

Scrutinising *L'Œil absolu*¹

NEIL JEFFARES

Xavier Salmon, *Maurice Quentin de La Tour: L'Œil absolu*

Cohen&Cohen, 2024, 624 pp.



A new, lavishly illustrated, huge book on the most important pastellist of the eighteenth century, written by the head of the Département des arts graphiques at the Louvre, responsible for the major 2004 monographic exhibition on La Tour and co-author of the best general introductory book (with Christine Debrie, 2000). When news of the publication broke two years ago, the local press in Saint-Quentin excitedly hailed it as a new catalogue raisonné, and the publisher's blurb has more recently described its extent, size (an odd 28.2x32 cm) and content ("riche d'environ 500 pastels et préparations"), and called it the only complete monograph to appear since 1928 (someone had the sense to qualify that by adding "en France"). The author's own preface (foreword? the prelims are oddly untitled) had the grace to acknowledge my catalogue raisonné, and added "Notre propos n'a pas été de donner un nouvel inventaire exhaustif...le livre a avant tout pour but de permettre au plus grand nombre de mieux comprendre la magie"

So what will you find? XS (as I shall call the book for short) is certainly handsomely, and liberally, illustrated: there are 508 numbered figures, a handful of unnumbered details and 20 "pages d'ouverture" (full page details bleeding off the edges, decorating mainly the end pages: only 9 are listed in what purports to be a list of them on p. 7). But – and this goes to the crux of my review – a great many of these relate to other matter I wasn't expecting to find in a La Tour monograph – reproductions of work by other artists, from Birochon (13 plates), Vivien (11) and Rosalba (8) to Liotard (8), Ducreux (12) and many others. Of the 310 or so left, 9 (I think) are "attributed to", 30 are copies or pastiches and a further 34 or so related engravings or oil copies of La Tour works. By my reckoning the book is "enrichi" with some 240 autograph La Tour pastels or préparations – less than half the promise as I read it. That is after deducting the bizarre inclusion of some 28 duplications – I'm not including the "pages d'ouverture" but simply numbered figures that appear twice (or in one case three times). Having paid your €160 and carted home this tome (weighing in at just under 5 kg), you may wonder what is going on. The oft-misquoted words of Gibbon's patron may even come to mind: "damned thick square book...".

It isn't even clear why this was done. Was it because it was deemed necessary to see the image again on the same page as the discussion (but sometimes the image is up to six pages after the discussion)? Or was it simply inadvertent? Given the bulk of the book, turning backwards and forwards is more of a nuisance than usual: I don't think this is what Dr Johnson meant by warning a young man that "when years come upon you you will find poring over books an irksome task." Dr Johnson might of course have worried about older readers' sight. To find out

¹ This essay first appeared as a post on my blog, neiljeffares.wordpress.com, on 26 June 2024. This version of record is updated with further observations. It may be cited as Neil Jeffares, "Scrutinising *L'Œil absolu*", *Pastels & pastellists*, <http://www.pastellists.com/Essays/SalmonLaTourReview.pdf>.

details about a work shown (the captions omit inventory numbers etc.), you have first to find the indicator to the figure in the text (frequently some way away), then find, somewhere nearby, the endnote superscript which appears in a font and size that can be hard to decipher without magnification; you then have to turn to the back of the book to locate the endnote itself. My La Tour catalogue (and indeed all pastels in my online *Dictionary of pastellists*, which is not even mentioned in the bibliography) have unique J numbers, taking you directly to the online entries; those J numbers have been added in the endnotes (I suspect as an afterthought) but by no means completely, never for the pastels by other artists and not for the works referred to but not illustrated even though they are reproduced in my Dictionary and could readily be found had J numbers been provided. To assist readers I have prepared a concordance between the XS figure numbers and J numbers in my catalogue (see [here](#)).

The reappearance of images sometimes hundreds of pages apart goes to a deeper problem. I found the intellectual structure of the book deeply puzzling. Not, by its own admission, a catalogue raisonné, what is it – beyond a collection of excellent illustrations (and for me its greatest achievement was the reproductions)? Is it a monograph on La Tour or a history of pastels in the eighteenth century? The latter surely is not what was billed, and almost certainly dealt with by publications already in most purchasers’ libraries (and of course available to all online from my site) – but why else do we get not just copious illustrations from other pastellists but texts such as Rosalba’s Paris diary or Tocqué’s 1750 discourse on the art of portraiture or Liotard’s *Traité*? These are not short quotes but lengthy passages of up to a dozen pages. If not padding, this felt as though the book had lost its way (I certainly had, having tried to read it straight through).

We then come to the parts dealing with La Tour. Again so often the prose style feels long-winded, and ends up quoting, not sentences, but pages from the well known sources: Duplaquet’s unreadable oration, and the salon critiques which have been done to death. Anyone familiar with my La Tour catalogue will know how I think they should be dealt with: printed in full in a documentation section, strictly for reference, and on the rare occasion when a fact emerges, that to be mentioned in the relevant catalogue entry. That is not the approach in XS.

This makes the book hard going for the general reader. But as a reference work, its organisation presents its own challenges. If you are a busy auctioneer and want to find what XS has to say about a specific pastel, it requires considerable effort to locate it in the book (there may be multiple appearances). There is a useful index, which helps for named sitters, but the *inconnus* remain a challenge. You may find my catalogue and XS concordance the quickest route.

Some confusion might have been avoided had there been an explanatory note setting out the author’s method. Are we to infer that works omitted are not thought “right”? I don’t think this is the intention (several dozen La Tour pastels, including three in Saint-Quentin, which are not normally questioned, don’t appear), although I suspect some readers will assume this is the implication (“monographie complète” as the blurb has it). As to attribution, for example, is there a significant difference between “Maurice Quentin de La Tour?” and “Attribué à Maurice Quentin de La Tour?” Without introductory apparatus, provenance, literature etc. any discussion of attribution is incomplete, making the need for consistent reference to my catalogue all the more necessary. Generally however I was surprised at how often XS and I agree on the status of the many versions of La Tour’s pastels.

There are also surprising omissions from the book (not just the the handbook elements found within most catalogues raisonnés). There is very little on the scientific analysis, and no x-ray or

spectroscopic or similar imaging; only one photograph of a support, one of a folded sheet and nothing on strainers; nothing on frames (apart from that of the président de Rieux). There is no clear chronology of work, nor short table of biographical dates. Indeed the biography focuses on the traditional, discredited sources (as Freud remarked, “Wer Biograph wird, verpflichtet sich zur Lüge, zur Verheimlichung, Heuchelei, Schönfärberei und selbst zur Verhehlung seines Unverständnisses”). There is very little about the family background. There is surprisingly little on modern critical reception, and virtually nothing about prices or auction performance. Why today does Liotard generate so much more interest than La Tour, a far greater artist?

One final disclosure: make of it what you will. A year ago I sent a note to the publisher in which I wrote:

...With any artist as important as La Tour there is a great deal of information shared among the widely published literature, including of course M. Salmon’s own publications, and much of it endlessly repeated and requiring no specific acknowledgement. ... In my work on La Tour over the last twenty years, I have however invested a great deal of time and effort in uncovering new documents in archives and forgotten publications which have never been published or have received no attention from La Tour scholars.... You can see some examples of this in my list of errata and omissions to M. Salmon’s 2018 catalogue of the Louvre pastels, here: <https://neiljeffares.wordpress.com/2018/07/12/the-louvre-pastels-catalogue-errata-and-observations/> It is the scale and number of these discoveries that is more significant than a couple of examples, and presents an unavoidable question. If M. Salmon ignores them, his book will be defective. If they are included in full (as I hope they will be), the credits required will be very extensive. I cannot believe that you would want to publish a work that made heavy reliance on an unacknowledged source. The best way forward would surely be to agree on a form of credit before publication, and I look forward to your suggestions.

I received no reply. But a quick read reveals that, just as I had hoped, XS has made extensive use of my research; and, just as I had feared, his acknowledgement of specific points is inconsistent at best. This is not merely a matter of courtesy: it is, as some of the illustrations below reveal, that in failing to credit the immediate source the integrity of the information flow can be broken, complicating later researchers’ tasks. It is faintly embarrassing to have to acknowledge my own typos the repetition of which has provided the clearest evidence that they were consulted when not acknowledged. A few examples from other scholars’ work have also been mentioned below.

Finally I should note that in my quick read, and while trying to verify some of these references, I have found some further trivial errors in my own work which I am pleased to have been able to correct. I have found one illustration of a version of a La Tour pastel I had never seen before and some 8 more in colour that I knew only in black and white. There are some references in non-La Tour passages or sitters’ biographies I didn’t know, but I don’t think I exaggerate when I say there is no significant new fact or document about La Tour that readers won’t already have been able to find in the La Tour catalogue and the related material on my site. I leave it to you to decide how you prefer to access such information.

My catalogue raisonné

All sections are available online at <http://www.pastellists.com/LaTour.htm>, and the 2022 eBook formally published for legal deposit is available for download too http://www.pastellists.com/Misc/Jeffares_LaTour_2022ed.pdf, as is the volume of longer essays, http://www.pastellists.com/Misc/LaTour_Supplementary_essays.pdf. There are paper versions in main art historical libraries worldwide.

References to “my main La Tour essay” are to <http://www.pastellists.com/Articles/LaTour.pdf> (of which I have also issued a French [translation](#)); to “Documentation”, http://www.pastellists.com/Misc/LaTour_chronology.pdf;

both of course printed within the 2022 eBook version, as of course are the six fascicles cataloguing the work (alphabetically by sitter).

Individual pastels can be found rapidly on my site by typing the exact J number into the search box on the home page <http://www.pastellists.com/index.htm>.

Notes by page number

In the interests of giving readers a rapid overview of the issues I encountered in a straight read-through I have assembled these notes rapidly. There may be duplication, errors or matters that required detailed further research; but a list like this is never complete. We are all fallible, so if I've claimed a discovery below which should be credited to an earlier researcher (which I've missed or forgotten), please let me know so I can update the document.

I have tried to refrain from purely copy editing points: but what I call the musée Antoine-Lécuyer, which XS calls the musée Antoine Lécuyer (notwithstanding the Imprimerie nationale's *Règles typographiques*) has (with equal disregard) formally changed its name, to the "Musée des Beaux-Arts Antoine Lécuyer" [*sic*]: thus it appears in the logo marking its sponsorship, but nowhere else in the book.

Works omitted from XS which I didn't think were in dispute (based on a quick run-through): J.46.1335; J.46.1617; J.46.1631; J.46.1721; J.46.1839; J.46.1855; J.46.1991; J.46.236; J.46.2364; J.46.2385; J.46.2402; J.46.2683; J.46.2834; J.46.3187; J.46.319 (inconnu, Cognacq-Jay); J.46.321; J.46.3221; J.46.3229 (trois inconnus, Saint-Quentin); J.46.3654; J.46.3661; J.46.3667; J.46.3686

Works I include as attributed which XS may not accept (but we don't know): J.46.1214; J.46.1355; J.46.1374; J.46.1383; J.46.1671; J.46.1952; J.46.2738; J.46.3391; J.46.3407

I haven't attempted to count the large number of "œuvres mentionnées" (lost portraits where no image is known) listed in my catalogue but not mentioned in XS.

p. 14 line -2: "de quelques années": I discovered her age, 4½ years older than La Tour.

p. 17 Bucelly story from Decameron presented again. I doubt if any attention should be paid to these stories which I analysed in great detail to show how they emanated from La Tour himself.

p. 17 line-1: I identified Mme Barbaut-Gelly. The passage is quoted, Desmaze cited but not me.

p. 21 When did La Tour first meet Mlle Fel? "très certainement avant 1757": but as I argue it goes back to well before that: "but one of her later letters (5.i.1788) refers obliquely to a recollection of the time when she sang at a concert at Amiens when Chauvelin was intendant there, putting the start of their friendship to before 1751 (if La Tour attended, which is uncertain from the mention); her recollection is confirmed by the final note in Meunier's police report: the Concert d'Amiens, known as the Société des Quarante, ran from 1745"

p. 25 Voltaire ou Le Blanc? The letter which Desmaze prints was in the collection of Benjamin Fillon, sold in Paris, Baudry, 16–17.ii.1877, Lot 1725, for Fr250. A facsimile of the signature "DeLaTour/aux galeries du Louvre ce 24 avril 1774" is included on 2 p. in-4 letter, and it is clear that no addressee is mentioned. So it is not obvious on what basis Desmaze suggested the recipient's identity; perhaps merely on the basis of the London publication cited. Voltaire seems improbable as they had not been in communication for some time and he had no obvious cousin (the Voltaire 1775 letter supposedly to Latour is in fact to a homonym). Le Blanc is credited with the *Dialogues sur les mœurs des Anglois*, printed in London in 1765 and is the more plausible recipient.

p. 26 Curieux: more of the debunked myth.

p. 27 (cf. p. 577) La Tour's question to the Academie about fossils: XS follows 20.xii.1783 date as in B&W note, who nonetheless locate this paragraph at the end of 1783, while this volume of Soulavie's *Histoire naturelle de la France méridionale...* was apparently published in 1782 (vi, pp. 265ff) – although presumably after La Tour's nomination to the Académie d'Amiens, 11.xi.1782. Both La Tour and Marie Fel were listed among the subscribers. It has therefore been brought forward with some additional text referenced in La Tour's 9.ii.1784 will *infra*. This makes little sense without discussing Soulavie.

p. 29 fig. 7 much too red.

p. 30 Huber disparu en 1744: I corrected XS's erroneous 1747 from his earlier publications, and this is based on extensive research I did on Huber.

p. 32 XS repeats Lecocq's statement that Lescot's foundation dated from 1744 in his will; but he died in 1745. Endnote 17: Lecocq 1876 is not in the biblio. It is *Documents inédits sur M.-Q. de La Tour publiés d'après les archives municipales*, Saint-Quentin, 1876, a reissue of 1875 but different from the Histoire.

p. 32 For 6 000,00 read 6,000

p. 33 The announcement in the *Mercure* dated 26 janvier 1778 appears (for the first time – it is not in B&W) in my Documentation, with the reference “*Mercure de France*, .II.1778, pp. 205–6”, meaning that it is found in the February 1778 issue (I use small cap Roman numerals with points and no space to the year to indicate months, not volumes). XS does not mention me but cites (endnote 18) “*Mercure de France*, II, 1778, p. 205-206”, as though it appears in volume II of 1778. In fact XS copies my text – e.g. with “sçachant que les pauvres ..., M. Delatour” which comes from the reprint in the *Journal politique, ou Gazette des gazettes* which I also cite (it was the text I originally followed but later attempted to conform to the *Mercure* as the primary source; but I erroneously left in some Journal spellings) but he does not; had he been consulting the *Mercure* directly he would have printed “sachant que les pauvres ..., le sieur Delatour” while my hybrid text retains the errors. I infer that XS was using my source.

p. 41 Although a note in the prelims states that the book follows original spelling etc., there are numerous places where the spelling has been modernised. The baptismal register has “par le sous. pr. cure”, i.e. “par le soussigné prêtre curé”, not “le soussigné présent curé”.

p. 41 The identification and dates to Meniolle etc. are mine; I don't believe they are found anywhere else before I printed them. Uncredited.

p. 43 Much of this family background is my research e.g. the La Tour-Havart marriage in 1699; no citation of La Tour's family, http://www.pastellists.com/Essays/LaTour_Family.pdf [Jeffares 2016] in my [Bibliography](#).

p. 51 Dupouch was born in Paris 5 mars 1690, not vers 1686.

Why so many pastels by Birochon? The discussion is unjustifiably long since the attribution isn't credible. There is no mention of my discovery of the “Note of portraits in pastelle at Redbraes”, National Records of Scotland, Papers of the family of Hume of Polwarth, ref. GD158/2482.

p. 56 XS now agrees with me that the resemblance of one of these to a miniature called Boucher is simply coincidence. Uncredited.

p. 58 Dates for Reine Havart, my discovery uncredited

p. 58 The two oils figs. 34, 35: they are discussed in Jeffares (not cited):

Virtually nothing is known of Pierre Pierre, “dit Latour” or “Delatour” (1707–1743), maître peintre à Paris, who was brother-in-law of La Tour's teacher Dupouch (*v.* §I.4 *infra*); he was the son of Louis Pierre dit Latour, employé dans les fermes du roi. The address in his 21.I.1731 marriage contract with Gabrielle-Catherine Dupouch (AN MC/XXIV/637) was rue de la Pelleterie (when he was described as an “ouvrier travaillant à la peinture”), and the same address is given in the registres de tutelles after his death (AN Y4609^B, 21.III.1743).

This makes it unlikely that he was the author of two oil portraits, [J.46.31495](#) and [J.46.3164](#), improbably attributed to Maurice-Quentin de La Tour on the basis of inscriptions and dates of 1736 and 1737 with an address in the rue Saint-Jacques opposite the Jésuites (now the Lycée Louis le Grand); one of these is after Delobel. Perhaps these are by Jean-Charles Latour, peintre, rue Saint-Jacques, known only from a consentement connected with a debt relating to outstanding rent on a house in the rue de l'Arbalète, 11.XII.1750 (AN MC/ET/XVIII/584).

p. 57 fig. 29 This inconnu is identified as Mr Renell by a process of elimination from the receipt; fig. 30 is Mrs Sutton.

p. 60 It was I who worked out whom Debrie meant by Mlle Menon; [*v.* *Éc. fr.*, Mlle de Menou, [J.9.2263](#)] and gave her correct name and dates, not cited.

Fig. 38 is already in the Dictionary, [J.9.4058](#), not cited.

p. 61 Why not identify the Horvitz work? ([J.46.3761](#)) This circumlocutory style is annoying; you have to wait to p. 69 for it to be mentioned again.

p. 62/65 wasn't it me who found the specific Rubens source about 10 years ago? In D&S it was “dit d'apres Rubens” with no particular picture identified.

p. 69 My catalogue entry for the “Murillo” copy reads “Jules Hachet believed this was copy of “Murillo” in NG, and Tourneux accepted this as proof that the artist travelled to London c.1725; but there were other versions in Paris such as that in the estate of François Berger acqu. Godefroid and sold to Tallard” but is not credited.

p. 72 My cat entry for J.46.3788 explains “Copied after the Rosalba pastel owned by comte de Morville until 1732, and by Jean de Boullongne after”, not cited. The Crozat letter is endnoted at 54 as “Baker and Henry 1995, p. 485”: this of course is about Murillo, not Rosalba. In fact the endnote indicators 51 to 55 on p. 72 should actually be 61 to 65 but takes some time to figure out.

p. 79 “premières années de la carrière de l’artiste” [Vivien]: my recent discovery that he worked in pastel in the 1680s [see http://www.pastellists.com/Essays/Vivien_Richelet.pdf] is ignored.

p. 84 The identification of Mme Guillaumon and the genealogy connecting to Vivien is mine.

p. 87 Rosalba’s mother was simply “Alba Foresti”; “Alba di Angelo Foresti” is a phrase in Vianelli transcribing her 1671 marriage and identifying her father’s name in the established form. On Rosalba’s first steps in pastel, my discovery of the Segurier manuscript should be mentioned.

p. 87 fig. 69 The dimensions of the Rosalba wrong, not 53x42 but 71x57 (this should be obvious to anyone who looks at it).

p. 90 Mlle d’Argeneu ou d’Argenon: I solved the mystery of the identity of Charles de La Fosse’s great-niece: she was [J.21.0216](#) Anne-Marguerite de La Pierre d’Argenon (c.1685–1747), cantatrice amateur, petite-nièce et fille adoptive du peintre Charles de La Fosse.

pp. 90ff My annotated edition of Rosalba’s [journal](#) identifies these people correctly; XS uses the outdated Sensier text and repeats his errors. For example, entry for 4 June 1720 on p. 90, XS identifies the Roland with Sensier, while my annotation states “Sensier (followed by Sani) identify Roland as having known Rosalba in Venice, as being “Roland d’Aubrevil”, and as being the son of Germain-Pierre Rolland (c.1659–1741), président à la première des requêtes. This is evidently a confusion: the reference must be to Louis Rolland, sgr d’Aubreuil (1687–), son of Barthélémy Rolland (1647–1718), banquier, from a completely different family. As Rolland d’Aubreuil was unmarried at the time, there may be a confusion with his uncle, Louis Rolland (1654–p. 1724), also a banquier and agent de change, and his wife, née Elisabeth Leclerc, daughter of a premier commis at the Trésor royal.”

Similarly, p. 91, entry for 13 June: “M. Baucon”: Unglossed by Sensier or Sani, this is Étienne Boucon (–1735), agent de change and patron of the arts: his daughter was La Tour’s Mme de Mondonville. And so on.

p. 93 It is unclear why XS questions whether the Dresden pastel is that in the diary, Louis XV, “in grande”. Between 1720 and 1765 it is known that it was given to August III., 1747, at time of marriage of Marie-Josèphe de Saxe to the dauphin; see provenance for [J.21.0697](#). The Josselin version is [J.21.0711](#). The unravelling of the misidentifications of the Mlles de Charolais and Clermont pastels is my work: Jeffares 2004 (my article on this subject published on paper in *Le Musée Condé* and also available online) should be cited; endnotes 93 and 94 merely cite Sani’s erroneous version and give no source for my correction.

Why are the Sani references throughout to the 1988 edition when this has been superseded by Sani 2007? It would have been easier and unambiguous to cite J numbers for all pastels.

p. 94 The puzzling reference to the two portraits said to be of Watteau is followed by endnote indicator 96: but refers only to the Treviso pastel [J.21.1063](#). It is endnote 97 which refers to the Frankurt pastel [J.21.1061](#), but the indicator for footnote 97 has been attached to the next sentence, a female pastel, [J.21.2531](#). In fact endnote 98 refers to that.

The provenance should have *Laperlier*, not Leparlier.

p. 95 fig. 75 duplicates fig. 53.

p. 97 The reattribution of the pastel [J.2472.353](#) in the Fondazione Cariplo in Milan from Rosalba to Coypel is mine. It was published as attributed to Coypel in my print edition of 2006 and confirmed as firmly by Coypel on the basis of a better image in 2011 (email to the institution). XS cites only the inv. no. in note 103 with no reference to me.

p. 98 [J.21.0721](#) Ursula Katharina von Altenbockum (1680–1743), Mätresse König Augusts II., was a princess, not a countess (married first to Jerzy Dominik Fürst Lubomirski, a prince; then made a Reichsfürstin von Teschen *suo jure*, then married another prince). More importantly, is it really her? There is a repetition called Isabella Correr Pisani [J.21.0861](#). The J numbers (not provided) would take you to this.

p. 98 Andrezel born December 1663, not 1662.

p. 103 On Chauvelin's connections with Richer de Roddes, abbé Huber, Marie Fel etc. see my cat. entries to [J.46.2717](#) and [J.46.1314](#).

p. 106 Although XS cites the adverse opinions of Alastair Laing and Rena Hoisington to his 2004 attribution, he does not note that I have explicitly agreed with XS. However the suggested identification (a new piece of information I didn't know) of the sitter as Catherine Oursin, Mme Pomereu des Riceys, requiring a date of 1723–24, seems to me impossible chronologically. It would carry more weight if the pendant in the 1746 inventaire had been located. The Pomereu family were clients of Vigée and Valade, and may well have commissioned pastels in the 1720s from other artists.

p. 106 I published a great deal of research on the abbé Huber including his correct dates. This is perhaps intended to be covered by the endnote 116 but the note is inadequate.

p. 107 XS has not understood the provenance of the early Huber portrait that I set out. "Mathilde Huber, épouse Gausse (ou Gausse)" was not the sitter's niece; rather it passed first to his nephew Jean Huber and thence to the latter's granddaughter Marguerite-Mathilde Huber who, in 1827, married Auguste Gausse.

p. 113 Removal to his brother Charles's: §I.8 of my main La Tour article has an account of La Tour's residences.

p. 115 Émile Straus, not Strauss

p. 119 "adressée semble-t-il par le collectionneur Antoine de Laroque", for which I am cited: but the footnote in the 2022 edition of my Documentation states "It is tempting to suggest that the author was Antoine de La Roque (1672–1744),... However a comparison of the handwriting in the note and that of La Roque in manuscript correspondence (e.g. lettres de 1731 à de Mauzaugues, Ms_151_43, f° 201 ff) make this very unlikely as the hand is much less tidy. Nor does it seem that Antoine's brother Jean, the explorer, can have been the author". XS is evidently quoting from an earlier edition of my work (the suggestion was still there in the 2020 edition before I examined the handwriting).

p. 119 endnote 14: the sottisier and the discrepancies and references were collated first by me in the Documentation.

p. 119 The details of Lemoyne's suicide are given in Hannah Williams's article, not cited.

p. 120 Worth noting that the La Tour submissions to the 1737 salon were printed as additions to the livret.

p. 120: treatment of German language: staatlichen not capitalised as adjective; le duc Christian des Deux-Ponts however appears in French; Leszczyński omits í (throughout) etc.

p. 121 I unravelled the Fozembas-Roux names which Desmaze had garbled in 2019; a summary appears in my catalogue entry for [J.46.1328](#). XS does not cite my research here, and does not cite me until p. 122 in connection with the pastiches.

p. 122 To understand the Bailey suggestion, [J.103.188](#) should be cited.

p. 125 The caption to fig. 95 (but not the text) adopts my suggestion that the engraver T. Bertrand should be identified as Thomas Bertrand, son of the sculptor and associate of René Frémin.

p. 126 "sketch by Saint-Aubin corresponds to autoportrait à l'index": I discovered the Saint-Aubin sketch and reproduced it in my catalogue at [J.46.1013](#).

p. 128 fig. 100 duplicates fig. 420 and again fig. 3 is detail.

p. 130 The caption to fig. 103: this is [J.46.1057](#).

p. 132 Do we need a whole page almost blank? same on pp. 346, 418; 430; 554.

p. 134 fig. 107 is new; text but not image is in Jeffares, not mentioned.

p. 141 The Kuntze versions and this whole discussion is my discovery.

p. 147 The Horvitz version is [J.46.2695](#); I reject it too.

p. 147 "Agée de 15 ou 16 ans": she was born on 15.vii.1722, and so 15 when the portrait was made, 16 when the exhibition opened.

pp. 154ff fig 120/121 They are not inédit. There is no acknowledgement of my publication of them on n. 209. I attributed them to La Tour before the sale, and included them in the La Tour catalogue at J.46.3699 and J.46.36991 in all editions until June 2022, including the ebook versions of record issued in 2020 and 2021. However I considered them borderline and still do; despite the strong latourien elements the treatment of the drapery in particular seemed excessively flat. Hovering around the 50% probability, in June 2022 I demoted them to the Anonymes éc. fr., with new J numbers J.9.8068335 and J.9.8068336. I have now put them back to the original J numbers largely because they will be easier to find, but my doubts haven't disappeared.

p. 157 fig. 121 “Mme de Stael” J.46.2986: this is my attribution in 2012.

p. 161 The Neilson copy of Dupouch J.5558.101 is my discovery, not credited.

p. 162: fig. 125 duplicates fig. 15.

p. 166, 169 The dimensions of fig. 129. 118x91 cm correspond to the Baltimore copy (more or less) whose size is correctly given in Cent pastels. CP gives those for the Vogue version as 165x135. Unexplained.

pp. 169ff Although the J number is cited for the président de Rieux, nowhere is mentioned my detailed study “La Tour, *Le président de Rieux*”, http://www.pastellists.com/Essays/LaTour_Rieux.pdf [Jeffares 2010c]

p. 184 The poem by L’Affichard in the Mercure was found by me and included in my Documentation, janvier 1742; in the 2022 edition I misspelled the author’s name as Thomas Laffichet, which XS has copied – although he does not credit me as the source of this passage. XS’s retyping includes minor errors: Scais for Sçais, jouïrai for jôüirai etc. where mine matches the Mercure.

p. 186 Here and elsewhere these long genealogies in words are very “wordy”; the simple pedigrees on my website (with hyperlinks from the sitter’s name in the catalogue) are a far more efficient way to display the relationships.

p. 189 fig. 141: I have this in colour.

p. 191 “M. Rossignol” owner of the Dumont le Romain. That is what I print in the main cat., but full details are in the collectors’ index: Jean Rossignol (1908 – 1984), businessman and collector, etc. For “sir Robert Abdy”, read “Sir Robert Abdy”.

pp. 195, 196 couldn’t these appear on facing pages?

p. 197 My research http://www.pastellists.com/Essays/LaTour_Huber.pdf appears here in extenso, including a transcription of the testament etc., but is mentioned only on p. 198 to disagree on a minor point, as though the preceding work was not mine.

p. 197 “collection Saladin en 1788”... as my pedigree makes clear, Michel-Jean-Louis Saladin du Vengeron (1756–1844) married Catherine-Marie Fabri (1765–1836), fille de Pierre Fabri (1727–1800) & de Catherine-Charlotte Vernet (1735–1795), fille de Jacob Vernet (1698–1789) – not a daughter of Isaac Vernet but a great-niece: see <http://www.pastellists.com/Genealogies/Vernet.pdf>.

p. 198 It was I who found the inv. p. m. and described its contents; D&S evidently did not know it, but XS now does – although the details quoted are all to be found in my essay, not cited as the source.

p. 200 This font doesn’t have an ß, and so appears as a box. Preußische Schlösser should not be hyphenated.

p. 201 Rottembourg is the more usual spelling although Rosenberg has Rothenbourg. He was born 26.ii.1684, as I have; 1683/84 an inference from age at death for those with imperfect information. He was portrayed by Birochon, repr. in my Dictionary but not among the 13 in XS (but listed on p. 55). P. 619: appears in index after Rothschild, as though XS changed his mind.

p. 202 line 5 for “Claude Cardin” read “Charles Cardin”.

p. 205 The exact passage from Hautecoeur 1959 is included in my La Tour Critical Fortune section.

pp. 206-217 This is a very long digression before we return to La Tour.

p. 224 The pastel box in fig. 154: the authenticity rests on family legend rather than tangible evidence; the box may be later, as I note in my catalogue entry for this item of memorabilia, J.M.46.115. It’s far too small to have been used for a full colour pastel. XS endnote 288 merely notes that it was given by the comte de Bylandt at an unspecified date. I disclose that Eugène-Jean-Alexandre, comte de Bylandt had married Belle’s great-niece Maria Henrietta van Tuyll van Serooskerken, petite-nièce de Mme de Charrière, in 1837; his son donated it in 1919.

p. 224ff No sources are cited for this description of pastel manufacture etc; there are many sources – among them my [Prolegomena](#) – indeed there is a vast treasury of resources on pastel on my site which could usefully have been cited for the convenience of readers.

p. 226 For the Charmeton family of pastel technicians, see my Suppliers' index:
<http://www.pastellists.com/Suppliers.pdf#search=%22Charmeton%22>

p. 226f Similarly for Pellechet see my <http://www.pastellists.com/Essays/Loriot.pdf>; indeed for any of these suppliers, makers etc, search the name in the search box on my site to be taken to numerous sources of information that readers will find greatly expand what is covered in XS. It would have been so simple to say so.

p. 227 The reference to the “Nadaux” crayons – endnote 290 cites merely the Goncourt passage which is reprinted in B&W, both as “Nadaud”. It is only in my documentation that this entry is annotated with the correct name of the artist – André Nadaux – as XS spells it without however citing me. Unless of course XS had located the autograph catalogue that the Goncourts had seen – where Nadaux is spelt correctly (but he doesn't cite that either, or the other one: Laverdet, 1852, no. 171; Collection Alfred Bovet; Paris, Delestre, Charavay, 23–25.vi.1885, no. 1477). There is of course a Dictionary entry for Nadaux to which the footnote in my La Tour documentation directs:
<http://www.pastellists.com/Articles/Nadaux.pdf>

p. 229 The Russell citation again comes straight from me, §III.1 of my main La Tour article: “John Russell, in the 2nd edition of his *Elements* (1777, p. 21: see [TREATISES](#)), added a curious footnote, suggesting that La Tour (“lately a Painter of note in Paris” – this was 1777) often used “with great success” smalt grounds, prepared by strewing smalt dust over paper brushed with gum water, brushed to remove any loose particles when dry.” I reproduce the text with this footnote (only available in the rare 1777 edition) in my [Treatises](#). Once again XS cites only my source without crediting my noticing it.

p. 230 “Deux ou trois pieds”: this is from La Tour's letter to Marigny, and are imperial feet, so the cm equivalent is not 60 to 90, but 65 to 98.

p. 232 what an indigestible assortment.

p. 233 why is fig. 172 Chicago in b/w? I have it in colour.

pp. 236/237 Which captions for which images?

p. 239 It was I who identified and attributed the princesse de Rohan to La Tour in 2013, and my essay should also be cited: http://www.pastellists.com/Essays/LaTour_Rohan.pdf.

p. 240 appui-main, mannequin: the brief notice reproduced in my Documentation is all we know of the contents; why not cite it, as was done in 2004 (unless because the B&W reference is evidently erroneous)? The grand mannequin is mentioned, but the appui-main is not (although widely used and quite plausible).

p. 243 the double-glass capsule: I discovered the two examples of this method; see see [PROLEGOMENA](#), §IV.8 and entries for Jean Monnet [J.46.2377](#) (Saint-Quentin) of 1756 and Lord Coventry [J.46.1565](#) of 1752.

pp. 243ff for fixing, the comprehensive account in the Prolegomena should be cited.

p. 244 identities of the Roussel couple now corrected to follow me; they were wrong up to 2004.

p. 245 why not ask me for the colour image?

p. 246f The Le Vieil and “M. de Bernières” documents are both in my documentation, additions to B&W. The name is spelt Berniere in the Mercure, but my index of suppliers gives his full details:
<http://www.pastellists.com/Suppliers.pdf#search=%22bernier%22>.

p. 254 Fig 201 duplicates fig. 155

p. 255 “maintenue comme telle par Neil Jeffares” i.e. as a preparation for the chapeau clabaud autoportrait ([J.46.1087](#)): nonsense, it's given a separate section ([J.46.1011](#)) – both in my “online” catalogue as he puts it and of course it is the same in my ebook edition of 2022.

p. 255 Again the Laffichet mistake (cf. p. 184) copied from me but not credited

p. 258 fig. 203 now in colour

p. 261 The pastel offered by von Baeyer: why not mention that this is [J.66.111](#)?

p. 261 I'm glad XS recognises the importance of Mme de Graffigny's evidence; it might have been appropriate to note that I was the first La Tour specialist to explore this and publish it in Jeffares 2017g.

p. 262 While Debrie & Salmon 2000, p. 69 n. 95, ?cop. "il faudrait pouvoir confirmer l'authenticité"; Salmon 2024, fig. 208 agrees with me as copy.

p. 261 On the Lemoyne bust, Cabezas's definitive study should be credited: "Le buste de Maurice-Quentin de La Tour par Jean-Baptiste Lemoyne", *Dix-huitième siècle*, 55, 2023, pp. 366–83. My cat no. is [J.I.46.205](#), in the La Tour Iconography section of my book (not cited). The identification and dates for Wespín are my research, not credited (note 351 merely suggests I reproduce the archival document which in fact was located by Cabezas). Again Cabezas's work and mine on identifying the Lair is hardly reflected by the citation in endnote 352 or the subsequent discussions (Grebert etc.). Indeed the whole discussion up to p. 265 seems to be taken completely from my Documentation, right up to the 2 juillet 1822 entry, and it is based on many archival documents first published by me and largely located by Cabezas.

This continues with the freemasonry references on p. 265.

p. 266 Although the Goncourts published the Génard passage, they didn't identify the author; I think Tourneux was the first to do so. Spelling here partly modernized; the subtitle is given incorrectly ("Parallele" is missing)

pp. 269ff My Montjoye discovery credited (just about ... it's phrased as though I'd simply discovered a document, although in fact the complicated chain of logic and genealogy set out on these pages is entirely mine). My Norton Simon doubts shared.

p. 272 The biography of Montjoye is almost entirely my work, but it's presented as though I'd merely spotted a similarity in technique in the homme en habit noir.

p. 273 The Roettiers is [J.I.46.601](#)

p. 273 Mugnerot [J.I.46.301](#) is my identification; his full name, biog, dates etc. – the signature not read with certainty in the 2005 catalogue – again not credited or mentioned.

p. 276 For all these copyists, their biographies are given in my <http://www.pastellists.com/Suppliers.pdf>. Although not cited this may be where XS found the forenames for the copyist named by Fleury (writing under a pseudonym) only as "Chevreux" (and if he had not consulted my site, why didn't he?)

p. 277 Fig. 219 duplicates fig. 8.

p. 279 The pastiches figs 221 and 222 are not new: they are in Jeffares at J.46.1157 and J.46.11445 with provenance.

p. 281 On the logements etc., see the diagram I repr in my main La Tour article.

p. 285ff The princesse de Rohan – my attribution and unravelling of the Lundberg version – *v. supra*. The passage quoted, beginning "Elle rassemble toutes les perfections avec la grande beauté", is lifted straight from my article http://www.pastellists.com/Essays/LaTour_Rohan.pdf; XS's endnote merely cites Laine & Brown – but they don't reproduce the letter, they merely mention it – and it is I who mention them in passing. The whole discussion, including fig. 224, the poem etc, is lifted straight from me; citing me in endnote 400, as though my sole contribution were the poem, seems inadequate.

p. 292 I comment on the similarity with the Rigaud portrait of Orry etc.

p. 294f The reference to Mme Nivelon as Anne Féret alone is a little confusing. For her biography and the dates quoted here without source, see my "La Tour's copyists (2): Anne Féret, Mme Nivelon (1711–1786)", <https://neiljeffares.wordpress.com/2020/05/17/la-tours-copyists-2-anne-feret-mme-nivelon-1711-1786/>, 17.v.2020 [Jeffares 2020a] where her biobios were first published. See also comment to p. 409 where she is called Nivelon.

p. 296 The identification of Sassenage follows my conclusion; the archives in Sassenage, which I consulted and cite, do not resolve the question: inv. p. m., 1787, art. 158, "sept tableaux de famille en cadres corés avec leurs glaces". The lady, not by La Tour, still gets a J number: [J.9.2709](#).

p. 300 Again it was I who first published the Graffigny letter in a La Tour context.

p. 302 Duval married Marie Bersin by contract of 30.v.1731. "Vers 1730" comes from my essay (which is credited) where I wrote "By around 1730" etc.; I also named his wife Marie-Anne, although the contract has just Marie Bersin. This can be found in a few seconds today; but in 2010 when I wrote my article, the contract wasn't online.

p. 304 “Pâris” is a 19th century orthographic intervention; they were just Paris in 18th century documents.

p. 306 fig. 244a I catalogued as a “pseudopendant” to the lovely La Tour of Mme Savalette. XS assumes it is a copy of the lost pastel of M. Savalette; I’m more cautious, and I can see why, with the pillar in the composition, Valade’s name was suggested. The strongest argument in favour of it being after La Tour is the very similar magistrate [J.46.3391](#) which I attribute to La Tour but XS ignores (whether deliberately or not is impossible to say); it is however the comparison between the two similar compositions that I consider tells against the Savalette attribution.

p. 307ff fig. 245 duplicates fig. 191. The discovery of the Philippe pastel was one of the triumphs of the 2004 exhibition. To follow the genealogical discussion my Philippe pedigree is helpful. As for Mme Philippe’s “fils” in the 1746 double portrait, unnamed by XS, my catalogue entry for [J.46.2508](#) identifies him as François-Gabriel Chappron de Monsivry, the youngest son of her step-daughter Charlotte-Marguerite, Mme Jean-Baptiste Chappron (and the only one born before 1746, but still a minor in 1769). I give the full provenance for the pastel as “Mrs Walter Frederick Kingsland, née Blanche Vanderbilt Marcelin (1868–1941), ∞ 1^o Franklin Singer; acqu. 1902 her sister-in-law, princesse Edmond de Polignac, née Winnaretta Singer (1865–1943), as of ??A.-J.-J. Le Riche de la Pouplinière par ??Louis Vigée in estate inventory; legs: her niece, Daisy Winnaretta Singer, Mme Michel Valéry Ollivier, puis Mme Hervé Dugardin (1891–1975); legs: her son, Alain Franklin Valéry-Ollivier (1925–1994); legs: Fritz Lehnhoff 2004; legs: Museumsstiftung zur Förderung der Staatlichen Bayerischen Museen 2021”. “Staatsgemäldesammlungen” in XS’s text has lost its umlaut.

p. 310 figs. 192, 193 duplicates of figs. 246, 247.

p. 312 The discussion of the complications of the provenance of the Grimod couple are easier with the full steps as set out in my catalogue.

p. 314f figs. 196, 197 duplicate figs. 250, 251.

p. 317 The portrait belonging to La Blotterie: you can easily follow this discussion if you are told that that pastel is my [J.9.2051](#), illustrated among the French anonymes; otherwise it is meaningless as Fleury & Brière (cited in the endnote 450) don’t reproduce it.

p. 318 fig. 254 duplicates fig. 185.

p. 318ff The discussion of the Louis Vigée pastel, fig. 257, my [J.758.276](#), and the identification of Le Riche are strengthened by the passage in Mme de Genlis which I found: endnote 455 cites the passage but doesn’t credit me. The story is a little more complicated. The pastel was included in the 2015 Vigée Le Burn exhibition organised by XS and Joseph Baillio; in his entry for this pastel (cat. 10, p. 96), XS noted that the Balechou print doesn’t name the sitter and questioned the identification as La Pouplinière. I then found the reference in Mme de Genlis’s *Memoires inédits* (Paris & Londres, 1825, I, p. 75) where the print is identified and its verses cited. That is the reference XS now inserts in his new book. While this seems to close the matter, earlier editions of Genlis cite different verses, suggesting the story be treated with caution; the later editions suggest the earlier verses were written by La Pouplinière’s “ami, M. de Broussonel” – the name of a much later author, confirming suspicions that the story of substitution is an editor’s invention to fit the print to the story.

p. 321 fig. 260 duplicates fig. 190.

p. 323 fig. 263 duplicates fig. 7. XS discusses the second version of Parrocel, of which I write “A second version of the pastel [J.46.2472](#), donated to Saint-Quentin by Yves Carlier de Fontobbia, is sensitively executed and incorporates enough changes of detail to keep open the possibility that it is autograph”; XS comes to a similar conclusion (but does not acknowledge me). But why not reproduce it instead of repeating the main version?

pp. 324f The Lemoyne pastels. I don’t say that the Valade copies either of the surviving pastels; I say “the Valade painting ... evidently draws from the same source as [J.46.2011](#)”: in other words, from the hypothetical lost version, so details of the chin etc. cannot easily be interpreted. Setting that aside the main difference between us is that XS thinks the Dormeuil face is the same as the Louvre one; to me, while of course they are very similar (it is after all the same sitter), there are distinct differences: the skin on the Dormeuil is tighter, the mouth firmer, the eyes brighter and most notably the cleft chin more prominent. A pasticheur would not have introduced those elements had he been starting from the Louvre pastel alone.

p. 327ff fig. 268 duplicates fig. 143; fig. 269 duplicates fig. 172; fig. 270 duplicates fig. 173.

p. 328 It was I who found the Kuntze copies in 2021 and pointed out the information it gave on the original state of this and the pendant; referred to in my catalogue entry for both, but discussed in my main La Tour article, §II.4,

where comparative illustrations are included, and introduced in this essay [Jeffares 2021f](#). They are not mentioned in XS.

p. 328 For the exact words in the inventaire de l'an II, see my Documentation at *9 décembre 1793*. "Jean-Baptiste Le Brun" is of course "Jean-Baptiste-Pierre Le Brun". The name appears in full on p. 517, erroneously.

p. 331 fig. 273 Although still in black and white, my image is much clearer than that reproduced here.

p. 332 The identification of [J.46.1825](#) Mlle Gabriel as the future Mme Michel Pignon, née Angélique-Catherine-Jeanne Gabriel (1739–1802) is mine.

p. 332f fig. 274 I proposed the attribution to La Tour in 2010 when XS insisted it was Lenoir. He has now seemingly relented; the inclusion of fig 275 shows why he was wrong: the works could hardly be more different apart from the costume and hair – hardly a basis for attributing portraits. It seems odd to discuss it further. My hesitation concerning the lighting from the right is not answered by an autoportrait where the mechanics of production can reverse the standard orientation.

p. 333f I note that XS has adopted my date of birth for Garnier d'Isle, wrong in almost all sources until I corrected it.

p. 335f I have an extensive discussion in my catalogue entry for the Mirleau pastels. While XS reveals that the La Tour pastel of her [J.46.237](#) was acquired by the present owner in 1971, three years after the last public auction, I mention the dealer's catalogue in which it appeared, and I can add that it was offered soon after to Saint-Quentin for 45,000 francs but declined (although the attribution was not disputed; Archives municipales de SQ, 14S3).

p. 339 The "Mlle Prevost" whose letter XS quotes from B&W was, as my documentation glosses, Jeanne-Louise *Prevost* (1721–1785), de Genève, gouvernante de Mme de Charrière.

p. 340ff this covers much of the material in my catalogue entries for the Cassanéa pastels.

p. 349 fig. 288 duplicates fig. 5.

p. 351 The Pommyer version of Marie Fel is discussed at length in my la Tour catalogue and my Pommyer article in the Gazette des beaux-arts, Jeffares 2001 (online version: http://www.pastellists.com/Essays/LaTour_Pommyer.pdf) where the complex provenance, music sheet etc. are all identified (XS does not cite).

p. 352 fig. 289 duplicates fig. 6.

p. 353 On Mlle Puvigné, my essay, "La Tour, *Mlle Puvigné*", http://www.pastellists.com/Essays/LaTour_Puvigne.pdf [Jeffares 2021a] adds much new information, including her real name and dates: Mme Jean-Baptiste d'Albessard, née Louise-Claire Hamoche-Puvigné (1735–1779). Ignored by XS.

p. 356 I first repr this in black and white; previously thought lost. I wrote to the owner in 2019 to secure a colour image, but received no reply; XS has now supplied one. XS does not print Pesselier's verses (see my Documentation, .viii.1750).

p. 358 fig. 293 duplicates fig. 184.

p. 358f The discussion of Mme Favart and Vanloo: XS restates that the Vanloo is based in the la Tour. I discuss this, noting that the head, in exactly the same orientation (without a hat), is found too in a portrait by Allais.

fig. 296 = fig. 165; fig. 297 = fig. 166; fig. 298 = fig. 167

p. 361 I note that Le Blanc was mentioned in the abbé Huber's will, and may well have met La Tour through him. Given their friendship (which persisted many years) it seems reasonable to keep open the possibility of a lost primary version from the salon (cf. the Pommyer versions) which perhaps was given to the sitter and of which the Saint-Quentin version is the replica; I agree that the support alone is not conclusive (see, e.g., §III.2 of my main article, "An examination of La Tour's supports ... shows that he breaks all these rules"). I note that XS has now withdrawn the suggestion put forward in 2004 that the Lyon copy [J.46.1999](#) is a possible candidate for the salon exhibit.

An examination of the parish register shows that Le Blanc was born in 1706, not 1707, although this is almost universally printed.

p. 363 Paradis de Moncrif: pleased to see the correct dates here, but I'm not sure why XS has given him an extra particle "François-Augustin de Paradis de Moncrif", judiciously ignored by the indexer on p. 617. But the most interesting thing about this portrait of Moncrif is that Lavater used it to illustrate his *Physiognomische Fragmente* (repr in §II.6 of my main La Tour article), not mentioned by XS.

p. 370 "Élisabeth Vigée Le Brun": Louise was her preferred first name; on p. 390 she appears as "Louise Élisabeth Vigée le Brun" although the preferred sequence and capitalisation (e.g. from the recent exhibition) is "Élisabeth Louise Vigée Le Brun".

pp. 371ff While I am credited with Laurence Bongie as having elaborated the biography of Élisabeth Ferrand, my research covers all of the details such as the mention of the two versions in the will etc.

p. 375 Hypotheken- needs space after hyphen (the bank has long since been absorbed into HVB). The provenance of the abbé Nollet is exceptionally complicated and only recently unravelled by me, after identifying Mlle d'Hecbourg; all overlooked by XS.

pp. 375–87 All of this material, including the versions of Rousseau, will be familiar to users of my catalogue, and I don't need to comment further.

p. 390 The mythology surrounding la Tour's behaviour at court needs to be taken very cautiously as I've emphasised repeatedly in my book.

p. 409 Nivelon not in index (Féret is: see p. 294 above). Fig. 338 discussed at length in <https://neiljeffares.wordpress.com/2020/05/17/la-tours-copyists-2-anne-feret-mme-nivelon-1711-1786/> with biog details of Nivelon hitherto unknown but are now lifted with no acknowledgement.

p. 412 Österreichische needs umlaut.

p. 414 The letter of 12 février 1750 from "le comte Loos" to Graf Brühl is in my documentation with the Dresden archive reference and Stryenski 1902 citation. XS does not mention me but however cites Marx 1992 and Henning & Marx 2007, who both mention the letter but do not give its text, although XS manages to include the exact words I have. Both the sources he cites spell the Saxon ambassador's name correctly (as does Stryenski), as Loß, while XS has followed my error (in the 2022 edition, now corrected) of Loos.

p. 420 I have a lengthy discussion of the double portrait which I commence with the words "reasons that have been widely, but inconclusively, discussed"... I haven't read the new account minutely to see if anything new has been found to add.

p. 428–33 The Saxe pastiche [fig. 363] previously catalogued as autograph (with no one having spotted the chymera until me) now explained as "ajouts posterieurs" – a reworking of a préparation. This seems improbable to me, as there isn't the slightest indication (nor as far as I am aware did Florence Herrenschildt spot anything in her 2004 campaign) of a reworking; in particular the carefully modulated background shows no sign of the disturbance I would expect. Unfortunately the history of the "fonds de l'atelier" is far from secure and persistent rumours of thefts and substitutions mean that the appearance of a pastel in the 1806 list does not exclude the possibility that this is a later work.

pp. 428, 434f As for the other versions, fig. 364, 365, the difference in quality with the Louvre pastel is huge – far greater than say that between the autograph autoportrait au jabot and the Montjoye copy, and the provenance doesn't contradict my assessment of these as workshop copies. That is precisely the role of the copyists who surrounded La Tour and who made multiple versions for clients who wanted them for presents.

Note by this stage the figures are six pages behind the text.

p. 429/34 XS's comment in relation to my suggestion about which version was sent to which Salon seems to suggest has not seen the cuirass below the red coat in the Dresden version, and states more clearly that Löwnedal does not wear one when he does.

p. 438 "Francois-Bernardin Frey (1716–1806)": my dates, my identification that he used the French form of the name rather than the Franz Bernhard Frey given everywhere including XS's 2018 Louvre pastels catalogue; no credit.

p. 438 The unidentified religieuse: again this discussion owes much to me, e.g. in 2018 XS identified the habit as probably Augustine; I add "or a less common order: Dominican, Bernardin, or Prémontrés" which now appears in XS.

p. 442 Why is fig. 375 in black and white? Can it and fig. 376 really be identified as princesses? I'm afraid the uncertainties of eighteenth century portraiture make an identification of a sitter (unless anatomically disfigured) based on a comparison with a portrait in a different attitude by a different artist wholly unreliable.

p. 449 "Hypo-Vereinsbank": no hyphen, solid

p. 450ff My Graffigny research cited. We've both written extensively about this pastel. On p. 453 XS refers to Pompadour's letter from Choisy; no source cited. I found the Poulet-Malassis extract and printed it in my Documentation under [?1752]. Details such as the naval reference situating the incident to the War of the Austrian Succession are from my essay; picked up by XS p. 454 with no further credit.

p. 455 If XS has examined fig. 392 in a private collection in Neuilly-sur-Seine, why does the caption show "non localisé"?

p. 456 Once again XS's manner of citation of the Kaunitz letter is distinctly unhelpful: he merely tells us that it is in the Kaunitz papers in the national archives in Vienna. It is useful to be reminded that the Goncourts quote it, or it can be found in my documentation. In fact the Goncourts misquote it slightly, but one can go to their source, Alfred von Arneth, *Geschichte Maria Theresias, v, 1756–1758*, 1875, p. 475; by doing so, one is led to an earlier letter which has hitherto been overlooked: A portrait is mentioned in a 7.IX.1756 postscript to a letter to Kaunitz from Mme de Pompadour attached to a letter sent by Starhemberg two days later, no doubt that mentioned in his reply of 10.IX.1756 (*v. infra*; only the response is mentioned by the Goncourts and subsequent authors): "Ce portrait que vous avés désiré, est enfin achevé. Mandés moy le moment que vous croirés convenable pour vous l'envoyer."

Here and throughout (e.g. p. 460 note 702) reference is made to archival documents which will not be readily accessible to most readers, while the text and full reference could be found online from my documentation.

p. 460 I was the first (in 2015) to spot and publish the Gautier-Dagoty passage; it is not in MSW's bibliography nor I believe in any previous La Tour study.

p. 470 The old Cambrai legends reappear.

p. 475 I have narrowed the window for the execution of the Henry pastel: it must be after Prestonpans, so between September and December 1745.

p. 483 As far as I can recall it was I who established the 1752 date for Mme His (son's marriage etc.).

p. 483 The reversion of the Troyes copy of Lady Coventry to Suzanne Giroust, which XS considered autograph in 2004, is unsurprising; I never put it above "possibly". I've been insisting on the problem of her forenames, having found the only documents created in her parents' lifetimes; XS now notes this.

p. 483 line -2: surely this needs a new paragraph as we launch into a completely different work.

p. 484 fig. 409 duplicates fig. 194 (but fig. 409 has a sepia tone, while fig. 194 has been edited). Fig 194 on p. 245 not listed in index: "243, 309, 483, 484" should be "243, 245, 309, 483, 484"

p. 485 The reference in La Blanc's letter to Mme Fortier was glossed in my documentation: "Alexandre Fortier (1700–1770), conseiller du roi, avocat, doyen des notaires au Châtelet; art collector, amateur clock-maker, and bibliophile; his pictures and library were auctioned in 1770. Based in the rue de Richelieu, he also owned a house in the faubourg du Roule; his second wife was Thérèse Le Roy, veuve de Denis Gault." XS shortens this but does not credit.

p. 486 Hogguer: this draws heavily on my research on this family. As for the Perronneau version, fig. 413, no J numbers are cited by XS for any of the numerous pastels by other artists; this is *J.582.138*. It was I who identified it as the Perronneau before the 2007 sale.

p. 488 fig. 414 duplicates fig. 186.

p. 490 fig. 415 duplicates fig. 4.

p. 491 XS now accepts my attribution of fig. 416 which I understand he rejected in 2015 both before and after the sale. I was firmly convinced of its authenticity before the sale on the basis of a photograph (see <https://x.com/neiljeffares/status/591961116353425408>). It was I that identified the drawing on the back as relating to Guillaume de Spinney's portrait of Jacoba Helena de Vicq hanging in Slot Zuylen and I wondered if it could be identified with the one in the atelier de l'artiste collection. I shared these thoughts with Lilas Sharifzadeh when she kindly showed me the drawing after the sale, and was happy to confirm my unqualified belief in it.

p. 493 fig. 418 duplicates fig. 155.

p. 497 fig. 420 duplicates fig. 3.

p. 498 “Le geste n’est pas sans analogie avec celui de la nymphe de la suite d’Apollon... et dont La Tour... copie” : I believe I first noticed this and my cat. states “It is arguable that the composition was inspired to some degree by the famous Rosalba *Nymphe de la suite d’Apollon* that La Tour had copied (J.46.3792).” (not mentioned). The analogy with the Coypel pendants is noteworthy, but this tradition goes back far longer – numerous portraits by Rigaud, some engraved by Drevet, predate the Coypels and are just as relevant.

p. 499 This paragraph runs on into the Valade discussion – a much later large oil portrait. This seems a big jump. If it is worth discussing, it must also be worth noting that Valade made two studies for the figures for this painting, in pastel, exhibited at the same salon.

p. 500ff Why 8 pastels by Liotard? Why the long extract from the Règles? On the reasons why Liotard did not meet with great success in Paris, see my article in the Liotard 2015 exhibition catalogue devoted to precisely this question (not cited).

p. 505 The quote from the *Journal économique* appears of course in R&L, p. 429, where the issue is wrongly described as “mars-avril”; March and April are separate issues, separately paginated. But XS’s endnote 754 repeats the same “Mars-avril” suggesting he took the passage from R&L without consulting the source he cites alone.

p. 511 Perronneau Fig. 433 duplicates fig. 210; La Tour Fig 434 duplicates fig. 211.

p. 512 The passage from the *Feuille nécessaire* is from my Dictionary entry on Mme Roslin, not cited.

p. 513 Why not reproduce the two pastels by Mme Roslin after the La Tour Negre and abbé Le Blanc? These are least would be new. And why not give the J numbers or just the reference to the 1920 sale where they appeared?

p. 515 Why 1735?: the dates I provide for Mlle Navarre. And the endnote citation for my work is hardly easy to follow: “op. cit.”. There is in fact a full entry for her in my *Dictionary of pastellists*.

p. 516 As to whether Labille-Guiard studied with La Tour, I don’t think either Passetz or Auricchio are sufficiently sceptical. In my ALG article in my *Dictionary* I write “In .v.1782 she first exhibited at the Salon de la Correspondance, and continued to do so that year and the next. Pahin de La Blancherie praised her various submissions, and described her (29.I.1783) as an “élève” of La Tour, a claim she seems never to have made for herself. It has however stuck, no doubt because the suggestion is so plausible (although there is no evidence of their having collaborated on pastels as Portalis suggested, in relation to a pastel now known to be by Ducreux). But the claim needs to be examined sceptically; Lebreton states that her request to watch La Tour at work obtained a positive response: “Elle en obtint beaucoup plus. Il s’y intéressa comme à une élève qui devait honorer son école.” That should not be confused with apprentissage or allouage, for which no document has been found (nor for any other of La Tour’s alleged pupils); nor should any weight be attached to the appearance of her name among the 50 artists named as beneficiaries in La Tour’s chaotic 1784 will. Stylistically her work is more likely to be confused with that of Ducreux or Lenoir (qq.v.).”

p. 517 The author of the *Almanach* was not Jean-Baptiste-Pierre Le Brun, but the abbé Jean-François Brun, dit Le Brun (1732–1804), whose identity I first unravelled and published in <https://neiljeffares.wordpress.com/2021/04/24/labbe-le-brun/> .

p. 520 Judlin: It was I who identified Judlin and provided his forenames. In endnote 792, XS cites two documents with the original archival codes, and adds Besnard & Wildenstein p. 114: but B&W only have one of these documents; the other has been taken from me without credit. You can easily tell which documents in my Documentation were in B&W as they are printed in Times Roman while my additions are in Garamond (apart from salon critiques where marking up the errors in B&W became too confusing, so all are in Garamond).

p. 522ff All this Ducreux material will be found in my Dictionary, from Messerschmidt to Chaussard etc. Do we need 8 of his self-portraits?

p. 531ff We seem to be revisiting previous material here.

p. 530 fig.460 The caption appears two pages later; easily missed.

p. 536 “En fait, l’évolution stylistique de l’artiste n’est pas aussi marquée”: I have stressed repeatedly throughout my catalogue and main essay “the difficulties of establishing a chronology for La Tour’s work” based on stylistic development.

- p. 536 “Deux pastels méconnus”, figs. 461, 462: they are of course in my catalogue (the endnote is far later).
- p. 537 Why not reproduce the Schmidt pastel as it isn’t widely known?
- p. 540 On the age of Pommyer and his iconography, see my expanded *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* article on the pastel http://www.pastellists.com/Essays/LaTour_Pommyer.pdf. Only the 2001 version is cited, and only on p. 543 in relation to the Melbourne version, but all this material on Pommyer is mine. I have also included comparative images of the La Tour and other portraits of the abbé side-by-side in §II.1 of my main La Tour article.
- p. 543 On Deschamps, endnote 828 refers to the La Tour genealogy I established (it might have been worth reproducing in full in this book, as much of it is new). But the discussion about Deschamps is set out properly in one of my supplementary essays, “La Tour’s abbé Deschamps”, <https://neiljeffares.wordpress.com/2020/06/03/la-tours-abbé-deschamps/>, 3.vi.2020 [2020b].
- p. 545f L’abbé Regley: all of this follows my detailed article <https://neiljeffares.wordpress.com/2018/08/03/an-elusive-abbé/>, not cited.
- p. 546 We launch straight into the Clairon portrait: what is the link? What is the structure of this chapter, or this book? The endnote gives the J number for fig. 473, but not that of the copy mentioned from an auction in Munich, although I reproduce it and provide more information. This gives the impression that the addition of J numbers at the end of any endnote mentioning a La Tour pastel figured in the book was a late, grudging acceptance rather than an initiative to inform readers.
- p. 548/550 The repr of Mme Masse knocks about 6cm from the right side of the image, although endnote 840 speaks of an addition to the left side. The dimensions of 80.6x64 differ from B&W.
- p. 556 On Monnet the most interesting thing about the mounting is the thick sheet of glass, now removed, almost certainly being the second glass capsule.
- p. 560 What an odd place to bury my extensive new research on the salles affair and the purchase of the house at Auteuil. These are discussed at great length not only in the original documents I include in Documentation but also in my main La Tour article as they throw new light on La Tour
- p. 571 Yet again this seems to be going back over the same overworked material, quoting at great length from well-known documents, all in my Documentation.
- p. 573 endnote 893 It is here the system breaks down. You have to locate the fig. in the text, then go to the end note, then look up the J number. Images 496–499 are dealt with in a single endnote, J.46.13179, .1318, .2477 and .2735. But fig. 496 is actually the Dachery copy, J.46.1589; 497 is J.46.3198; 498 is J.46.1362; and 499 is J.46.3203.
- p. 577 Once more (cf. p. 27): all of this material is in my book, including the Soulavie connections. XS writes “En 1782 ou peu avant”; my footnote points out that B&W locate this paragraph at the end of 1783, while this volume of Soulavie’s *Histoire naturelle de la France méridionale*...was apparently published in 1782 (vi, pp. 265ff) – although presumably after La Tour’s nomination to the Académie d’Amiens, 11.xi.1782. Both La Tour and Marie Fel were listed among the subscribers. It has therefore been brought forward with some additional text referenced in La Tour’s 9.ii.1784.
- p. 578 La Tour as expert: no source cited in the endnotes. My main La Tour article, §I.15: “La Tour was involved in several such law cases (*v.* DOCUMENTS; the cases concerned Marteau’s estate, 4.iv.1757; Renou, 13.viii.1774, acting with Greuze; Montjoye, 8.xi.1783 and 10.i.1784, acting with the miniaturist Alexis Judlin; and Viel, 26.xi.1783, acting with the pastellist Jean Valade). In the last, concerning a miniature, La Tour and his colleague Valade directed that their valuation fee be donated to the poor of the parish (Saint-Germain-l’Auxerrois).”
- p. 581 all these documents are in my Documentation, many for the first time. Yet only the sources I cite are cited by XS.
- p. 584 There are two endnote indicators 915: the single endnote refers to the Cochin letter, but the Fel letter is not in B&W (it is of course in my Documentation).
- p. 588 The book ends rather abruptly with little on later critical reception, etc.
- Index: I have not read this attentively. There are some omissions (Soulavie etc.). Why is Charles de Latour out of sequence?