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Women and the Visual Arts

French art during the eighteenth century is generally divided into two phases. The rococo dominates the first half of the century, and the latter half is characterized by subjects and forms modeled on antiquity and by a strong reaction against the decorative excesses of the earlier style. A scholarly tradition established in the nineteenth century by the Goncourt brothers attributes to the ascendancy of women the existence of the rococo and the essence of eighteenth-century art. But, in fact, the actual influence of women and of women artists upon this supposedly feminine aesthetic has as yet to be properly distilled from myth and prejudice.

Economic and political factors, rather than women, determined most of the changes that occurred during the first two decades of the eighteenth century. The depleted finances of the crown curtailed the money spent by the Direction Générale des Bâtiments du Roi on large public commissions during the last few years of the reign of Louis XIV. In addition, after Louis XIV's death in 1715, the Regent Philippe, duc d'Orléans, moved the court from Versailles to the Palais-Royal in Paris. This meant that many nobles previously housed at Versailles moved back to their private hotels in Paris. As they sought to redecorate their salons, these aristocrats developed a taste for intimacy and sumptuous decorative details. The art they popularized was radically different in scale, form, and content from the art produced for the ceremonious grandeur of the apartments at Versailles.

The painter whose name is most closely linked with this period is Antoine Watteau (1684-1721). His small, brilliantly colored depictions of richly clad Parisians enjoying the pleasures of breezy parks and enchanted isles guaranteed his popularity at a young age. Watteau's fame was such that in 1717 the Académie Royale de Peinture et Sculpture created a new category especially for him, admitting him as painter of fêtes galantes. Watteau's victory was preceded and partly determined by the victory in the same academy of the roubenistes, the proponents of color, over the poussinistes, or upholders of the baroque classical ideal. These events mark the beginnings of the rococo style in painting.
One woman artist played a particularly important role at this time. Like Watteau, whose portrait she drew during her brief stay in Paris in 1720, the Italian pastelist and painter Rosalba Carriera (1675-1757) had a seminal influence on the development of the rococo aesthetic in France and throughout Europe. The Venetian-born artist enjoyed tremendous success and had an unparalleled international reputation during her lifetime. She was the first artist to master the painterly, expressive qualities of the pastel medium. Instead of colored drawings, she produced richly textured, airy, subtly colored pastel paintings. Her technique opened up unforeseen possibilities for virtuoso handling not only of pastels but also of oils. She was known, too, for her sensitive appreciation of the characters of her sitters.

The Académie Royale admitted Carriera to its ranks in 1720, ignoring a policy made in 1706 that no more women would be allowed entrance. This was significant since a French artist’s success at the time was contingent upon membership and rank in the Académie. The Académie had been founded in 1648 for the express purpose of enhancing the image and power of the king through a monopoly of art patronage. It was first of all an art school that placed most of its emphasis on drawing from the male nude. It also assisted in the selection and promotion of artists. In addition, the academy not only provided artists with access to royal patronage but also gave them an opportunity to exhibit their work publicly in the Salons.

The number of academicians varied but generally comprised about one hundred members. There were several ranks of membership. Agréé, or apprentice, was the rank given to students who had passed the first requirements and generally had spent some time studying in Rome. The artist would be received into full membership upon presentation of a morceau de réception, the subject of which was determined by the academy. Once a full academician, the artist could rise to the status of assistant professor, professor, supervisor, right on up to the much-coveted position of premier peintre du roi, much in the same way that one makes one’s way up the academic ladder in a present-day university.

The academy also defined the hierarchy of genres, a necessary scale of values by which to judge a work of art. Paintings were divided into categories according to their subject matter. History painting, the grand genre, was the most important category, followed in importance by portraiture, genre painting, still life, and landscape painting.

At its foundation, the academy had fairly liberal intentions toward women, and by 1682, seven women had been admitted. However, women were never allowed to participate in the all-important life classes, nor could they compete for the sought-after Prix de Rome, which was predicated on the submission of complex figurative
compositions. Without these avenues, the grand genre of history painting and, with it, the ladder to academic success were inaccessible to women from the very beginning. The women members of the academy were at best honorary, members in title only.

In 1706, the academy reversed its original policy and closed its doors to women. This decision, made at a time when several women had just applied to become academicians, probably reflects the fears of the male members that the prestige and professionalism of their institution would be threatened by the presence of females. Fortunately, exceptions to this policy were made throughout the eighteenth century. After Rosalba Carriera, two more foreign women, the Dutch flower painter Margareta Haverman (1693-after 1750) and the German portraitist Anna Dorothea Lisiewska-Therbusch (1721-1782), and five French women were admitted before the academy’s demise during the Revolution.

We shall return to the French women academicians in a moment, but before we do, we should examine briefly the career of a woman whose direct influence on the academy and on artistic production shaped the art of the mid-eighteenth century. This woman was Jeanne Antoinette Poisson (1721-1764), better known as the marquise de Pompadour. Poisson, whose father had been exiled at the time of her birth, owed most of her education and her rise to power to Lenormant de Tournehem, a friend of her mother’s, a nobleman with a good position in society. Jeanne Antoinette and her younger brother, Abel, were brought up in Paris in a cosmopolitan world where art, music, literature, and dance were mastered and displayed in the company of the educated men and women who gathered in the salons to discuss the latest intellectual and artistic events. Jeanne’s acquaintances in Paris included such men as Voltaire, Marmontel, and Fontenelle, among the foremost writers of the day.

In 1741, Lenormant de Tournehem married his own nephew, Lenormant d’Etoiles, to Jeanne Poisson, but it is obvious that he had even higher aspirations. In 1745, a meeting was arranged between Jeanne d’Etoiles and the king, and she became the king’s mistress. In spite of great opposition to her presentation at court because she had not been nobly born, in the fall of 1745, Jeanne d’Etoiles, named marquise de Pompadour, attained the position of official royal favorite. It is not coincidental that in December of the same year, Lenormant de Tournehem was appointed Surintendant de Bâtiments du Roi.

The position of Surintendant gave de Tournehem total power over artistic production in France. The Académie Royale, along with the academy of architecture, the royal tapestry works, and the manufacture of porcelain, all came under his jurisdiction. A month following
his own appointment, in January of 1746, Lenormant de Tournehem named as successor for his position the younger brother of Mme de Pompadour, Abel Poisson, later known as the marquis de Vandières, de Marigny, and de Ménars. Tournehem and Pompadour arranged for Abel Poisson's training by sending him to Rome in 1750 in the company of young artists and architects. In 1751, at Tournehem's death, the marquis de Marigny was thus perfectly equipped to undertake his new responsibilities as Surintendant des Bâtiments, a post he held until 1773. Pompadour's influence both on Lenormant de Tournehem and on her brother has never been properly studied, but it is evident that through the two men and through her own extensive private and public building programs her power over the arts from 1745 to her death in 1764, and indirectly right on up to 1773, was extensive and far-reaching.

Unfortunately, the royal favorite's name, paired with that of François Boucher (1703-1770), her preferred painter, retains even today some of the negative connotations it acquired during the Revolution. In the 1790s, Pompadour was synonymous with all the decadence of the ancien régime. During the nineteenth century, several historians, including the Goncourt brothers, did a great deal to restore some of Pompadour's power. But most of them insisted on the essentially frivolous nature of the art associated with her and found it necessary to apologize for the "courtisanesque" aesthetic she inspired.

The Goncourt brothers openly challenged the argument that Pompadour had had anything to do with the nascent interest in classical art. But there are numerous indications that Mme de Pompadour was not only aware of the changes taking place in art at mid-century but also encouraged these changes. Her decision to send her brother to Rome for his education indicates her recognition of the importance of Italian baroque and ancient Roman art. She was also instrumental in appointing the painter Jean-Jacques Bachelier (1724-1806) as the artistic director of the royal porcelain factories at Vincennes and Sèvres. Bachelier invented the bisque technique, and he introduced simple, new designs modeled on ancient vases. He educated the porcelain workers away from the overly imaginative, abstract rococo shapes and patterns by enforcing the study of geometry and design. In addition to her influence over porcelain manufacture, Pompadour encouraged classical forms in architecture. She supported the architect Jacques-Ange Gabriel and admired his designs for the Ecole Militaire and the Petit Trianon. In-depth scholarship on Pompadour's relationship to the arts would probably reveal many more examples of this kind.

Scholars today, however, are apt to refer to Pompadour with sweeping generalizations. Some attribute to her an exaggerated
influence, while others fail to consider her role in the light of new discoveries about the period. L. D. Ettlinger admits that Mme de Pompadour "became the most influential arbiter of taste" in her time but saddles her also with the responsibility for the change from a male to a female sensibility and with the transfer of the arts from the public to a private sphere. Thus, Pompadour is indirectly and unreasonably associated with changes that had occurred before her birth during the Régence. On the other end of the spectrum, the important research published recently by Pierre Rosenberg emphasizes the fact that there is more to French painting during this period than Watteau, Boucher, and Fragonard. Rosenberg places the stress on art commissioned not for the court but for the church and for public buildings. In all of this new literature, Mme de Pompadour is mentioned only in passing. Most of the credit is given to her uncle, Lenormant de Tournehem, and to her brother, the marquis de Marigny.

It is not really surprising that art historians are reluctant to treat Mme de Pompadour seriously and to re-evaluate the period of her most prominent influence in terms that include her. Art history traces the progress of great individual achievements. In contrast, the history of mid-eighteenth century art is the history of collaborative efforts where the distinctions between the "minor" and the "fine" arts are far from clear. The artists patronized by Mme de Pompadour worked collaboratively on architecture, designs for interiors, tapestries, porcelains, and painted decorations. Descriptions of the total environments conceived by Pompadour and executed with the help of teams of artists at the château de Bellevue and her other residences almost defy the imagination. These palaces were comprehensive works of art. At Bellevue, even the livery of the servants was planned to harmonize with the total aesthetic balance of the environment. Until art historians are able to accept such examples of collaboration as valid works of art, the evaluation of periods like the mid-eighteenth century will remain incomplete.

Another problematic aspect of Mme de Pompadour's participation in the arts is the fact that she herself was an accomplished amateur artist. Her talents were often praised by her contemporaries. Voltaire, for example, wrote gallantly of her drawings:

Pompadour ton crayon divin
Devrait dessiner ton visage
Jamais une plus belle main
N'aurait fait un plus bel ouvrage.

Pompadour also organized performances, designed costumes, acted, sang, and encouraged the active participation of all the members of the court. It is probably due to her example that drawing and painting
became so fashionable with the ladies of the court. Queen Marie Leczynska’s artistic ventures were often praised along with those of Mme de Pompadour by contemporary critics.\textsuperscript{20}

Although Mme de Pompadour herself readily admitted that drawing was meant to be an amusement and not an occupation for well-bred ladies, there are indications that the spread of amateurism was generally beneficial for aspiring women artists. Several women were able to make a living teaching painting and drawing either privately or in the convents. A number of women attempted to elevate themselves from the rank of amateur by participating in the exhibitions of the less exclusive Académie de Saint Luc and also in the Salons de la Correspondance organized by Pahin de La Blancherie.\textsuperscript{21} But for the most part, these women were not recognized by their contemporaries as professionals.

Mme de Pompadour did not patronize any women artists herself, and only one gained admission to the Académie Royale during her lifetime. This was the flower painter and miniaturist Marie-Thérèse Reboul (1728-1805), accepted in 1757. That same year, Reboul married the painter Joseph-Marie Vien (1716-1809), and it is to his influence that her admission is often attributed.\textsuperscript{22} Reboul exhibited regularly at the Salons and assisted her husband by engraving several of his designs. Her Salon entries were usually well received by the critics but treated with gallant condescension. Writing of Reboul’s work in the Salon of 1763, one critic remarked that even women had viewed her paintings with pleasure. The implication here is obviously that women would normally be offended by another woman’s success. The critics were very conscious of the unique position Reboul enjoyed in being the only female academician at the time. One journal praised her works by saying that they continued to justify the honors which Reboul had already received. Denis Diderot offered words of praise for the “elegance and good taste” of her flower paintings.\textsuperscript{23}

In 1770, two more French women were received into the Académie Royale. They were Marie-Suzanne Giroust (1734-1772) and Anne Vallayer-Coster (1744-1818). Giroust was the wife of the Swedish-born portrait painter Alexandre Roslin and a close acquaintance of the Vien family.\textsuperscript{24} Giroust worked with pastels in the tradition of Rosalba Carriera. She studied with the well-known pastelist Maurice Quentin de La Tour, and she is reputed to have been one of the finest women pastelists of the late eighteenth century. She was particularly well respected for her portraits of family members and friends. Unfortunately, her success was short-lived, for she died of breast cancer in 1772 at the age of 38.

The still-life painter Anne Vallayer-Coster, who was received into the Académie the same year as Giroust, is the best known and most
studied of the three French artists we have just discussed. Although her early training remains a mystery, her work has been compared to that of the two most important still-life painters of the period, Jean-Baptiste Oudry (1686-1755) and Jean-Baptiste-Siméon Chardin (1699-1779). The engraver J. G. Wille (1715-1808) remarked in his journal at the time of Coster's admission that her talent "is truly that of a man perfected in this genre of painting representing still life."²⁵

Vallayer-Coster was the daughter of a goldsmith, who was employed at the Gobelins tapestry works; she married a lawyer, who was also a wealthy and influential member of Parliament. Her father's connections with the Premier Peintre du Roi Jean-Baptiste-Marie Pierre (1714-1789) and her husband's wealth and position probably played a part in ensuring her success, but the critical acclaim her paintings commanded during the height of her productivity between 1769 and 1787 was due to her talent and labor alone.

Reboul, Giroust, and Vallayer-Coster all had connections with male artists either through marriage or birth; these kinds of family ties are generally the rule for women artists. There are a number of women related to male artists who, although they did not gain admission to the Académie, nevertheless achieved some renown and should be mentioned briefly. Marie Anne Loir (1715-c.1769) was the sister of pastelist and sculptor Alexis Loir (1712-1785) and a student of Jean-François de Troy (1679-1752), whom she accompanied to Rome in 1738. She was elected to the Académie de Marseilles and was often praised for her portraits. Françoise Duparc (1762-1788), the daughter of the sculptor Antoine Duparc, became particularly well known for her original depictions of working-class people. Like Loir, Duparc was recognized by the Académie de Marseilles.²⁶

Marie Anne Collot (1748-1821) entered the studio of the sculptor Etienne Maurice Falconet (1716-1791) at the age of fifteen. She became Falconet's daughter-in-law by marrying Pierre-Etienne, a painter in his own right, in 1777; but her reputation was tainted by rumors that she had also been the mistress of the father. From an early stage in Collot's career, the sculptor Falconet, who "nursed an almost morbid aversion toward bust portraiture," relinquished most of the portrait commissions to Collot.²⁷ She accompanied Falconet to Russia in 1766 and remained there with him until 1778, executing a large number of works. She was appointed official portrait sculptor to Catherine the Great, from whom she received numerous commissions. In 1783, the date of Collot's last known sculpture, Falconet became ill, and she devoted herself entirely to his care, neglecting her art. After both Falconet and his son died in 1791, Collot retired in Lorraine for the remaining thirty years of her life.

Like Marie Anne Collot, Marguerite Gérard (1761-1837) was also raised in the ménage of an artist and devoted a large portion of her
time to family matters. When her sister married the brother of Jean Honoré Fragonard (1732-1806), Marguerite Gérard was invited to join the extended family of the artist. She thus had the opportunity to study with Fragonard and to see many private art collections accessible only to artists. She was the first French woman to achieve professional success as a genre painter. Her style is carefully distilled from the precious genre paintings of the Dutch masters and Fragonard's techniques. Unfortunately, she was accused of being Fragonard's mistress and of having her canvasses finished by the master. As we have seen, women artists have always attracted such slander; none of these claims have ever been substantiated, and her style and choice of subjects have been shown to be distinctive and original. Although Gérard was never an academician, after the Salon was open to women in the 1790s, she exhibited regularly and was very successful during her lifetime.

Marguerite Gérard was the youngest of the four women artists who, on the eve of the Revolution, achieved a degree of fame that not only equaled that of male contemporaries but has also insured them a place in history. We have already mentioned the still-life painter Anne Vallayer-Coster; the other two artists are considered even more significant than either Gérard or Vallayer-Coster. In fact, Adélaïde Labille-Guìard (1749-1803) and Elisabeth Vigée-Lebrun (1755-1842) may be said to have been two of the most celebrated women artists of their time. They reached the peaks of their respective careers in 1783, when they became the last two women to be accepted into the Académie Royale before this institution was abolished in the 1790s.

Labille-Guìard and Vigée-Lebrun differ from all their female predecessors in several respects. They practiced portraiture; but they did so on a very large scale, and they even experimented with history painting. They achieved more recognition as artists and thus helped to pave the way for the many women artists who followed. In spite of this, they were not able to escape slander and notoriety. From the very beginnings of their public success, they were typecast by their critics—Labille-Guìard's style was seen as stiff and masculine while Vigée-Lebrun's technique was challenged for being too soft and superficial—and pitted against one another as rivals. Although it is true that some degree of rivalry must have existed when the stakes and patrons were as high as they were, the extent of this antagonism has never been fully documented. What is certain is the fact that the two artists not only had clearly distinct styles but also vastly different personal lives and political sentiments.

Adélaïde Labille-Guìard was Vigée-Lebrun's senior by five years. She came from a humble background and received her first artistic instruction with the miniaturist François Elie Vincent (1708-1816).
Vincent's son, the painter François André Vincent (1746-1816), became Labille's close advisor and her second husband. Between 1769 and 1774, Labille-Guiard studied with Maurice Quentin de La Tour and, under his guidance, became a skilled pastelist and perceptive portraitist. She exhibited in the exhibitions of the Académie de Saint-Luc and at the Salon de la Correspondance. She worked her way into the Académie Royale primarily by painting portraits of the academy's members, thereby acquainting these artists with her skills.

In addition to the patronage of artists, Labille-Guiard also secured the patronage of members of the royal family. She was given the title peintre de mesdames. In spite of this association with the court of Louis XVI, Labille-Guiard weathered the tides of the Revolution without much difficulty because her sentiments were clearly with the revolutionaries; in 1791, she exhibited eight portraits of the deputies of the National Assembly. She was also instrumental in planning the reconstruction of the old Académie Royale. She asked that the academy eliminate its limitation on the number of women members, and she suggested that since women would not be allowed to teach or hold office an unlimited number of women artists should be accepted with the honorary rank of conseiller. The only privilege attached to this rank was that of exhibiting at the Salon, which admittedly was of very high practical value. Unfortunately, the loss of the rank of academician made official the view that women could not really compete with men to become great artists.31

Elisabeth Vigée-Lebrun outlived Adélaïde Labille-Guiard by nearly forty years, which may be the reason why she appears to overshadow her contemporary. Elisabeth Vigée-Lebrun was more precocious and also more concerned with glamor than Adélaïde Labille-Guiard. She was the daughter of the pastelist Louis Vigée, a member of the Académie de Saint-Luc. She studied with a number of her father's friends, including Gabriel François Doyen (1726-1806) and Joseph Vernet (1714-1789). In 1779, she completed her first of many portraits of Marie-Antoinette, whose favorite painter she rapidly became. Throughout her life, Vigée-Lebrun was patronized by the aristocracy and by royalty all over Europe. She was a brilliant hostess and felt comfortable in social situations with the nobility who formed the core of her clientele. Her salon attracted the celebrities of the period and her evening parties, often designed with original themes, were celebrated throughout the continent.

In 1789, with the coming of the Revolution and endangered by her ties to the royal family, Vigée-Lebrun fled to Italy. She was accepted into the academies of Rome, Parma, and Bologna. She continued her travels and visited Naples, Vienna, Dresden, St. Petersburg, Moscow, London, and Geneva. Everywhere she went, she was warmly greeted

---

and deluged with well-paid commissions. When the Bourbons were restored to power in France, she returned and regained the favor of the court. Even though she was over sixty at the time, she continued to paint; and she exhibited until 1824, when she began to spend her time writing and compiling her memoirs.32

A number of women artists born in the 1760s profited from the success of Adélaïde Labille-Guiard and Elisabeth Vigée-Lebrun and from the increased access to Salon exhibitions that Labille-Guiard’s reforms had brought about. Many of these artists are known chiefly because their names appeared regularly in the Salon livrets. For example, Marie-Geneviève Bouliar (1762-1825) exhibited over forty paintings between 1791 and 1817, but few of these works can be traced today.33

Several other women of the 1760 generation deserve to be mentioned. Gabrielle Capet (1761-1817) was Labille-Guiard’s student, living with her teacher and caring for her until her death. Capet specialized in portrait miniatures. Jeanne-Elisabeth Chaudet (1767-1832) studied with Vigée-Lebrun and exhibited at the Salon between 1798 and 1817. She painted children and animals in antique bas-relief-like profiles. Marie-Guilllmine Benoist (1768-1828) studied with Vigée-Lebrun and Jacques Louis David (1748-1825). She exhibited regularly in the Expositions de la Jeunesse from 1784 to 1788 and, after 1790, in the Salons. Unfortunately, nothing is known about her project for a studio for women artists.34

Another of David’s students was Constance Marie Charpentier (born Blondelu, 1767-1849), who exhibited between 1798 and 1819. She executed ambitious mythological and allegorical scenes in addition to portraits and genre work, but only three of her paintings are known. Of these three, the portrait of Charlotte du Val d’Ognes in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, has had an infamous history of attributions. Originally given to Jacques Louis David, the portrait was credited to Charpentier in 1951. At present, its authorship is again being challenged.35

The problem of identifying extant works by women artists plagues the study of this subject. It is quite probable that many paintings by women are presently masquerading as the work of the more famous male teachers. Charpentier’s case is only one example. Her contemporary, Jeanne Philibert Ledoux (1767-1840), suffers from the same fate as Charpentier. Ledoux’s paintings are often confused with those of her teacher Jean-Baptiste Greuze (1725-1805).36

In closing, we should refer to the tragic career of Constance Mayer (1775 or 1778-1821), who studied first with Greuze and, after Greuze’s death, with Pierre Paul Prud’hon (1750-1823). She began exhibiting in 1796, but her greatest success came after 1804 when she
adopted Prud’hon’s style. Throughout her life, she was apparently haunted by periods of depression and self-doubt. In one of these moments, she committed suicide, leaving Prud’hon, whose affection for her is recorded in his letters, to mourn her death.37

The number of women artists working during the last two decades of the eighteenth century is quite impressive. It indicates that women did indeed achieve a degree of acceptance as artists at this time. Interestingly, they did so at a time when the dominant style was the neoclassicism of Jacques Louis David. With its restrained brushwork and moral, classical subjects, the art of David expressed a new masculine aesthetic that consciously rejected the soft, sensuous, feminine qualities of the rococo.

Perhaps the names of individual women are more prominent in the latter part of the century simply because the ideal of the individual master became more pronounced at this time. As we have noted, the first part of the century deserves to be studied in terms of collaborative efforts involving all the arts. Research into engraving, porcelain painting, dressmaking and design, all fields that were open to women, would probably reveal that a large number of women artists were involved even at the beginning of the century.

More attention should also be devoted to the function of amateurs and patrons at this time. The position of artists in society was challenged in the eighteenth century with the advent of art critics. With increased published information about the techniques and methods for making art, amateur painters as well as amateur collectors of both sexes flourished. The image of the Romantic artist, alienated from society and inaccessible to it, developed partly in reaction to this invasion of the art world by well-educated amateurs.

We can safely conclude that women did indeed play a part in eighteenth-century art, both through their patronage and through their own creative endeavors. We can even argue that they played a more important role than in preceding centuries. But the understanding of their function is far from complete. A detailed analysis would perhaps reveal many important facts regarding the complex, changing relationship between artists and society at this time. Such a study would be well worth the effort.
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