

H-France Review Vol. 9 (August 2009), No. 112

Mark Ledbury, ed. *David after David: Essays on the Later Work*. Williamstown, Mass.: Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, 2007; distributed by Yale University Press. xvi + 360 pp. 135 b/w and 15 color illustrations. Notes. \$65.00 U.S. (cl). ISBN 978-0-931102-69-1 and 978-0-300-12151-3.

Review by Jann Matlock, University College London.

Jacques-Louis David has emerged, over the last two decades, as the most influential artist of the pivotal moment of the birth of modernity. Head of a powerful teaching studio that produced some of the most important young artists of his era, David was elected president of the National Convention and thus served to organize revolutionary festivals as well as to conceptualize the new art of revolutionary institutions. He not only produced some of the most important canvasses of the late eighteenth century—*Belisarius* (1781), *The Oath of the Horatii* (1785), *The Lictors Returning to Brutus the Bodies of His Sons* (1789), but he elaborated some of the Revolution's most significant representations (*The Death of Marat*; *Bara*; *Le Pelletier de Saint-Fargeau on His Deathbed* [all 1793]), even as he helped frame crucial questions about political representation. Not surprisingly, David's work of the 1780s and 1790s has been instrumental for scholars formulating new enquiries about visual culture. Since the 1980s, a series of challenging studies asked new questions about power, politics, representation, and ideology. David took center stage in these shifting frameworks because his work from the late eighteenth century, from *Belisarius* to *The Intervention of the Sabine Women* (1799), was so thoroughly imbricated in political and social change. Understanding the conditions for cultural representation meant necessarily thinking beyond formal or biographical analysis of works and seeking new ways to understand how art was embedded in—changing and changed by—events in the world. Yet, while David's early and middle career initiated debates in a variety of arenas, silence shrouded his work after 1800. It was as though his adherence to the Napoleonic regimes, for which he was First Painter, somehow risked undermining the very artistic projects, if not also the evocative questions about them, that made his art of the revolutionary period so intriguing. Mark Ledbury's edited volume, *David after David*, along with a major show and catalogue by Philippe Bordes, *Jacques-Louis David: Empire to Exile*, sets out to refigure the post-revolutionary era through the art, politics, cultural spheres, and life of that later David. [1]

The title of Ledbury's volume, drawn from contributions to an international conference in 2005 at the Clark Art Institute, announces a temporal paradox and a problem of identity: *David after David* suggests there is a man—or a myth of a man—*after* the one readers think they know, the artist born in 1748 who successively reinvented himself and the art of his era through six regimes and in several countries. This volume's title also puts forward a crisis in subjectivity for the artist Jacques-Louis David himself, for his contemporaries, for his legacy, and especially for his interpreters in the field of art history. *David after David* would therefore set forth a problem of staging, of masks, of reframing, even, in the words of the volume's editor, of “decentering” (p. x). Articulated in these terms, the project of representing a David “after David” seems embedded in the theoretical acquisitions of two decades of creative work in visual studies, an awareness that the very authority of art history has often been invested in the cult of personality surrounding artists. [2] It has thus involved a turn away from questions of biography, subjectivity, and intentionality toward issues of representation, discourse, and reception; and especially, an interdisciplinary imperative that has valorized the exchanges of art historians with those in history, philosophy, anthropology, and literary and film studies.

Ledbury's book refers, implicitly in its title and explicitly in its introduction, to a founding moment in these shifts, a conference called *David contre David*, organized by Régis Michel at the Louvre in 1989, amidst commemorations of the French Revolution and alongside the first major retrospective of David since 1948.[3] Michel's model conference (and the resulting two-volume publication) trumpeted transformations in the discipline of art history—especially new questions about narrative, history, gender, sexuality, sociability, and the public sphere.[4] It also staged the problem of identity announced in its title—which translates as “David against David”—as one of split subjectivities and ideological crises, both in the era that the artist's career spanned and in the late twentieth century that had reinvested his life and work with new meanings. *David contre David* at once announced a protest against the more conservative aspects of the Louvre show and amplified new voices deconstructing the cult of great men traditionally espoused by French art institutions. But it was also a teaser about the very constructions of identity in and through art. How did David work within one framework but against it at the same time? How could “David” be marketed by the artist and/or his contemporaries to undo the very expectations that the artist's name seemed to imply? Where was “David” anyway? Was he in the painting of his *ancien régime* studio, in the Academy that elected him and that he helped supplant, in the Convention, in prison after Thermidor? Was he still with the Jacobins or now with Napoleon? When we said “David,” who did we think we were talking about and why?

David after David takes up the gauntlet nearly twenty years after the call for a pluralistic, interpretative, theoretical art history by Michel and some forty multidisciplinary authors of *David contre David*. A few contributors are back again here, not least Bordes, now curator of *Jacques-Louis David: Empire to Exile*, the exhibit at the J. Paul Getty Museum and Clark Art Institute for which Ledbury's colloquium proposed to “further the aims” (p. viii). Ewa Lajer-Burcharth announced her feminist psychoanalytical approach to David's *Sabines* at the earlier conference and has returned here to discuss the artist's exile portraiture. Thomas Crow offered in 1989 a peek into *Emulations*, his book on David's relation to his students, and has come back now, as outgoing Getty Research Institute Director, to explore David's exile imagination. Dorothy Johnson gestured at the Louvre toward her volume about David's exile art, a work that especially figured “*David contre David*” by arguing that the art resulting from David's engagement with Napoleon worked subversively against the Empire. She is back here to reflect on the late exile drawings. Important figure in the 1980s David renaissance because of his analysis of *Belisarius* in *Absorption and Theatricality*, Michael Fried analyzed David's antitheatricality in 1989, and although he did not participate in the 2005 conference, he joins contributors in the published volume with a reading of David's prison self-portrait.[5]

Though one misses certain voices and conceptual frameworks from that earlier conference, especially its *maître d'oeuvre*, Régis Michel, one can relish here the presence of powerful new voices emerging between the two events: Darcy Grimaldo Grigsby whose *Extremities* refined our questions about nineteenth-century colonial and imperial projects; Susan Siegfried, whose work on Boilly, Napoleonic art, and Ingres has set new standards for integrating theoretical and historical research in art history; Todd Porterfield, whose *Allure of Empire* and co-authored book with Siegfried, *Staging Empire*, offer new paradigms for analyzing art and politics; Satish Padiyar, whose *Chains* brings queer and gender theory to rigorous visual analysis; and Daniel Harkett, whose work on politics and spectacle in Restoration France promises to rejuvenate reception studies.[6] But one can also regret certain voices: Mary Sheriff and Abigail Solomon-Godeau, both strangely absent (were these important scholars really not invited?) as well as the late Mary Vidal, whose work on David's female students has transformed our understanding of women's artistic participation in the revolutionary and post-revolutionary period.[7]

The advantage of the 1989 conference (and publication) was its breadth—nationally and internationally, but also in terms of disciplinary affiliations and theoretical approaches—and the sheer number of scholars (forty-seven, including the organizer) who contributed work there. But that was another era in publishing, another era for barriers between fields and methods being challenged, another era in

conceptual risk-taking even within the most conservative institutions in art history. It was also literally another David--of the 1780s to 1799--the one we had gotten to know since the 1974 show, *De David à Delacroix: La Peinture française de 1774 à 1830*, shook up the terms for interrogating Neoclassicism and Romanticism.[8] In fact, the pre-1800 David was so well known by the time of the publication of *David contre David* that it could get by on 256 shoddily reproduced (often postage-stamp sized) black-and-white illustrations, as if readers no longer needed to see the works to follow interpretations. Ledbury's *David after David* is much more lavishly produced with 15 color plates, 135 halftones, and an artistic layout that sacrifices a page to each contributor's title (Note to the production designers: I would far rather have had longer articles and an index!). And it is also shorter on contributors (21 of them) by more than half. Given the smaller size of this conference and volume, one cannot fault Ledbury for inviting principally well-known art historical scholars of David. But one can still imagine a more widely ranging dialogue around this period and these works.[9] The framework for that dialogue seems laid out, in fact, in Ledbury's introduction and through a number of the essays.

While Bordes's catalogue was organized temporally in relation to biographical aspects of David's career (e.g. "In the Service of Napoleon") and thematically in terms of preoccupations within those temporal frames (e.g., "Portraits of the Consulate and Empire," "Antiquity Revisited," "Portraits in Exile"), the essays in Ledbury's collection weave in and out of temporal problematics and mix thematic and conceptual issues that arch beyond biography. The five sections--"History Painting and Empire," "Myth, Memory, and Exile," "The Stakes of Portraiture," "Friends, Pupils, Rivals," and "Seeing David"--offer wide stages on which groups of analyses can dialogue with one another. While one might have wished for more elucidation of these categories in Ledbury's introduction, the essays do a good job of clarifying the stakes for each section.

In his "Introduction" Ledbury lays out enticing frameworks for new research on David--both for research that lies *beyond* this collection and for work actually appearing here. He summarizes the book's achievement as primarily salvage work--fixing how we see the David after 1800, specifically through "voices that counter this sense of David's waning complexity and relevance" (p. viii). The remedial work is twofold, first, "restor[ing] complexity" to the works of Empire, which "have sometimes been regarded as empty works of pure brawn and bravura, lacking depth or resonance" and, second, "reanimat[ing] and revis[ing] our understanding of several of the major works in exile" (p. ix).[10] Ledbury argues that understanding David under the Empire requires seeing how the First Painter to Napoleon becomes anything but central as he is pushed aside by former students and rivals. Through this discovery, Ledbury claims, "we can start to plot a network of troubled friendships, mutual borrowings, and aesthetic differences that can no longer be seen simply in terms of a diachronic emulation model, but rather as a more synchronic and complex process of intergenerational love-hate that spans the Napoleonic and exile periods." In short, we can see David "less as the leader of a school than as part of a complex generation of cultural creators" (p. x). Ledbury argues further that problems in narrative, gender, ideology, and sociability open interpretative possibilities for the post-Directory David, as do new approaches to reading sources "both ancient and modern" (p. xi) and to engaging contemporary visual and entertainment culture.[11] The multiple "Davids" after David here will include not just David's self-reinvention and, in turn, the critics' sense of a break within the artist's career after 1800, but also new research into the "contingent, bizarre, astonishing, and irregular on canvas" (p. xv). With a "wider agenda that far outstrips the scope of this volume," Ledbury contends, much research can yet occur (p. xv). While this is a predictable promise in collections that propose to rescue hitherto invisible artists and art, it is nonetheless an important one. But Ledbury's remarks here seem tinged with regret, as if this volume has not quite found an agenda as wide as "David after David" merited, as if the project had become hamstrung by a concern evoked in Ledbury's conclusion where he noted that "There are many aspect of David's social, cultural, and intellectual life that need to be clarified" (p. xv). Might the volume have become too caught up with rescuing the subject that was David, thus losing sight of the more ambitious scope it began by proposing? Fortunately, a good

number of essays in *David after David* honor the most daring tradition of interdisciplinary and theoretically-inspired David studies.

Grigsby and Porterfield open the volume with essays informed, on the one hand, by rigorous research into historical reception and, on the other, by theoretical questions about power and its workings through art. Grigsby here makes accessible a portion of her unpublished 1995 dissertation on the Decennial exhibit of 1810 and its prize competition [12]—a show “intended to aggrandize the regime by drawing attention to its highest achievements in the arts, letters, and sciences between 1799 and 1809” (p. 19). Exploring the paradoxical situation in which the jury’s award of a top prize to *The Coronation of Napoleon and Josephine* (1805-08) ultimately staged an opposition to both the emperor and his First Painter David, Grigsby analyzes the politics of a network of rivalries racking both aesthetics and the French state. Expertly drawing on contemporary press criticism and Institute reports, Grigsby forges an account of political values that makes one wish for a more extensive publication of her research on the *prix décennaux*. Her work also points beyond her essay. Her reflections on the Decennial report’s praise of new directions in medicine makes one want to understand the interrelationships of the reorganized postrevolutionary surgical and medical schools and the reinvestment of anatomy in artistic practices. Her analysis of Guizot’s and Staël’s Salon criticism suggests a need for work on sociability and aesthetics in post-Thermidor France, and her nuanced analysis of the Decennial show makes one long for similarly detailed work on the Empire Salons. Grigsby makes an important contribution to thinking about how narratives are privileged in art and how the definitions of “histoire” (both *la peinture d’histoire* as well as “History”) change in relation to conceptions of the past. Most importantly, she offers an excellent paradigm for considering how the best-laid plans for instrumentalizing culture can go awry.

Porterfield, like Grigsby, works from contemporary press and state reports, in this case from the three exhibitions of David’s *Coronation* (known as the *Sacre*). Winking at the symposium title, Porterfield announces his subject as “David sans David,” or the creation of a David who, by the time of this commission in 1805-08, was no longer really doing the work that made him David: “The notion rested on essentializing the artist’s identity and minimizing whatever would upset the picture of artistic mastery and aesthetic coherence” (p. 39). From the outset, Porterfield claims, the critical reception of David’s *Sacre* was “ambivalent,” a “persistent discourse” that suggests “we somehow have a David painting without David” (pp. 39-40). Porterfield sets out to demonstrate that from the first exhibitions of the painting in 1808—exhibitions that entailed considerable reworking of the painting between each of its appearances—the *Sacre* was always riven by “occulted and shifting responsibility” (p. 40). What’s more, Porterfield argues, this “dispersed responsibility” was crucial to its success (p. 40). One of the most important contributions of Porterfield’s work, here and in the longer version of this study in *Staging Empire*, is to shift questions about the *Sacre* away from David’s allegiances, intentions, motivations, and conflicts. It is possible, as Porterfield shows brilliantly, to study the changes made to a canvas without speculating on what the artist wanted each time he reworked it. Porterfield successfully uses contemporary criticism and police reports to reflect on the tensions that made changes in the painting necessary and that create its illusions of being illustrative of a real event. To do this, he also turns to the speech act theory of J. L. Austin and the modifications to it by Jacques Derrida and Judith Butler. How, asks Porterfield, does a “promise” like the one cited in the performative action of the *Sacre* make intentionality irrelevant? There is great subtlety in this move to use speech-act theory to think about the way events and our depiction of them ultimately elide subjectivity, not least because Porterfield combines it with nuanced historical analysis and attentiveness to formal aspects of these visual works. The “David sans David” here is one that puts the “David after David”’s art in historical and political context, making it less a David of subjectivity than of work caught in tensions that we are even today still negotiating.

Siegfried’s “The Artifice of Antiquity: Sappho’s Dream” brings a fresh approach to a painting that has been underestimated, even by Bordes’s catalogue.[13] *Sappho, Phaon, and Cupid* (1809) is one of the

fourteen paintings from this exhibition that were not present in the 1989 Louvre retrospective, and its reinsertion into the Davidian canon by Siegfried's inventive analysis will make some new waves. Siegfried's essay is the most informed by feminist theory in the volume, though Porterfield's reflections on the *Sacre* as "Josephine's painting" (p. x) and Lampe's analysis of the creepy Cupid in *Love Leaving Psyche* (1817) are both indebted to gender studies. Siegfried veers away from Johnson's argument that the late mythological works are "political project[s] against the odds" (p. 93)[14] but even more so away from the assumption that what David should have been doing was painting heroic historical dramas rather than mythological fantasies. Siegfried asks us to look at those paintings revisiting antiquity, especially *Sappho*, on their own terms. The second of two questions she asks at the outset (what is going on in these paintings and what was David trying to do in them?) suggests a more traditional approach to intentionality and subjectivity than one usually finds in Siegfried's work, but her analysis here, fortunately, pays more attention to the former question than to the latter (p. 93). Through a careful tracing of David's potential sources (not just the versions we know today, but specifically those available to David and his public), Siegfried demonstrates that this painting shows David's projection of Sappho's fantasy and not a dramatic representation (as imagined by Ovid) of an episode in Sappho's life. Arguing that the painting demanded reflections on how painting stages truth artificially (p. 105), Siegfried teases out suggestions in this work that the viewer should not be "taken in" by the private fantasies staged by art (p. 105). Her readings raise intriguing questions about what uses David was forging in this era through a project of female ventriloquizing. Such ventriloquizing expanded in the period around 1808 far beyond new translations of Sappho's extant Greek fragments or Ovid's *Heroides*, and there is much work to be done to develop a broader context for these projections of male artists into female voices, particularly in relation to the voluminous novelistic and painting production by women in the Consulate and Empire.[15] "Sappho" was, after all, the nickname of one of the most powerful feminist thinkers of the first decades of the nineteenth century, Constance de Salm, a figure whose marriage enabled her to retire partially from Paris in 1804 rather than take her lumps from Napoleon's draconian policies toward the Ideologues with whom she had been associated.[16] And, too, the Emperor's banned arch-enemy, Germaine de Staël, had represented another woman with a lyre in a novel (*Corinne*) that was on every chic bed stand in France from 1807. While we have no hard evidence that David is referencing these women who spoke so powerfully in their own voices, he is certainly testing what having a voice might mean and considering the costs of losing it—a concern that must have been shared by many artists and intellectuals as Napoleon progressively shut down the press, the theaters, and the free expression of ideas, even putting restrictions on how art represented his own physicality and gaze. Siegfried's article lays a fine foundation for thinking about how this staging of the artifices of painting might occur. It makes one anticipate her further work on how those artifices are imbricated in the Napoleonic regime's ambivalent uses of female voice, artistry, and genius.

Helen Weston's "David's *Alexander, Apelles, and Campaspe*," rescues this work from the ignominy in which it has often languished, while also projecting new relationships for early nineteenth-century painting to the powerful theatrical arts operating in high and low culture. Attentive to classical sources in a way that aligns her work with Siegfried's sleuthing of nuances, Weston discovers an important contemporary source for the *Apelles* (1813-23) in a popular opera of 1798. She likewise opens doors for analyzing this painting through her exploration of David's experience of the Phantasmagoria shows of Consulate Paris, forged in part through his connection with Girodet who moved his own studio into the original locale of the Robertson spectacles of 1799-1800, the Capucine convent, after having lived next door at the time of the first performances (p. 145). Suddenly, through this geographic insight, the recently recovered François-Louis Dejuinne painting of *Girodet Painting Pygmalion* (1821) enters into a new relationship with David's later unfinished painting (pp. 148-49), casting the project of painting on canvas as a magic act. Recent studies have explored how lantern shows operated in terms of fantasies of the imaginary, of the invention of new forms of subjectivity, of the restaging of the historical as spectacle, and of the sexual possibilities opened up by popular theater with mixed audiences.[18] One looks forward to Weston integrating this work in her projected study of how popular spectacles transformed the terms through which nineteenth-century art was produced and imagined.

Lajer-Burcharth turns in “The Self in Exile: David’s *Portrait of Emmanuel-Joseph Sieyès*” to Edward Said’s “Reflections on Exile.” Given that David spent the years 1815-25 in exile, nearly a quarter of his artistic career, the theorization of exile needed a larger place in this volume than it received. One is therefore grateful for Lajer-Burcharth’s attempt to tease out the paradoxes of the state of exile. Cautiously reading David’s statements about his exile experience not as a “source of information or a document of truth about the artist’s Belgian experience, but rather a form of self-presentation through which David sought to work out the meanings of [exile],” Lajer-Burcharth asks, “How does one paint in exile?” and “How does one represent an exiled self?” (pp. 233-34). She establishes exile as shaking up the relationship between subjectivity and history, “including one’s own history” and asks if such an experience can “generate . . . a new image of interiority” (p. 234). Building on her earlier work concerning David’s prison portrait, Lajer-Burcharth brings her usual sharp sense of historical detail to careful visual analyses of how David’s portrait of his fellow revolutionary, Sieyès, juggled figurative codes. Lajer-Burcharth has irked more conservative scholars like Jean-Claude Lebensztejn with her poised questions about homosociability and the politics of gender as well as her analysis of how, after Thermidor, David ran into trouble with representation.[19] In fact, her explorations of the issue of representation go to the heart of the problem of figuring social and aesthetic meaning. As *Necklines* showed, how bodies were figured visually had political ramifications, and those politics were run through with the desires invested in bodies. In her essay on the Sieyès portrait (1817), she returns to the former priest’s own revolutionary writings on representation as well as to his later political texts, teasing out how this crucial figure both opened and closed the revolution (p. 250, n. 33). What Lajer-Burcharth does with the Latin inscription in this painting dazzles, not just for the way she imagines a performative space of history within what superficially appears to be intimate portraiture, but also thanks to the way she connects the work to representational problems of exile. Lajer-Burcharth’s work here draws attention to the length limitations imposed on contributors in this volume, whose essays tend to be half (or less) the length of essays in *Art Bulletin* or *Representations*. I would have been delighted to have seen this essay expand so that it might have worked through in more detail the theoretical stakes for its argument and explored other works of David’s exile period (perhaps through comparisons to other artists who have struggled with exilic representation). Even in its brevity, this is a stunning invitation to new questions about portraiture, representation, and the paradoxes of exile.

Harkett, like Grigsby and Porterfield, reminds us how radically works change when we read them in the context of their exhibitionary practices. Drawing from his dissertation on Restoration art exhibitions, Harkett vividly reconstructs the last Paris show of David’s work, centering around *Mars Disarmed by Venus* (1824-25), one where the artist employed, as he had with the *Sabines* in 1799-1804 and with *Le Sacre* in 1808, an installation with a mirror where his spectators saw themselves “walking into the [exhibited] picture.”[20] Harkett suggests how surprising it was for the public in the mid-1820s to experience David’s works because of their invisibility in the decades after the Revolution. He also conveys how much this experience must have shaken up aesthetics, if not also politics, in that period marked by repressive crackdowns following Charles X’s arrival in power and the assassination of the duc de Berry. Harkett has discovered that the *Mars* show occurred in one of the busy arcades near the entertainment district that included the Panorama Show, the Theatre des Funambules, and as much street carnival as the government would allow. This discovery opens doors for Harkett to reflect on how these spectacles relate to exhibition practices and to the aesthetics of the art itself (p. 323, n. 6). Harkett also shows how David’s revolutionary-era work—seen for the first time in decades at the estate sale after the artist’s death—retained its “disruptive potential” and “resistan[ce] to stabilizing narratives” (p. 322). One wants more on how this shock would play out in the art and politics of those who were able to see, for the first time since the early 1790s, works like *The Oath of the Tennis Court*, *The Death of Bara*, and the more confidentially exhibited *Marat* and *Le Pelletier*. But that is perhaps not a story of “David after David” but rather one of the Davidian legacy in a myriad of other forms.[21] Harkett’s further explorations of political and aesthetic discourses seem promising.

The methodological significance for what Ledbury calls “a wider and more ambitious agenda” (p. xv) foregrounds the articles by Grigsby, Porterfield, Siegfried, Weston, Lajer-Burcharth, and Harkett as deserving special attention. The volume also includes smart analyses by Godehard Janzing of the variations on *Leonidas*, Issa Lampe on the different versions of *Love Leaving Psyche*, Thomas Crow on *The Anger of Achilles*, Dorothy Johnson on a series of large late drawings, Mark Ledbury on works depicting myths of the establishment of Rome through violent sexual acts, and Michael Fried on how David’s prison self-portrait interpolates his own Marat. Tom Gretton provides a stunning reading—one of the best close analyses in the volume—of the *Portrait of Zénaïde and Charlotte Bonaparte*. Satish Padiyar considers how what Said called “late style” might elucidate the exile repetitions of *Leonidas*. Thanks to their perceptive analyses and to Bordes’s catalogue that provides exquisite color plates of these works along with details about their creation, provenance, and previous research, it will henceforth be impossible to think of David as an artist whose career soured after 1799. In fact, there are still works displayed by this exhibition that remained little discussed in this volume and on which one can hope for further study: for example, the 1997 Louvre acquisition, *Portrait of Baptistine-Julie (“Juliette”) Blait de Villeneuve* (1824), showing a woman in a cluttered interior with her harp. One also looks forward to more work on the painting that did not travel to either Los Angeles or Williamstown, the bizarre overblown spectacle of *Mars*. Perhaps, thanks to Harkett’s discoveries, the Musées Royaux de Belgique who own the painting could restage the 1824–25 show?

Part of the challenge for this volume of essays, as well as for the *Empire to Exile* show it accompanied, was a project of necessary salvage-work and remedial reputations, both for specific paintings that had been neglected or critically disparaged, and for the artist David himself about whom Ledbury cites, not without irony, Michel’s remark that the post-Consulate David was little more than a puppet.[21] One of the pleasures in the last two decades of analyzing the David of the late *ancien régime* and Revolution was that so much important cultural historical (i.e., the history of meanings) and history of culture (i.e., the history of various kinds of high and low art) work had been done on this period in the run-up to the bicentennial. The archives for studying the 1780s through 1790s had been tapped by a diverse group of scholars in fields ranging from political culture to history of medicine, and their sophisticated research created a solid interdisciplinary platform for exchange. Also, the Bibliothèque Nationale’s Deloynes Collection of press clippings about exhibitions from the old regime to 1808 facilitated broad perspectives on aesthetic change and the political engagements of art with its time. Fine research on the late eighteenth-century press meant that the frameworks for making sense of stories told about visual culture had been forged before scholars walked into the Periodicals section of the Bibliothèque Nationale. Then, too, post-’68 theoretical engagements in French, British, and North American research institutions made the Revolutionary era and its culture a fertile ground for testing the theories of Foucault, Barthes, Lacan, Stephen Greenblatt, Eve Sedgwick, Joan Scott, and Judith Butler.[22] The Napoleonic and Restoration periods corresponding to the concerns of *David after David* remain far less explored.

Despite a number of excellent articles, despite its editor’s provocative suggestions about wider goals, and despite the beautiful production of the volume, *David after David* struck me as a shift away from what made the earlier Louvre conference volumes so daring. If *David after David* called for a less biographical, less intentions-driven art history, both in its polemical introduction and in the actual practice of many of its contributors, *David after David* means business when it says we are going to read about David. This is a volume that is too often preoccupied with the biographical, with the man in relation to his art, and therefore less concerned than one would wish with the art in its historical or ideological contexts. This is an anthology where a surprising number of contributors seemed even to claim to know what David’s intentions were, what his motivations were, what the subjectivity of that man entailed. Doubly invested in subjectivity, then, *David after David* works its framework both in traditional ways and, fortunately, in more surprising ones. Its superior articles—those by Grigsby, Porterfield, Siegfried, Weston, Gretton, Lajer-Burcharth, Padiyar, and Harkett—continue in the best tradition of the interdisciplinary, theoretically informed work of the Louvre conference. Several other

articles provide fine analyses and fascinating invitations to read beyond their pages to other work by their authors, and here I count Janzing, Crow, Johnson, Ledbury, and Fried. But the overall volume, even some of its impressively analytical essays, seems to shy away from theory, from interdisciplinarity, from paradigms that have shaken up our frameworks in the past three decades. This is an interesting, if too well-behaved, collection that procures impressive readings of understudied paintings and that foregrounds the work of the older generation of David scholars with a few significant nods to new work in the field. *David after David* will ensure the posterity of David's post-1800 art. But I am not sure that is quite enough. The volume asks when is "David," and it does a fine job of insisting on who "David" was, but it leaves too far outside its boundaries the question of where was "David." It risks, at turns, losing the ironic bracketing of the split subjectivity implied in that doubling of names. In doing so, despite the strength of more than half its contributions, *David after David* reads like an account of another exile, of the tough, daring questions the best art historians have asked since the 1980s. We should hope for a David after this David that will reinsert those questions in the temporal and spatial frames they demand.

LIST OF ESSAYS

Mark Ledbury, "Introduction"

Darcy Grimaldo Grigsby, "The First painter and the Prix Décennaux of 1810"

Todd Porterfield, "David sans David"

Valérie Bajou, "Painting and Politics under the Empire: David's *Distribution of the Eagles*"

Godehard Janzing, "*Leonidas* at the Crossroads: The Crux of the Composition"

Susan L. Siegfried, "The Artifice of Antiquity: Sappho's Dream"

Issa Lampe, "Repainting *Love Leaving Psyche*: David's Memorial to an Empire Past"

Thomas Crow, "The Imagination of Exile in David's *Anger of Achilles*"

Helen Weston, "David's *Alexander, Apelles, and Campaspe*"

Dorothy Johnson, "Lines of Thought: David's Aporetic Late Drawings"

Mark Ledbury, "Roman Dreams: Two Late Drawings"

Michael Fried, "David/Marat: The Self-Portrait of 1794"

Tom Gretton, "David's *Portrait of Zénaïde and Charlotte Bonaparte*: Overt and Covert Napoleonic Subjects in the Summer of 1821"

Heather McPherson, "Endgame and Afterimage: David's *Portrait of Alexandre Lenoir*"

Ewa Lajer-Burcharth, "The Self in Exile: David's *Portrait of Emmanuel-Joseph Sieyès*"

Mehdi Korchane, "Overlapping Destinies: David and Guérin in the Public Eye from the Director to the Empire"

Stéphane Guégan, “Ingres and David: Remarks on a Persistent Misunderstanding”

David O’Brien, “Exile and Artistic Practice in David’s Letters from Brussels”

Satish Padiyar, “Dispossessed: On ‘Late’ David”

Harkett, Daniel, “Revelation, Narrative, Rupture: Viewing David in Restoration Paris”

Simon Lee, “Napoleon amongst the Shopkeepers: David’s 1815 Exhibition in London”

Philippe Bordes, “After the Exhibition in Los Angeles and Williamstown”

NOTES

[1] Philippe Bordes, *Jacques-Louis David, Empire to Exile*, Exhibition Catalogue (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005), hereafter *JLD*.

[2] See Neil McWilliam, “Life and Afterlife: Jacques-Louis David, Nineteenth-Century Criticism and the Construction of the Biographical Subject,” in Michael Orwicz, ed., *Art Criticism and its Institutions in Nineteenth-Century France* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), pp. 56-57.

[3] Ledbury speaks of “casting an affectionate glance back at this fundamental work” (p. xv, n. 6): Régis Michel, *David contre David* (Paris: La Documentation française, 1993), 2 vols. Robert Rosenblum offered an overview of David studies at the time of the conference: “Reconstructing David,” *Art in America*, 78:5 (May 1990): 189-97, 257. Garry Apgar reviewed the publication in “David and After,” *Art in America*, 84 (Feb. 1996): 25-29. The 1989 exhibition catalogue is Antoine Schnapper and Arlette Sérullaz, *Jacques-Louis David, 1748-1825* (Paris: RMN, 1989).

[4] Ledbury notes that the David of that 1989 conference “exposed the methodological fault lines in the discipline” (p. viii), though perhaps it was more the conference itself that did this than the art or artist under discussion.

[5] Ewa Lajer-Burcharth, *Necklines: The Art of Jacques-Louis David after the Terror* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1999); Thomas Crow, *Emulations: Making Artists for Revolutionary France* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1995); Dorothy Johnson, *Jacques-Louis David: Art in Metamorphosis* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994); Michael Fried, *Absorption and Theatricality* (Berkeley: University of Calif. Press, 1980). It is hard not to regret certain absences among the contributors of 2007, especially of those from outside the discipline of art history. Gone are those trained in history or literature (Simon Schama, Antoine de Baecque, Norman Bryson, Ronald Paulson). Gone are the voices of T. J. Clark, Richard Wrigley, Neil McWilliam, Adrian Rifkin, and Alex Potts—participants in “the new art history” of the 1980s. Gone too, are questions of popular culture (represented in 1989 by James Cuno on caricature), though Helen Weston uses the history of popular spectacles to analyze a painting. Gone as well is the centrality of gender, at least the explicit gender questions that steamed up the 1989 Louvre public (Bryson, Lajer-Burcharth, Robert Simon), though Susan Siegfried gestures toward her own contributions to this field, and Vidal’s essay might have remedied this gap.

[6] Darcy Grimaldo Grigsby, *Extremities: Painting Empire in Post-Revolutionary France* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2002); Todd Porterfield, *The Allure of Empire: Art in the Service of French Imperialism, 1798-1836* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1998); with Susan Siegfried, *Staging Empire: Napoleon, Ingres, and David* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006); Susan

Siegfried, *The Art of Louis-Léopold Boilly: Modern Life in Napoleonic France* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1995); ed. with Adrian Rifkin, *Fingering Ingres* (London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2001); Satish Padiyar, *Chains: David, Canova, and the Fall of the Public Hero in Revolutionary France* (University Park: Pennsylvania University Press, 2007); Daniel Harkett, "Exhibition: Culture in Restoration Paris," Ph.D. Dissertation, Brown University, 2005.

[7] See, for example, Mary Sheriff, *The Exceptional Woman: Vigée-Lebrun and the Cultural Politics of Art* (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1997); and "Jacques-Louis David and the Ladies," in Dorothy Johnson, ed., *Jacques-Louis David: New Perspectives* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2006), pp. 90-107; and Abigail Solomon-Godeau, *Male Trouble: A Crisis in Representation* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1997); and "Endymion était-il gay," in *Girodet, 1767-1824*, ed. Sylvain Bellanger (Paris: Gallimard, 2005), pp. 81-96. One also regrets the absence of the late Stefan Germer whose work inspired many of those in this volume (See "On marche dans ce tableau. Zur Konstituierung des 'Realistischen' in den napoleonischen Darstellungen von Jacques-Louis David," in Gudrun Gersmann and Hubertus Kohle, ed. *Frankreich 1800* [Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1990], pp. 81-103; and "In Search of the Beholder," *Art Bulletin*, 74:1 [1992]: 19-36).

[8] *De David à Delacroix: La Peinture française de 1774 à 1830*, Exhibition Catalogue (Paris: Grand Palais, 1974).

[9] One might have wished, for example, to hear from those working on the Empress Josephine's patronage, especially since a major Getty show foregrounded this work in the same year as the David show (*Josephine and the Arts of the Empire* [Los Angeles, Calif.: Getty, 2005]). One might equally have hoped to hear from those asking questions about colonialism, such as Jill Casid (see *Sowing Empire: Landscape and Colonization* [Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005]), or about war, such as Tony Halliday in John Bonehill and Geoff Quilley, *Conflicting Visions: War and Visual Culture in Britain and France c. 1700-1830* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005). Of interest might also have been those working on propaganda and ideology such as historians Annie Jourdan, Annie Duprat, Stuart Semmel, or art historians Nina Athanassoglou-Kallmyer and Barbara Day-Hickman. One misses Patricia Mainardi who works so effectively between disciplines and between high and low art (see her "Impertinent Questions," *French Historical Studies*, 19: 2 [1995], 399-413). One regrets that Sylvie Aprile, historian of nineteenth-century exile, is not engaged in debate with those elaborating paradigms for studying this modern condition. Two cultural historians who have studied brilliantly the postrevolutionary period, James Livesey and Denise Davidson, could have been asked to share their work. Two recent scholars of portraiture, Tamar Garb and Margaret Oppenheimer, might have brought further breadth to this volume's readings of portraits. In short, one regrets the absence of the cross-temporal and cross-disciplinary dialogue that such scholars might have imported to the field of David studies.

[10] Rosenblum noted that despite the size of the 1989 Louvre colloquium, "many major chapters of his work, especially his Napoleonic productions, were barely mentioned at all" (p. 92).

[11] This echoes Rosenblum's view of the "fertility" of "David territory" for "feminist questions of gender roles; inquiries into 18th-century attitudes toward child-rearing; investigations of the lowest order of popular imagery as sources for the lofty achievements of high art; psychoanalytic speculations about the covert projection of an artist's personal traumas in work destined for public view; Marxist efforts to see the changing structures and subjects of art as inevitable corollaries of radical social change" (p. 191).

[12] Grigsby, "Classicism, Nationalism and History: The *prix décennaux* of 1810 and the Politics of Art under post-Revolutionary Empire," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1995.

[13] Bordes, *JLD*, 205-11. See Marc Gerstein's similar critique of this portion of the catalogue, which he contrasts with Bordes's "tour de force" interpretation of *Cupid and Psyche* (*CAA Reviews*, 6 June 2006 at www.caareviews.org).

[14] Johnson takes particularly strong hits from Bordes who critiques her influential argument about the continued revolutionary impulses in David's Napoleonic and exile works (*JLD*, 236, 238); Siegfried's disagreement with Johnson seems much more appreciative of Johnson's attention to *Sappho*.

[15] I discuss the uses of female voices by male authors in the Consulate and Empire in "Novels of Testimony and the 'Invention' of the Modern French Novel," in *The Cambridge Companion to the French Novel from 1800 to the Present*, ed. Timothy Unwin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 16-35." See also Carla Hesse, *The Other Enlightenment: How French Women Became Modern* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001; Margaret Cohen, *The Sentimental Education of the Novel* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999).and Margaret Oppenheimer, "Women Artists in Paris, 1791-1814," Ph.D. Dissertation, Institute of Fine Arts, NYU, 1996.

[16] See Elizabeth Colwill, "Laws of Nature/Rights of Genius: Constance de Salm and Debates over Female Authorship in the Age of Revolution," in *Going Public: Women and Publishing in Early Modern France*, ed. Dena Goodman and Elizabeth Goldsmith (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell UP, 1995), 224-42; and Jacqueline Letzter and Robert Adelson, *Women Writing Opera: Creativity and Controversy in the Age of the French Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), esp. 35-36; 100-104. Salm's tragedy *Sappho*, under her first married name, Constance Pipelet, played from December 1794 through 1795 and was the ninth most-performed work in Paris in this period (Letzter and Adelson, 35). Her *Épître aux femmes* (Paris: Desenne, 1797), which established an identification with Sappho, was praised by the *Décade philosophique* in 1797, setting off a press battle.

[17] See, for example, Terry Castle, *The Female Thermometer* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); Jann Matlock, "The Invisible Woman and Her Secrets Unveiled," *Yale Journal of Criticism*, 9:2 (Fall 1996): 175-221; Ségolène Le Men, et al., ed., *Lanternes magiques, tableaux transparents*, Exhib. Cat., Musée d'Orsay (Paris: RMN, 1995); and Maurice Samuels, *The Spectacular Past: Popular History and the Novel in Nineteenth-Century France* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2004), chapter one.

[18] Lebensztejn simultaneously published his critical view of *Necklines* in *Art Bulletin* (83 [March 2001]: 153-57) and *Les Cahiers du Musée national d'art moderne* (75 [Spring 2001]: 112-17). Peculiarly, in *JLD*, Bordes refers readers to the former review rather than to Lajer-Burcharth's book itself, though he makes a concession to the interest of her work by adding a notation about John Goodman's more favorable review (*Oxford Art Journal*, 24:1 [2001]: 162-76). It is hard not to read Bordes's highlighting of the Lebensztejn attack in tandem with his snipes against feminist research in his catalogue essay (*JLD*, pp. 7; 337, n. 14). As a longstanding admirer of his work, I was disappointed in his resorting to caricature of research that is as rich and varied as the scholars involved with it: Lajer-Burcharth, Solomon-Godeau, Sheriff, Siegfried, Vidal, Grigsby (for example in her stellar "Nudity à la Grecque in 1799," *Art Bulletin*, 80 [June 1998]: 311-35), and Linda Nochlin, to name only a few luminaries in this field for the era spanning David's career.

[19] See Germer, "On marche dans ce tableau," pp. 81-103. Lajer-Burcharth first explored the implications of this in her *David contre David* presentation, revised in *Necklines*. Frédérique Desbuissons offered an interpretation of this early installation art, uncovering later mirror installations on which Harkett draws here with attribution ("A Ruin: Jacques-Louis David's *Sabine Women*," *Art History*, 20:3 [1997]: 434-36).

[20] Neil McWilliam explored this in his *David contre David* essay, a more detailed version of which appeared as "Life and Afterlife."

[21] See Michel, *Posséder et détruire: Stratégies sexuelles dans l'art d'Occident* (Paris: RMN, 200), 120, cited by Ledbury, p. xv, n. 9. For harsh criticism of the *Apelles*, see Warren Roberts who calls it “kitsch,” associating it with the “decline . . . in David’s work as a history painter” in *Jacques-Louis David: Revolutionary Artist* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989), pp. 213-14.

[22] Bordes and Michel collaborated in 1988 on a path-breaking anthology that continues to set the terms for the best historically and theoretically engaged art history: *Aux Armes & aux Arts! Les Arts de la Révolution, 1789-1799* (Paris: Adam Biro, 1988). What makes that volume so important, especially Michel’s analysis of the politics of the post-1789 Salons (“L’Art des Salons,” 9-101), was that it took seriously the interdisciplinarity made possible by so many scholars descending simultaneously because of the bicentennial to work on a single short period, while at the same time putting into service the challenging new questions being asked by British and North American scholars using “French theory”—about ideology, power, sexual politics, gender, and the relationship of aesthetic preoccupations to their time. “The representations of the social world themselves are the constituents of social reality,” Roger Chartier had pointed out (“Intellectual History or Sociocultural History,” in *Modern European Intellectual History*, ed. Dominick LaCapra and Steven Kaplan [Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1982], 30). Both the editors and contributors of *Aux Armes* took to heart such new reflections on the social embeddedness of representations and the transformative power of the arts. In “Y a-t-il un art révolutionnaire?” the editors asked in their introduction, giving as their answer “Ce n’est pas certain. Du moins y a-t-il une révolution dans l’art.” The articles in this 1988 volume continue to serve as reference points because of its authors’ eagerness to think the revolution differently—and to shift the focus of art history away from great works and great artists toward that very battle articulated by the revolutionaries themselves, toward new questions and new frameworks—even toward new ways of imagining the historical. From the studies of revolutionary decors and architecture to those on the invention of the revolutionary museum and the revolutionary myth itself, this volume continues to bear fruit for approaches to culture because its contributors had worked so well with research beyond their disciplinary fields. But it also profited from the sheer magnitude of research in fields beyond art history and from the theoretical sophistication and daring of that new work. Studying the Empire and Restoration leaves scholars with fewer means. Though the last decade has seen new research, such as *Repenser la Restauration*, ed. Jean-Yves Mollier, Martine Reid, Jean-Claude Yon (Paris: Nouveau Monde, 2005), the overall scope of the work on the Restoration and Empire remains (in comparison with the outpouring of research in the period around the 1789 Bicentennial) narrower and its quantity less ample. Small wonder then that the art historians in *David after David* have fewer frameworks for analyzing how these works operate in their historical moment.

Jann Matlock
University College London
j.matlock@ucl.ac.uk

Copyright © 2009 by the Society for French Historical Studies, all rights reserved. The Society for French Historical Studies permits the electronic distribution of individual reviews for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and the location of the review on the H-France website. The Society for French Historical Studies reserves the right to withdraw the license for redistribution/republication of individual reviews at any time and for any specific case. Neither bulk redistribution/republication in electronic form of more than five percent of the contents of H-France Review nor re-publication of any amount in print form will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of H-France. The views posted on H-France Review are not necessarily the views of the Society for French Historical Studies. ISSN 1553-9172