

THE OBJECT OF ART



Cambridge Studies in French General Editor: MALCOLM BOWIE

Also in the series:

LEO BERSANI
The Death of Stéphane Mallarmé

J. M. COCKING

Proust: Collected Essays
on the Writer and his Art



THE OBJECT OF ART

THE THEORY OF ILLUSION IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY FRANCE

MARIAN HOBSON

Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE

LONDON NEW YORK NEW ROCHELLE
MELBOURNE SYDNEY



à Michel Jeanneret

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521115025

© Cambridge University Press 1982

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1982 This digitally printed version 2009

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Catalogue Card Number: 81–17101

ISBN 978-0-521-24350-6 hardback ISBN 978-0-521-11502-5 paperback



CONTENTS

General editor's preface	viii
Foreword	ix
Introduction	1
I Illusion and likeness	3
II Illusion: old wine, new bottles	18
Part One Illusion and art: from the truth of imitation to	
the imitation of truth	45
1 Illusion and the Rococo: the idea of papillotage	47
2 Art and replica: the imitation of truth	62
Part Two Illusion and form in the novel	81
3 The exclusion of the false	85
4 The inclusion of the false: the novel within the novel	121
Part Three Illusion and the theatre	139
5 Plays	141
6 Spectators	180
7 Actors	194
Part Four Illusion and theories of poetry: from fictions	
to forgeries	209
8 Illusion and the poet's voice	211
9 Why does the poet use the language he uses?	227
Part Five Illusion as subjectivity: theories of music	253
10 Musicandillusion	255
11 Musicandimitation	273
Conclusion	298
Notes	308
Bibliography	353
Index	386

V



GENERAL EDITOR'S PREFACE

This series aims at providing a new forum for the discussion of major critical or scholarly topics within the field of French studies. It differs from most similar-seeming ventures in the degree of freedom which contributing authors are allowed and in the range of subjects covered. For the series is not concerned to promote any single area of academic specialisation or any single theoretical approach. Authors are invited to address themselves to problems, and to argue their solutions in whatever terms seem best able to produce an incisive and cogent account of the matter in hand. The search for such terms will sometimes involve the crossing of boundaries between familiar academic disciplines, or the calling of those boundaries into dispute. Most of the studies will be written especially for the series, although from time to time it will also provide new editions of outstanding works which were previously out of print, or originally published in languages other than English or French.



FOREWORD

This book is not a survey of eighteenth-century aesthetics. That has been done, recently and excellently, by J. Chouillet, in l'Esthétique des Lumières (1974). Nor, while taking as its subject eighteenthcentury theories of illusion, does it aim to present a slice of the history of European man's perception of art. Rather, it attempts to describe a historical change in the way of conceiving man's perception of art. That these two histories cannot be identical is evident, though they cannot be separated. For man's perception of art is in the main a praxis: its study must go through psychology, through economics (the art market), anthropology (the place society gives to art), architecture (where pictures are placed, where concerts are heard), etc. But our conception of that perception, in that it is necessarily linguistic, is necessarily, even if unwittingly or unwillingly, theoretical. It embodies - because language embodies - epistemological and cultural assumptions. This is true even of our conception of those arts which are non-linguistic. It is possible to comment on a piece of music by interpreting it, on a drawing by pastiching it; but is not this, even if accompanied by speech, to draw back the work into the orbit of perception, rather than to tie it into (perhaps to tie it up in?) the world of conceptions? This book studies primarily the language of critics, indeed it began as a historical account of one word, 'illusion'. But perception and conception of the perception of art are necessarily intertwined - and the first must be used in the interpretation of the second. To speak baldly, it is best to know what the critics are talking about. The work of art, on the other hand, calls for certain kinds of perception, and not others (the term is that of the great art critic Roger de Piles, 'appeler'); it directs us, and changes our conceptions. These in turn, no doubt, change the mode of perception.

I have attempted to exhibit a historical change, mostly within the area of French theories of art in the eighteenth century. This calls for three methodological remarks:

vii



Foreword

This change in conceptions of art is at the same time radical and prepared. The continuous displacement that is culture moves along lines of tension that go back to Antiquity, and it is from within the present situation of these lines of tension that we approach it.

History is not the same as chronology. Certain later writers are, in my perspective, erratic blocks, and illustrate perfectly earlier tendencies. This is unsurprising (there exists in Great Britain in 1980 a Flat Earth Society). That history may proceed by jumps and overlaps does not need defending in general; discussion must centre on the interpretation of individual instances. Out of similar considerations, I have used on occasion two German writers, Lessing and Herder, not for the (considerable) weight of their own merits, but because they illuminate with special clarity tendencies present less sharply in French writers. In the case of Lessing, who is continuing and criticising the work of Diderot, this is conscious.

I haven't – could anyone – exhausted the sources in the most basic sense of locating and reading them. But to have attempted such a method would have suffered from a defect worse even than near-impossibility. It would have assumed its domain and its objects. In history, it is the light thrown on objects which makes them visible. It is then that the objects can reveal that the light is coming from the wrong or right angle.

The debts contracted are many and many are acknowledged in the notes. I have, for example, followed the practice of attributing passages and quotations to the twentieth-century critics who first showed their value and interest, in spite of the fact that in almost all cases I have read the original text.

Here, in this foreword, I have personal debts to acknowledge: to Ralph Leigh, in particular, for what was not just the supervision of my thesis – demanding, sometimes frightening, always friendly – but an education in discrimination and scholarship. Although, as their 'assistante', I was supposed to 'assist' them, Jean Starobinski and George Steiner taught me much by their example as well as by their advice. Without the generosity and patience of Malcolm Bowie, the editor of this series, the manuscript could never have been made ready (as it was, it nearly wasn't). I owe gratitude to Geoff Bennington, for the encouragement and criticism which saw me through bad days; to Simon Harvey who helped check some references; and to Ann and



Foreword

Martin Wolfe, for great and constant kindness. Most of all I owe to a man who does not prate about women's lib, but practises it: the book is dedicated to him.