampes et de la Photographie (Photo: Bibliothèque nationale de France).

On dit qu'un élève d'un peintre habile copia si parfaitement un tableau de son maître, que celui-ci s'y trompa. J'ai entendu nier la possibilité du fait par un peintre qui vit aujourd'hui, & qui se fait admirer par la vérité & l'originalité de ses ouvrages. *M. Chardin* prétendoit que quelle que fût la copie qu'on feroit d'un de ses tableaux, il ne s'y méprendroit jamais, & que cette copie seroit ou plus belle (ce qui seroit difficile), ou moins belle que l'original. On lui objecta des autorités, il n'en fut point ébranlé; il opposa la raison & le bon sens aux témoignages & aux faits prétendus, ajoutant qu'il n'y avoit point d'absurdités, en quelque genre que ce fût, dans lesquelles on ne fût précipité, lorsqu'on sacrifieroit ses lumières à des noms & à des passages. Il faut, disoit-il, examiner d'abord la possibilité, & les preuves de fait ensuite.⁴⁴

In short, whatever connoisseurial expertise, textual evidence, and famous authorities might be brought to bear, the artist would always recognize his own authentic works, and be able



Figure 5. Laurent Cars after Jean-Baptiste-Siméon Chardin, *La Serinette*, 1753, detail. Engraving, 40.2 × 34.2 cm. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, département des Estampes et de la Photographie (Photo: Bibliothèque nationale de France).

to distinguish them from copies made by other artists. Chardin, admired for the originality of his work, thus remains the ultimate arbiter of that originality, the living guarantee against its counterfeit.

Chardin's exhibition of repetitions underscored his unique ability to copy himself, emphasized his work's resistance to successful copying by others, and called attention to the uniqueness of his manner. Levesque echoed Diderot in the *Encyclopédie méthodique* (1788) article "Copie": "M. Chardin assurois qu'il ne se méprendroit jamais aux copies que l'on pourroit faire de ses tableaux. Il faut avouer que tous les peintres ne sont pas aussi difficiles à copier que M. Chardin."⁴⁵ The difficulty of copying his work was rooted in the uniqueness of his facture, which lay beyond academic practice and training. Thus in the absence of academic reference points critics cast about for analogies to describe his style. In 1750 the abbé Guillaume-Thomas Raynal (1713–96) compared his "singular" manner of laying colours down next to each other without mixing them to a mosaic or a

tapestry, and in 1753 Lacombe compared his facture to *manière noire* engraving.⁴⁶ Even the qualifiers evoked an alien materiality, as for example the pamphlet of 1739 that credited Chardin with “une façon chiffonnée d’où résultent néanmoins des ensembles merveilleux.”⁴⁷ As described by the abbé Jean-Bernard Le Blanc (1707–81) in 1753, Chardin’s style was appreciated as a unique, self-generated combination of Flemish attention to detail and Italian *force*, a phrase that the *Mercur de France* echoed in 1761: “La patience des Hollandais n’a pas copié plus fidèlement la nature, et le génie des Italiens n’a pas employé un pinceau plus vigoureux pour la rendre.”⁴⁸

In period criticism, Chardin’s unique facture was thought to be rooted in its irreducibility to academic formula. An anonymous critic implied that no other academic artist had mastered Chardin’s technique when, in 1749, he wrote that Chardin should take students lest his inimitable technique be lost: “On ne peut trop l’inviter à faire des élèves qui puissent perpétuer le genre de talent dans lequel il excelle. C’est faute d’élèves que nombre de talents se sont éteints peu à peu.”⁴⁹ In 1753 Le Blanc argued much the same point, but from a different direction, writing that Chardin had taken the *manière* of no master, but that “il s’en est fait une particulière et qu’il seroit dangereux de vouloir imiter.”⁵⁰ In 1761 Joseph de La Porte (1714–79) wrote that Chardin “n’avait point eu de guide à imiter et [est] inimitable lui-même dans sa manière vraiment originale de rendre ces sortes d’objets qui doivent à l’industrie de son pinceau et à la vérité de son expression tout l’intérêt qu’elles inspirent.”⁵¹ In 1747 Le Blanc wrote that Chardin “s’est fait une manière qui n’appartient qu’à lui.”⁵² Chardin’s facture was inimitable because it was not rooted in training that could be codified in academic terms and thus easily reproduced.

Salon critics characterized Chardin’s painthandling as a self-created and self-identifying technique. “Son goût de peinture,” observed a pamphlet of 1738, “est à lui seul. Ce ne sont pas des traits finis, ce n’est pas une touche fondue, c’est au contraire du brut et du raboteux.”⁵³ He eschewed the drawing, underpainting, and glazes that defined the Franco-Italian tradition. He tended to build the painted surface with opaque patches and scumbling rather than with the precise academic scaffolding and layering of drawing, underpainting, and glazing, all dependent on anatomical training that he lacked.⁵⁴ His use of highly textured, gritty paint obviated traditional glazes. His unacademic technique is further reflected in the fact that he did not integrate drawing, so central to the Franco-Italian tradition, into his practice but rather created his compositions using painted sketches.⁵⁵

Chardin’s repeat exhibitions neutralized the interest in his iconography, already low on the hierarchy of genres and thus believed to be relatively devoid of intellectual content, so that the



Figure 6. François-Bernard Lépicié after Jean-Baptiste-Siméon Chardin, *La Pourvoyeuse*, 1742, detail. Engraving, 32.5 x 25.6 cm. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, département des Estampes et de la Photographie (Photo: Bibliothèque nationale de France).

discourse of his uniqueness centered on his facture rather than his subject matter.⁵⁶ In 1759 his repeat exhibition of *Un jeune Dessinateur* and *Une Fille qui travaille en tapisserie* occasioned exclusively formal criticism, for the subject, already familiar, needed no explaining: “Il y en a [des tableaux de M. Chardin] deux de petites figures qui sont d’un effet, d’un moelleux et d’un accord charmants; la couleur y est pleine de vigueur et dans des tons vrais; l’intelligence de la lumière très-bien entendue.”⁵⁷ La Porte’s criticism, already cited in part, of his 1761 re-exhibition of *Le Bénédicité* was similarly formal:

Une répétition du *Bénédicité* de M. Chardin, avec des changements, renouvelle les éloges du public et l’empressement avec lequel on a toujours accueilli les productions de ce grand artiste. On retrouve dans ce morceau le célèbre et rare imitateur de la nature, qui n’avait point eu de guide à imiter et [est] inimitable lui-même dans sa manière vraiment originale de rendre ces sortes d’objets qui doivent à l’industrie de son pinceau et à la vérité de son expression tout l’intérêt qu’elles inspirent.⁵⁸

Not only the repeat exhibition of the picture but the lack of inherent interest in its subject matter directed attention to its facture. Diderot focused exclusively on formal qualities with respect to the 1769 exhibition of *La Pourvoyeuse*, a composition first exhibited in 1739 (fig. 3):

Cette cuisinière qui revient du marché est encore la redite d’un morceau peint il y a quarante ans. C’est une belle petite chose que ce tableau. Si Chardin a un défaut, comme il

tient à son faire particulier, vous le retrouverez partout; par la même raison, ce qu'il a de parfait, il ne le perd jamais. Il est ici également harmonieux; c'est la même entente de reflets, la même vérité d'effet, chose rare; car il est facile d'avoir de l'effet quand on se permet des licences, lorsqu'on établit une masse d'ombres sans se soucier de ce qui la produit. Mais être chaud et principié, esclave de la nature et maître de l'art, avoir du génie et de la raison, c'est le diable à confesser. C'est dommage que Chardin mette sa manière à tout, et qu'en passant d'un objet à un autre elle devienne quelquefois lourde et pesante. Elle se conciliera à merveille avec l'opaque, le mat, le solide des objets inanimés; elle jurera avec le vivant, la délicatesse des objets sensibles. Voyez-là, ici dans un réchaud, des pains et autres accessoires, et jugez si elle fait également bien au visage et au bras de cette servante, qui me paraît d'ailleurs un peu colossale de proportion et manière d'attitude.⁵⁹

As there was no need to explain the subject matter of repetitions, critical focus shifted to facture even if this emphasized the artist's failings. Chardin used repetition to generate reception weighted to formal qualities rather than subject matter, and thus exploited the perceived uniqueness of his facture as the basis of his originality. Furthermore, this suggests how the lesser genres of still life and genre painting in which Chardin worked permitted his unusual practice and terminology of repetition, and thus opened the space for the development of modern notions of originality. At once formulaic and distanced from academic practices of copying and emulation, the lesser genres represent alternative histories of production and reception that the art-historical literature, with its focus on copying and emulation in the higher genres, has overlooked.⁶⁰

Seeing Through Print

Chardin employed repetition to generate a discourse of artistic originality that in turn applied to prints after his work. Commentary on his unique facture not only helped increase the demand for painted repetitions but also created new possibilities for marketing prints as faithful transcriptions of the painter's hand. The *Mercur*'s remark about Le Bas's *Le Négligé ou Toilette du Matin*, "L'intelligent Graveur est parfaitement entré dans l'esprit du Sujet qui y est traité," perpetuated the rhetoric of the translation of Chardin's originality into prints.⁶¹ Such claims, circulated in printed texts, located his originality in printed images.

Critics believed that Chardin's prints approximated his unique facture. The only sustained period analysis of the formal equivalents between paintings and prints by Chardin, the *Annonce* for Cars's *La Serinette* (fig. 4), confirmed Diderot's claim that prints after Chardin reproduced his originality:

Le Graveur a ménagé & conservé toutes les finesses; il a exprimé celles de l'accord & des grandes parties de la peinture, mais ce qu'on appelle la couleur en terme de graveur; & pour la rendre avec vérité, il a sçu placer à propos & opposer les differens genres de travail. Enfin l'Estampe fait voir la blancheur de peau d'une blonde, en opposition avec une coëffe & un mantelet de mousseline; hardiesse de la peinture, que la gravure a rendue avec une justesse & une vérité qui lui étoient peut-être plus difficiles.⁶²

What Diderot critiqued as Chardin's monotony of texture became, in the hands of his printmakers, variety of graphic mark. Viewers of Chardin's paintings perceived the "magic" resolution of his idiosyncratic texture of paint into comprehensible pictorial subjects by means of a process that criticism repeatedly described as the emergence of an image out of fog or haze.⁶³ Viewers of prints after Chardin's paintings were familiar with the unique optical properties of his painting, both from firsthand experience and from printed criticism. These viewers were thus primed to perceive the minute tonal shifts made by a variety of burin work as emulating the unique texture of Chardin's paintings, mentally substituting one medium, print, for another, paint.

The term *couleur*, applied to printmaking, referred to tonal variety⁶⁴ and resonated with a fundamental problem of reproductive printmaking, the translation of colour and texture into graphic language, what William Ivins termed the syntax of prints.⁶⁵ What the *Mercur* called the "differens genres de travail" of the burin of Cars refers to the variations in hatching patterns and densities visible, for example, in the transitions between the woman's dress, mantle, and the chair (see detail, fig. 5). Crosshatching, which recalls the weave of the fabric and its reflective density, reproduces the silken surface of the skirt of her dress. Much tighter and more delicate crosshatching, almost pointillist in effect, follows the contours of her face and resolves into subtle tonal modulations suggestive of the fine texture of skin. Hatching in dotted lines implies the thin, papery properties of the mantle, its fringe delineated by the absence of marks.

Reception mediated by the visual syntax of reproductive prints rather than by the absolute formal qualities of his paintings affirmed Chardin's originality. His printmakers did not reproduce his unique texture but rather created marks representing the surface properties of the objects he depicted. Such variety of marks is evident in prints after even the most highly textured of Chardin's canvases, such as Lépicié's *La Pourvoyeuse* (detail, fig. 6). Moreover, his printmakers used these same techniques to reproduce the work of other painters—even such characteristically academic painters as Boucher.⁶⁶ For example, in Lépicié's *Le Déjeuné*, after a Boucher canvas devoid of



Figure 7. François Boucher, *Le Déjeuner*, 1739. Oil on canvas, 81.5 × 65.5 cm. Paris, Musée du Louvre (Photo: Musée du Louvre / The Bridgeman Art Library).



Figure 8. François-Bernard Lépicié after François Boucher, *Le Déjeuner*, 1744, detail. Engraving, 32.2 × 25.8 cm. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, département des Estampes et de la Photographie (Photo: Bibliothèque nationale de France).

Chardin-like texture (detail fig. 8, after fig. 7), relatively open crosshatching and interrupted lines describe the white skirt of the lady's dress, and modulated densities of etched dots distinguish the texture of her skin from that of her surroundings.⁶⁷ As in Cars's *La Serinette*, not only type but directionality of mark defines objects, notably in the horizontal/vertical hatched grid that differentiates the wall and mirror from the contoured marks of the figure. Chardin's printmakers not only obviated his painted texture in their transcription of his work, but they also used techniques not unique to the reproduction of his work to do so. Yet period rhetoric of the fidelity of prints to his paintings reveals that viewers understood the prints to represent his originality and thus posited through them his unique facture.

The case of Chardin and his printmakers illustrates how authenticity and originality in modern aesthetics are founded on repetition—not only the repetition and reproduction of ori-

ginal, authentic artworks but the multiplication of connoisseurial opinion in printed texts—in order to create aesthetic consensus. Chardin did not profit directly from the sale of prints after his work; unlike Jean-Baptiste Greuze (1725–1805) later in the century, he did not enter into a profit-sharing arrangement with his printmakers.⁶⁸ Yet he coordinated the timing of the release of prints after his work, as has been argued above, to manage the reception of his paintings. Prints and painted repetitions not only recalled his older paintings to his audience, they also shaped the perception of their originality.

As *tapissier*, the academican responsible for installing the Salon, in 1755 and from 1761 to 1773, Chardin was sensitive to both the synchronic effects of a given Salon installation and the diachronic effects of renewal and recollection caused by the Salon's periodicity.⁶⁹ Yet as an early exploiter of the reproductive print in the Salon, he also understood how the perception of

his originality was extended through printed images. Chardin's originality appeared as a broadly visible phenomenon through its repetition in paintings and prints. It was the locus of the periodic Salon that permitted such repetition.

Through repetition the periodic Salon and its print culture—both printed images and texts—established a new mode of reception defined by consensus of language and opinion (including diverse opinions rooted in consensus within various groups) rather than the isolated opinions of patrons or the authoritative opinions of connoisseurs: painted repetitions, reproductive prints, and finally printed criticism allowed for the diffusion and standardization of opinion.⁷⁰ Key to modern aesthetics, Immanuel Kant's (1724–1804) *sensus communis* (*Kritik der Urteilskraft*, 1790), the assumption that one's aesthetic judgment will be shared by others, was anticipated by the Salon and its print culture, with its appeal to consensus built by the repetition of texts and objects in space and time.⁷¹ Through its emphasis on formal appreciation and its appeal to a community of taste united in the perception of originality, Chardin's use of repetition planted the seeds of modern aesthetics in the Salon.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Elizabeth Legge, W. McAllister Johnson, Jenny Purtle, and the readers for *RACAR* for their invaluable advice and suggestions.

Notes

- 1 Søren Kierkegaard, *Fear and Trembling: Repetition*, trans. Howard and Edna Hong (Princeton, 1983), 131.
- 2 Michael Baxandall has hinted at the importance of replicas and prints in Chardin's marketing practice as a transitional moment toward nineteenth- and twentieth-century models of art production and marketing, *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures* (New Haven, 1985), 53. On the nineteenth-century "culture of the copy," see Robert Verhoogt, *Art in Reproduction: Nineteenth-Century Prints after Lawrence Alma-Tadema, Jozef Israëls and Ary Scheffer* (Amsterdam, 2007); Stephen Bann, *Parallel Lines: Printmakers, Painters and Photographers in Nineteenth-Century France* (New Haven, 2001); Richard Schiff, "The Original, the Imitation, the Copy, and the Spontaneous Classic: Theory and Painting in Nineteenth-Century France," *Yale French Studies* 66 (1984): 27–54.
- 3 Annie Becq, "Expositions, peintres et critiques: vers l'image moderne de l'artiste," *Dix-huitième siècle* 14 (1982): 131–49; Becq, *Genèse de l'esthétique française moderne: de la raison classique à l'imagination créatrice, 1680–1814* (Paris, 1994), 192–95, 475–81, 763–64, 779–87; Thomas Crow, *Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris* (New Haven, 1985); Richard Wrigley, *The Origins of French Art Criticism: From the Ancien Régime to the Restoration* (Oxford, 1993).
- 4 Walter Benjamin, "Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit," *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Rolf Tiedemann, Rolf and Hermann Schweppenhäuser (Frankfurt, 1980), I, 2, 471–508, originally published 1936.
- 5 On the status of the reproductive print in the period, see William B. MacGregor, "The Authority of Prints: An Early Modern Perspective," *Art History* XXII, 3 (September 1999): 389–420; Susan Lambert, *The Image Multiplied: Five Centuries of Printed Reproductions of Paintings and Drawings* (London, 1987), 13–30; Rebecca Zorach and Elizabeth Rodini, "On Imitation and Invention: An Introduction to the Reproductive Print," in *Paper Museums: The Reproductive Print in Europe, 1500–1800*, ed. Rebecca Zorach and Elizabeth Rodini (Chicago, 2005), 1–29; Alexandra M. Corey, "Creativity, Authenticity, and the Copy in Early Print Culture," *Paper Museums*, 31–40; Caroline Karpinski, "The Print in Thrall to Its Original: A Historiographic Perspective," in *Retaining the Original: Multiple Originals, Copies, and Reproductions*, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts Symposium Papers VII (Washington, 1989), 101–9. On the copy, see François Chamoux et al., "Copies, répliques, faux," *Revue de l'Art* 21 (1973): 5–31; Jeffrey M. Muller, "Measures of Authenticity: The Detection of Copies in the Early Literature on Connoisseurship," in *Retaining the Original*, 141–49.
- 6 Christian Michel analyzes the period metaphor of translation with respect to the reproductive print in "Les débats sur la notion de graveur-traducteur en France au XVIIIe siècle," in François Fossier, ed., *Delineavit et sculpsit: dix-neuf contributions sur les rapports dessin-gravure du XVIe au XXe siècle* (Lyon, 2003), 151–61.
- 7 Denis Diderot, *Diderot. Salons I*, ed. Jean Seznec and Jean Adhémar (Oxford, 1975), 125.
- 8 Charles-Antoine Coypel, *Jugemens sur les principaux ouvrages exposés au Louvre le 27 août 1751* (Amsterdam, 1751), catalogued in Georges Duplessis, *Catalogue de la collection des pièces sur les beaux-arts imprimées et manuscrites, recueillie par Pierre-Jean Mariette, Charles-Nicolas Cochin et M. Deloynes, Auditeur des Comptes, et acquise récemment par le Département des Estampes de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1881), hereafter Coll. Deloynes no. 51, 36.
- 9 Letter from *conseiller* Fleischman to Karoline Luise von Baden: "Les tableaux que Chardin a faits pour l'Abbé Troublet [sic] sont point actuellement chez ce dernier... Cet habile peintre étant de mes amis depuis plus de dix ans vous pouvez Madame compter avoir des répétitions de lui, qui ne vous coûteront guère plus que l'abbé n'en a payé pour les siens, quoiqu'il m'ait prié de le dispenser de m'en accuser le prix qu'il en a donné," reprinted in Pierre Rosenberg, *Chardin 1699–1779* (Paris, 1979), 319; these pictures are found in Pierre Rosenberg, *Tout l'œuvre peint de Chardin* (Paris, 1983), cat. 154, 155.

- ¹⁰ Rosenberg, *Tout l'œuvre peint de Chardin*, cat. 120h, *Le Bénédicité*, and 118c, *La Mère labourieuse*, were both painted by an unknown artist for Tessin in 1741, and indicate “que Chardin acceptait que l'on fasse des copies de ses œuvres et qu'elles soient commercialisées,” 99.
- ¹¹ See Ryan Whyte, “Painting as Social Conversation: the *petit sujet* in the Ancien Régime,” Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 2008, 198–205.
- ¹² Théodore Michel Lejeune, *Guide théorique et pratique de l'amateur de tableaux; études sur les imitateurs et les copistes des maîtres de toutes les écoles dont les œuvres forment la base ordinaire des galeries* (Paris, 1864–65); see Chamoux et al., “Copies, répliques, faux,” 20–21.
- ¹³ Jacques Lacombe, *Dictionnaire portatif des beaux-arts* (Paris, 1752); Antoine-Joseph Pernety, *Dictionnaire portatif de peinture, sculpture et gravure* (Paris, 1757).
- ¹⁴ Pierre-Charles Levesque and Claude-Henri Watelet, *Encyclopédie méthodique, Beaux-arts* (Paris, 1788), 1/152, s.v. “Copie.”
- ¹⁵ Pernety, *Dictionnaire*, 500–501.
- ¹⁶ *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française, quatrième édition* (Paris, 1762), II, 603, s.v. “Répéter.”
- ¹⁷ Jean-Hugues Taraval, *La Sainte Famille*, Salon 1775/78, *Répétition du même sujet, Tableau de chevalet de 2 pieds, sur 1 pied 6 pouces*, Salon 1775/79; Jean-Baptiste Regnault, *Persée délivre Andromède, & la remet entre les mains de ses Parens, Ce Tableau a 9 pieds de haut, sur 8 de large*, Salon 1783/166, *Deux petits Tableaux, l'un la répétition d'Andromède délivrée par Persée*, Salon 1783/172; Pierre Pasquier, *Le Portrait de M. de Voltaire. C'est une répétition en émail, de celui qu'il a peint en mignature à Ferney en 1771* [i.e., *Le Portrait de M. de Voltaire, peint à Fernex* [sic] *au mois d'Avril 1771*, Salon 1771/129], Salon 1773/129.
- ¹⁸ See Chamoux et al., “Copies, répliques, faux,” 19–20.
- ¹⁹ For example, Carle Van Loo, *Louis XV*, Versailles, Inv. MV 3751, replica of the original shown Salon 1751/8; François Hubert Drouais, *Le Comte d'Artois et Madame Clotilde*, Versailles, Inv. MV 3898, commissioned by Louis XV in 1762, replica of Louvre Inv. 4114; Joseph Siffred Duplessis, *Louis XVI*, Versailles, Inv. MV 7083, replica of the original shown Salon 1777/119. The most famous case is the studio of Hyacinthe Rigaud: see Joseph Hippolyte Roman, ed., *Le Livre de Raison du peintre Hyacinthe Rigaud publié avec une introduction et des notes* (Paris, 1919).
- ²⁰ For example, Antoine Coypel, *Jacob reprochant à Laban de lui avoir donné pour femme Léa au lieu de Rachel*, Louvre, Inv. 3503, replica of the picture shown Salon 1704, commissioned for the Manufacture des Gobelins as a model for a tapestry, see Louis Dimier, “Antoine Coypel,” in *Les Peintres français du XVIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1928), cat. 31; and Coypel, *Les Adieux d'Hector et d'Andromaque*, Louvre, Inv. 3550, commissioned for the Manufacture des Gobelins as a model for a tapestry, see Dimier, “Antoine Coypel,” cat. 52.
- ²¹ For example, Jacques-Louis David, François Xavier baron Fabre, and Anne Louis Girodet-Trioson, *Bélisaire*, 1784, 101 x 115 cm, Louvre, Inv. 3694, exhibited Salon 1785/104, and David, Fabre, Girodet-Trioson, *Bélisaire*, 1784, Louvre, Inv. 3694, reduced replicas of the painting shown Salon 1781/311, now in the Palais des beaux-arts de Lille, Inv. P 436; David, Fabre, Girodet-Trioson, *Le Serment des Horaces*, 1786, Toledo Museum of Art, Inv. 1950.308, reduced replica of the painting shown Salon 1785/103; David, *Paris et Hélène*, 1789, Paris, Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Inv. 38663, replica of the painting shown Salon 1789/89, Louvre, Inv. 3696; studio of David, *La Mort de Marat*, around 1793, 92 x 73 cm, Musée des beaux-arts de Dijon, Inv. 2306, and David, *Marat assassiné*, 162.5 x 130 cm, Louvre, Inv. RF 1945–2, replicas of David, *La Mort de Marat*, Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Inv. 3260. On David's studio practice, see Thomas Crow, *Emulation: David, Drouais, and Girodet in the Art of Revolutionary France* (New Haven, 2006).
- ²² Lambert, *The Image Multiplied*, 37–48.
- ²³ Philip Conisbee, “Introduction,” in *Claude-Joseph Vernet 1714–1789* (London, 1976), unpaginated.
- ²⁴ Léon Lagrange, *Joseph Vernet et la peinture au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1864), 38–39, 232–34.
- ²⁵ Vernet's *Journal*, for 1746: “Le premier octobre donné à M. Grenier 4 sequins pour finir de payer les deux copies qu'il a fait pour M. Slodtz,” in Lagrange, *Joseph Vernet et la peinture au XVIIIe siècle*, 376.
- ²⁶ *Marine*, Musée des beaux-arts de Marseille, Inv. 269; *Marine, effet de nuit*, Dijon, musée national Magnin, Inv. 1938 F 557, reduced replica of Vernet, *La Nuit ou clair de lune*, Versailles, Inv. MV 5927; *La Gondole italienne*, Musée des beaux-arts de Bordeaux, Inv. Bx E 482, reversed copy after an engraving by Pierre-Jacques Duret after Vernet (Pierre Arlaud, *Catalogue raisonné des estampes gravées d'après Joseph Vernet* [Avignon, 1976], 46, cat. 168); and catalogued in *Uppark Sussex* (London, 1976): *Seapiece: Night*, 1751, 21; *Storm and Shipwreck*, 1751, 26; *Harbour Scene: Morning*, 1751, 35, all identical size copies of Vernet's suite *The Four Times of Day*, also located in Uppark: see Florence Ingersoll-Smouse, *Joseph Vernet, peintre de marine, 1714–1789: étude critique suivi d'un catalogue raisonné de son œuvre peint* (Paris, 1926).
- ²⁷ Rosenberg, *Tout l'œuvre peint de Fragonard*.
- ²⁸ Excluding still lifes, for which there was no taste in prints in the period, the only Chardin not to be engraved in the eighteenth century was *Les Aliments de la convalescence*, Salon 1747/60.
- ²⁹ Philippe de Chennevières and Anatole de Montaiglon, eds., *Abécédario de P. J. Mariette et autres notes inédites de cet amateur sur les arts et les artistes* (Paris, 1851–53), I, 359.
- ³⁰ Neufville de Brunabois Montador, *Lettre à Madame la marquise de S.P.R.*, Coll. Deloynes no. 8, 8.
- ³¹ For example, Philip Conisbee, in *Chardin* (Lewisberg, 1986), 127–31, 133–37, who nevertheless acknowledges the special understanding of Chardin's work in Lépicier's verses, e.g., 158–59. See Ryan Whyte, “Understanding Painting, Print and Verse: Chardin's

- Le Négligé ou Toilette du Matin*,” in Christina Ionescu and Renata Schellenberg, eds., *Word and Image in the Eighteenth Century: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue* (Newcastle, 2008), 44–54.
- 32 Anatole de Montaiglon, ed., *Procès-verbaux de l'Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture, 1648–1792* (Paris, 1883), V, 267. Every print by an academician after an academician was required to pass the collective scrutiny of the Académie in order to enjoy the *privilege* and bear the initials A.P.D.R. (Avec Privilège du Roi), in a process that contractually transferred rights over the image to the printmaker.
- 33 Chardin to Tessin, 5 October 1746, reprinted in Rosenberg, *Chardin, 1699–1779*, 387.
- 34 *Mercure de France*, June 1747, 131.
- 35 Étienne La Font de Saint-Yenne, *Réflexions sur quelques causes de l'état présent de la peinture en France* (La Haye, 1747), 110.
- 36 The print letter reads: “Le Tableau original est dans la Gallerie de Drotningholm / en Suede qui fait pendant à un autre du même Auteur représentant / une dame qui vérifie des livres de dépenses domestiques. Peint en 1747.”
- 37 See Rosenberg, *Tout l'œuvre peint de Chardin*, 101–2, cat. 124.
- 38 According to their print letters, Lépicié's *Le Bénédicité*, *Le Château de cartes*, *La Mère laborieuse*, *La Pourvoyeuse*, *La Ratisseuse*, *Le Souffleur*, and *Le Toton* were available from Lépicié and Surugue, while Lépicié's *La Gouvernante* and *La Maîtresse d'école* were available only “chez Surugue.”
- 39 According to their print letters, Fillœul's *Dame prenant son thé* and *Faiseur de châteaux de cartes* were available from Fillœul and Le Bas. In his engraved catalogue of around 1751, Le Bas lists his *Négligée ou Toilette du Matin* as well as Fillœul's *Dame prenant son thé* and *Faiseur de châteaux de cartes*, but without crediting Fillœul for their authorship: Lisbon, Biblioteca Nacional, Cabinet des Estampes, Inv. R. 30.949; illustrated in Peter Fuhring's review of Maxime Préaud et al., *Dictionnaire des éditeurs d'estampes à Paris sous l'Ancien Régime, Nouvelles de l'estampe* 107 (October 1989), 41.
- 40 *Mercure de France*, December 1757, 171.
- 41 *Mercure de France*, June 1755, 197; *Inventaire du fonds français 18e*, V, 501–2, no. 139. For Chardin's election to *trésorier*, see Rosenberg, *Chardin 1699–1779*, 390.
- 42 Muller, “Measures of Authenticity,” 146.
- 43 For these later developments, see Bann, *Parallel Lines*.
- 44 Denis Diderot and Jean le Rond d'Alembert, eds., *Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers* (Paris, 1754), IV, 176–77.
- 45 *Encyclopédie méthodique, Beaux-arts*, I, 153.
- 46 Abbé Guillaume-Thomas-François Raynal, *Correspondance littéraire* (Paris, 1877–88), I, 464; Jacques Lacombe, *Le Salon* (n.p., 1753), Coll. Deloynes no. 55, 24.
- 47 Neufville de Brunaboïs Montador, *Description raisonnée des tableaux exposés au Louvre. Lettre à madame la marquise de S. P. R.* (n.p., 1739), Coll. Deloynes no. 11, 9.
- 48 Abbé Jean-Bernard Le Blanc, *Observations sur les ouvrages de MM. De l'Académie de peinture et de sculpture, exposés au Sallon du Louvre en l'année 1753*, Coll. Deloynes no. 63, 24; *Mercure de France*, October 1761, I, 156.
- 49 *Lettre sur la peinture, la sculpture et l'architecture à M ***. Seconde édition revue et augmentée de nouvelles notes et de reflexions sur les Tableaux de M. de Troy* (Amsterdam, 1749), Coll. Deloynes no. 39, 110.
- 50 Le Blanc, *Observations sur les ouvrages...*, Coll. Deloynes no. 63, 24.
- 51 La Porte, *Observations d'une société...*, Coll. Deloynes no. 94, 36.
- 52 Le Blanc, *Lettre sur l'exposition des ouvrages de peinture, sculpture, etc., de l'année 1747 et en general sur l'utilité de ces sortes d'expositions, à Monsieur R. D. R...* (n.p., 1747), Coll. Deloynes no. 26, 95.
- 53 Neufville de Brunaboïs Montador, *Lettre à Madame la marquise de S. P. R.* (Paris, 1738), Coll. Deloynes no. 8, 8.
- 54 On Chardin's paint handling technique, see Elisabeth Martin and Pascal Guinet, “Un métier de magicien,” in *Chardin: 95 chefs-d'œuvre au Grand Palais* (Dijon, 1999), 52–57; Mechthild Most, “‘Un excellent tableau de M. Chardin, dont le mérite est assés connu.’ Bildmaterialien und Maltechnik Chardins am Beispiel der ‘Briefsieglerin,’” in *Die “Briefsieglerin” von Jean-Siméon Chardin. Neue Einsichten in ein restauriertes Meisterwerk* (Potsdam, 2003), 54–78; and Rosenberg, *Chardin 1699–1779*.
- 55 As Rosenberg has observed, twelve painted sketches are recorded in Chardin's death inventory (Paris, Archives nationales, M.C., Étude LVI, liasse 246), *Tout l'œuvre peint de Chardin*, 101; painted sketches exist for *Le Bénédicité*, *Tout l'œuvre peint de Chardin*, cat. 119, and *L'Économe*, cat. 124. Mariette notes that Chardin does not do preparatory studies or sketches on paper, *Abécédario de P.-J. Mariette*, I, 359–60; Rosenberg catalogues only five drawings of fairly solid authenticity, *Tout l'œuvre peint de Chardin*, cat. 1b, 1c, 1d, 2a, 4b, all juvenilia.
- 56 “On admire dans celui-ci le talent de rendre avec un vrai qui lui est propre, & singulièrement naïf, certains moments dans les actions de la vie nullement intéressans, qui ne méritent par eux-mêmes aucune attention, et dont quelques-uns n'étoient dignes ni du choix de l'Auteur, ni des beautés qu'on y admire....” La Font de Saint-Yenne, *Réflexions*, 109.
- 57 *Année littéraire* (1759), V, 217.
- 58 La Porte, *Observations d'une société...*, Coll. Deloynes no. 94, 36.
- 59 Diderot, *Diderot. Salons IV*, 83.
- 60 Two recent important treatments of copying and emulation in academic theory and practice: Paul Duro, “‘The Surest Measure of Perfection’: Approaches to Imitation in Seventeenth-Century Art and Theory,” *Word & Image* XXV, 4 (October–December 2009): 363–83; and Maria H. Loh, “New and Improved: Repetition as Originality in Italian Baroque Practice and Theory,” *The Art Bulletin* LXXXVI, 3 (September 2004): 477–504.

- 61 *Mercure de France*, December 1741, I, 1697.
- 62 *Mercure de France*, November 1753, 162.
- 63 Neufville de Brunabois Montador, *Description raisonnée...1739*, Coll. Deloynes no. 11, 9; Lacombe, *Le Salon*, Coll. Deloynes no. 55, 24; Diderot, *Diderot. Salons I*, 226; Diderot, *Diderot. Salons II*, 114.
- 64 Watelet uses the term *couleur* in this sense throughout his entry “Gravure,” Diderot and d’Alembert, *Encyclopédie*, VII, 877–90.
- 65 William M. Ivins Jr., *Prints and Visual Communication* (Cambridge, 1969).
- 66 See Ivins’s comments on the visual conventions of prints in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, *Prints and Visual Communication*, 71–92.
- 67 The painting is Louvre Inv. RF 926; for the print, *Inventaire du fonds français 18e*, IV, 408, no. 68.
- 68 On Greuze’s profit-sharing agreement with his printmakers, see Christian Michel, “La diffusion des gravures d’après Greuze,” in *Diderot et Greuze: actes du Colloque de Clermont-Ferrand (16 novembre 1984)*, ed. Antoinette and Jean Ehrard (Clermont-Ferrand, 1986), 39–49; Françoise Arquie-Bruley, “Documents notariés inédits sur Greuze,” *Bulletin de la Société de l’histoire de l’art français* (1981): 125–54; Antony Griffiths, “Greuze et ses graveurs,” *Nouvelles de l’estampe*, 52–53 (July–October 1980): 9–11.
- 69 Isabelle Pichet argues that Chardin’s work as *tapissier*, through placement and juxtaposition of artworks in a given Salon, guided the public’s judgement of artworks, in “Le pouvoir discursif de la mise en exposition au Salon: Chardin le tapissier,” *Cahiers d’histoire culturelle* 19 (2008): 1–9. Pichet studies the work of the *tapissiers* between 1750 and 1789 in her dissertation, “Expographie, critique et opinion: Les discursivités du Salon de l’Académie de Paris (1750–1789),” UQAM, thèse non publiée, 2009. Unfortunately, the author is unable to address this dissertation as Pichet has removed it from the UQAM library, withheld it from the dissertation databases, and refused the author’s request for access to it.
- 70 On the development of aesthetic judgment through consensus rather than social station in the period, see William Ray, “Talking About Art: the French Royal Academy Salons and the Formation of the Discursive Citizen,” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* XXXVII/4 (Summer 2004): 527–52.
- 71 Immanuel Kant, *Kant’s gesammelte Schriften. Hrsg. von der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin, 1910–55), V, 165–485, see specifically paragraphs 20–22, 40.