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Sir Joshua Reynolds’s conversation piece with Henry Fane (no. 28), presented by Junius S. Morgan in 1887 and exhibited shortly thereafter in the European paintings galleries on the second floor of the Central Park building.
The present catalogue, the first to be devoted to the collection of British pictures in The Metropolitan Museum of Art, has been made possible by the Drue E. Heinz Fund. Philippe de Montebello authorized its publication early in 2005, when Katharine Baetjer, Curator in the Department of European Paintings, informed him that she had finished her initial preparations for the volume by organizing the British paintings records for entry into the Museum’s database. Katharine not only wrote the text but also expertly implemented the publication of this book from inception to completion. In 2006 Drue Heinz agreed to support the project, and she later indicated that she wished to be its sole sponsor. This is a director’s dream, and, needless to say, an author’s as well.

Drue, who was elected a Benefactor in 1971, became a Trustee in 1979. A charter member of the Visiting Committee to the Department of European Paintings, she has been its Chairman since 1977. She endowed the position of Drue Heinz Chairman of the Department of Drawings and Prints and recently named the new Henry J. Heinz II Galleries in the 19th- and Early 20th-Century European Paintings and Sculpture Galleries in memory of her husband, Jack. Drue’s publications fund, established in 1973, has underwritten many exhibition and collection catalogues, including European Miniatures in The Metropolitan Museum of Art (1996), Pieter Bruegel the Elder: Drawings and Prints (2001), The Lure of the Exotic: Gauguin in New York Collections (2002), and Leonardo da Vinci, Master draftsman (2003). We are, as always, profoundly grateful for her support.

Thomas P. Campbell
Director
The Metropolitan Museum of Art
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Reynold's portrait of Henry Fane (no. 28), exhibited in the Drue Heinz Gallery, 2009
A Note to the Reader

The Metropolitan Museum holds a small collection of English paintings, supplemented with a few Scottish, Welsh, and Irish works as well as a number of pictures by artists who were not born in Britain but who painted most of their works there. The vast majority have been acquired from time to time by gift and bequest. As is quite typical of private collections of British paintings formed in the United States before World War II, the preponderance are portraits, with few genre scenes, fewer landscapes, and hardly any mythological or biblical subjects. The book includes old masters and nineteenth-century paintings (the latter by artists born in or before 1864). While there are some marvelous pictures, the collection, which is limited in extent and uneven in quality, cannot offer a history of its subject.

For these reasons I have not provided a general introduction to this volume, but have focused entirely on the individual works of art. The brief biographies of the artists are intended simply as a background against which to place the paintings. I have tried to cover everything of importance, while generally opting for texts that are as short as possible, sometimes exchanging images for words, and including as many related works as could be accommodated. The following points should be kept in mind when using this catalogue.

Images
High-resolution digital images made for this book can be found on the Museum's website, www.metmuseum.org; for access, the reader should go to “Works of Art” and enter the accession number in the search field. These images provide more information than reproductions of details, of which, as a consequence, there are very few.

Organization
The catalogue is in general arranged chronologically, according to the birth dates of the artists; if an artist has more than one work in the Museum, these are ordered by date of execution.

Titles, inscriptions, and dimensions
The practice in the Department of European Paintings is to translate all titles into English. Anything written on a work of art in addition to the signature and/or the date is catalogued as an inscription. Information from labels on the reverse of a painting or frame is included only if it seems to bear on the authenticity or history of the work or on the identity of the sitter. For all prints reproduced as comparative illustrations, the measurements given are that of the plate rather than the image or the sheet.

"Ex colls."
There is quite a long tradition of research on the history of collecting in the Department of European Paintings, and the records of former ownership, while not in narrative form, are as complete as we can make them. The information is constantly updated, and it is possible that by the time this book is published some new material will have accrued, in which case it will be available on the website, for which see above.

Selected Exhibitions, Selected References, and footnotes
The major sources for the published opinions and quotations that appear in each entry can be found under Selected References in the entry; additional published sources and unpublished opinions are given in the footnotes. When an abbreviated citation (author name and date) occurs in the Selected References or the footnotes, the reader should consult the bibliographic references at the end of the artist's biography for the full citation. In 2008 complete exhibition histories and lists of references for each painting were put up on the Museum website; updates are collected on a regularly scheduled basis. Further information may therefore be accessed on the site.

Unpublished opinions
These usually take one of two forms: a letter or email to a staff member, most often in response to a request for the writer's opinion or—and these are now less common—a note taken by a staff member who accompanied a visitor to the galleries or storerooms to record his or her views of a work. Letters and other documents are housed either in the archive files in the Department of European Paintings or in the Museum's central archive; in the latter case this is noted. In the footnotes, such opinions are cited by the name of the person, the type of communication, and the year, all the data required to identify the document should further information be needed.
Condition
Except in the case of Joshua Reynolds’s conversation piece (no. 28), information concerning the condition of a painting appears in the body of the entry. If the work is in good state, and, insofar as we can judge, looks more or less in accordance with what we understand to have been the artist’s intention, there may be no specific comment. While the decision to keep the commentary to a minimum was mine, it was made in close consultation with colleagues in the Department of Paintings Conservation. Further information is always available upon request.

Omissions

Abbreviations and genealogical sources
The abbreviations “MMAB” and “MMJ” are used for The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin and the Metropolitan Museum Journal, respectively. The electronic edition of the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (61 vols.; Oxford, 2004), is cited throughout this publication. Additionally, the following are the principal genealogical sources that have been consulted in the preparation of this volume.


Burke’s Peerage and Gentry: www.burkes-peerage.net.


genuki / UK & Ireland Genealogy: www.genuki.org.uk.

National Archives, Kew, Surrey: www.nationalarchives.gov.uk.

British Paintings

in The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1575–1875
1. Walter Devereux, First Earl of Essex

Oil on wood, 41.6 x 31.5 in. (105.7 x 80 cm)
Dated and inscribed: (upper left, on garter) HOMI-SOR-VMI MAL-PENS. (Shame on him who thinks evil); (upper right) AVROSI-1572: AETATVX-32: / VIRTUTIS, COMES, INVIDIA. (Envy is the companion of virtue)
Arms (upper left) of the Devereux family in the first quarter; the whole surmounted by an earl’s coronet
Rogers Fund, 1920 (20.151.6)

Ex coll.: by descent to Lord John Thynne, 3rd Baron Carteret (until d. 1849); Reverend John Thynne, Haynes Park, Bedfordshire (1849—d. 1885); Francis John Thynne, Haynes Park (1885–d. 1910); Bevil Granville Carteret Thynne (1910–11; Thynne Heirlooms sale, Christie’s, London, May 1, 1911, n. 35, for £89.3.0 to Leggatt); [Leggatt, London, from 1911]; Sir Guy Francis Laking (until d. 1920; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, April 21, 1939, n. 46, as by F. Zuccaro, for £125.10.0 to Dean for MMA)


Federico Zuccaro was in London for only six months, from March to August 1575, and while he made red and black chalk drawings of Queen Elizabeth I and Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester (British Museum, London), no paintings from the Italian artist’s brief stay in England are known to survive. Thus, Elizabethan portraits are no longer attributed to Zuccaro, as this one, among many others, once was. David Piper, in 1962, advanced the suggestion that the painting might be by George Gower, and Roy Strong, in 1965, tended to agree, but the evidence is so limited that it is difficult to judge.1 However, the identity of the sitter has never been in doubt.

Walter Devereux, born at Chartley, Staffordshire, on September 16, 1539, succeeded his grandfather as Viscount Hereford and Lord Ferrers in 1558. Devereux was joint custodian of Mary, Queen of Scots, in 1568. In the following year, having raised troops, he helped to put down the Northern Rising and was appointed marshal of the army at Leicester. He was lord lieutenant of County Stafford from 1569 until his death. Faithful to Queen Elizabeth I, Devereux was installed as a Knight of the Garter on April 23, 1572, and created Earl of Essex on May 4 of the same year. He sailed for Ireland in the summer of 1573 in an attempt to colonize Ulster, a venture costly to himself and more so to the queen that ended in failure in the summer of 1575. The earl died in Dublin, aged thirty-seven, on September 22, 1576, and was succeeded by his son Robert, a royal favorite who was executed in 1601 after attempting to raise a rebellion.

The present portrait is one of a number that commemorated the sitter’s rise to power in 1572. It was apparently modeled on a portrait of William Herbert, who in 1551 had been created Baron Herbert of Cardiff and first Earl of Pembroke of the second creation and who died in 1570 (fig. 1).2 The armor in the Pembroke portrait is Italian, possibly Milanese, of about 1550, a distinctive type known as a medium cavalry demiligne. It is replicated in ours, although the handling is not as sophisticated, and according to Stuart Pyhrr, the helmet is inaccurately rendered.3 While the face and hands in our painting are somewhat worn, it is in generally good state, with some losses where the three boards that make up the work are joined vertically. A version of the New York model is at the Mansion House, Ipswich; others were in the collections of Earl Amherst and Lord Bagot.4

A variant, of higher quality (fig. 2), is at the National Portrait Gallery, London. It differs in that the sitter’s hair is closely cropped, and he extends a baton. In the London picture, the date, age, and inscription at the upper right are rather carelessly painted. Another, coarser version of the London model belongs to the Ulster Museum in Belfast.

Fig. 1. English artist, William Herbert, 1st Earl of Pembroke, ca. 1565. Oil on wood, 47.6 x 37.8 in. (121.3 x 96.0 cm). Anguissola Genned- laerhol Cymru National Museum of Wales (NMWA 156468)

Fig. 2. English artist, Walter Devereux, 1st Earl of Essex, 1572. Oil on wood, 42.7 x 31.5 in. (108.9 x 79.5 cm). National Portrait Gallery, London (4984)


2. Information about the Pembroke portrait was supplied in 2000 in a letter from Ann Sumner of the National Museums and Galleries of Wales, responding to a request from Stuart W. Pyhrr, Curator of Arms and Armor. Some of her data had been provided by Claude Blair, former Keeper of Metalwork, Victoria and Albert Museum, and is confirmed by Pyhrr, who notes that the painting of the armor is superior to ours in quality and detail.


4. The Amherst picture was sold at Sotheby’s, London, January 29, 1964, no. 1; the Bagot work was also sold at Sotheby’s, London, July 26, 1967, no. 172. The latter was engraved by W. Bell. Photographs are at the Heinz Archive and Library, National Portrait Gallery, London.
2. Sir John Shurley of Isfield

Oil on wood, 35 3/4 x 29 3/4 in. (90.8 x 74.6 cm)
Dated and inscribed: (upper right) ETATIS SVÆ 23 / ANNO 1588; (lower right) H
Arms (upper left), apparently of the Shirley family
Gift of Kate T. Davison, in memory of her husband, Henry Pomeroy Davison, 1931 (31.194.2)

EX COLL.: by descent to Charles Callis Western, Lord Western, Felix Hall, Kelvedon, Essex (by
1841–d. 1844); Sir Thomas Burch Western, 1st Baronet, Felix Hall (1844–d. 1873); Sir Thomas Sutton Western,
2nd Baronet, Felix Hall (1873–d. 1877); Sir Thomas Charles Callis Western, 3rd Baronet, Felix Hall
(1877–1913); his sale, Christie’s, London, June 13, 1913, no. 100, as Portrait of Sir Anthony Sherley by
F. Zuccero, for £15.10.0 to Knoedler; [Knoedler, New York, and Colnaghi, London, 1923–24, as Sir
John Sherley; half-share traded back to Colnaghi]; [Colnaghi, London, from 1924]; Kate T. (Mrs. Henry
Pomeroy) Davison, New York (by 1936–51)

SELECTED EXHIBITION: South Kensington Museum, London, “Exhibition of National Portraits,
Ending with the Reign of King James the Second,” April 1866, no. 290 (as Sir Anthony Shirley, lent by Sir
Thomas B. Western)

SELECTED REFERENCES: E. P. Shirley, Stemmata Shirleiana; or, The Annals of the Shirley Family (London,
1841), pp. 213–14, 2nd ed. (London, 1873), p. 278; Bernard Burke, A Visitation of the Seats and Arms of the
Noblemen and Gentlemen of Great Britain and Ireland, 2nd ser., vol. 1 (London, 1834), p. 21; Sidney Lee,
“Shirley or Sherley, Sir Anthony (1565–1632),” in Dictionary of National Biography, vol. 18 (London, 1900),

The sitter, who was twenty-three in 1588, holds a baton and wears a sword and
etched Italian armor that is typical for the period. Under his helmet there is what looks
rather like an initial H with a small tail. In 1952 Ellis Waterhouse noted that “the idea
that [this] may be in fact a signature” should not be “altogether lightly . . . disregarded,”
and Roy Strong, ten years later, suggested that it could be the monogram of the elusive
Elizabethan portraitist Hubbard. Strong felt that our portrait must be by the same hand
as a half-length of Sir Walter Raleigh (fig. 3) in the National Portrait Gallery, London, a
view he reiterated in 1969. This seems probable. The style of the two inscriptions is more
or less identical and the dates are the same. Unfortunately, both portraits are quite worn
and damaged, and thus difficult to judge.

According to Bernard Burke, writing in 1854, portraits of Sir Robert Shirley and Sir
Anthony Shirley, ambassador from Persia, were at Felix Hall, Kelvedon, Essex, a resi-
dence of the Western family. Anthony and Robert were brothers, the second and third
sons of Sir Thomas Shirley of Wiston, Sussex. Seemingly, the present painting was the
one exhibited in 1866 as Sir Anthony Shirley. In 1873 E. P. Shirley instead identified
our sitter as Sir John Shurley of Isfield, also in Sussex, who married Sir Anthony’s sister
Jane. (Both Sir Anthony of Wiston and Sir John of Isfield were born in 1565.) There
the matter stood until 1979, when A. V. B. Norman asserted that the sitter was not Sir
John of Isfield and also pointed out that Sir George Shurley, Lord Chief Justice of
the King’s Bench, Ireland, in 1620, had “the arms of [this] portrait in his first quarters, so
your portrait presumably belongs somewhere in that branch.”

Clive Cheesman, Rouge Dragon Pursuivant at the College of Arms, London, has
provided the following clarifications. The Shirley, or Sherley, families (the spellings
were more or less interchangeable) used arms such as these, except that the stripes were
vertical rather than diagonal. The difference could simply have been the error of a family
member or of the painter, if neither had been advised by a herald. In the sixteenth century,
the Shurleys of Isfield were allowed arms closer to those of the Wiston Shireys. Fur-
ther, Sir George Shurley, who died in 1634, was the brother of Sir John of Isfield, who
married the sister of Anthony Shirley. Based

Fig. 3. Attributed to “H” Monogrammist, Sir Walter Raleigh, 1588. Oil on wood, 36 x 29 3/4 in. (91.4 x 74.6 cm). National Portrait Gallery, London (7)

Fig. 4. Attributed to Aegidius Sadeler, Anthony Sherley (Shirley), early 17th century. Line engraving, 7 3/4 x 5 1/4 in. (18.4 x 13.5 cm). National Portrait Gallery, London (D26057)
on the arms, Sir John Shurley (concerning whose activities nothing is known) is the more likely candidate.

However, the identification of the sitter as Anthony Shirley also has some merit. In 1586 he served as a captain of infantry under Queen Elizabeth’s favorite, Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, in the campaign against the Spanish in the Netherlands. In 1588, when the young soldier returned to England, his father was in favor with the queen, having been appointed treasurer-at-war on February 17, 1587. Anthony Shirley was doubtless at court, where his father jockeyed constantly to enlarge the family’s wealth and improve their position, and he is more likely to have been painted by the same artist as the adventurer and courtier Sir Walter Ralegh. In 1594 Anthony Shirley became a privyer. In 1598 he traveled to Persia, where Shah ‘Abbas accepted his offer to become an ambassador, representing Persian interests in Europe. Later Anthony lived in Venice, spying for both the Scots and the Spaniards, and eventually he was expelled from the city for life. Perhaps for past services, in 1607 Emperor Rudolph II created him Count Palatine. He continued to travel and scheme and died in obscurity—probably in poverty—in the 1630s. While in Prague, early in the seventeenth century, Anthony Shirley had sat for a portrait that is thought to have been engraved by Aegidius Sadeler. The sitter in that work (fig. 4) shows some resemblance to the one here, but on balance the more likely identification on historical and genealogical grounds is with Sir John Shurley of Isfield, Sussex.

3. Mary, Queen of Scots, with Her Son, James

Oil on slate, 8¼ x 7¼ in. (21.5 x 19.7 cm)
Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917 (17.190.2)

Ex coll.: Alexander William George Duff, 1st Duke of Fife; Duff House, Banff (until d. 1907; his estate sale, Christie’s, June 7, 1907, no. 1, for £419.0 to Pearson); [J. Pearson, London, from 1907, as The Duff-Olguisie Portrait of Mary Stuart and her infant son James I, painted circa 1565]; J. Pierpont Morgan, London and New York (until d. 1913; his estate, 1913–17)

The painting appeared in the 1907 house estate sale of the first Duke of Fife and was acquired by the London book and autograph dealer Pearson, who sold it to Mr. Morgan as a contemporary portrait of Mary, Queen of Scots, with her son, later James VI of Scotland and I of England. Mary, born December 8, 1542, a week before the death of her father, was betrothed in 1548 to the dauphin of France, later François II, whom she married in 1558. He died in 1560. Her second marriage, in 1565, was to her cousin Henry Stewart, Lord Darnley; their son was born at Edinburgh Castle on June 19, 1566. Were this painting to be of the period, it would date to 1567, the year after James’s birth.

The portrait has not been exhibited at the Museum since the 1930s, when modern location records were established, suggesting that there was even then some question as to its authenticity. When David Piper saw it in 1962, he ascribed it to the Isle of Thanet Forger, who he said was active about 1910 “painting Elizabethan subjects in this same size.” Oliver Millar had not seen anything by the same hand. Hubert von Sonnenburg pointed out that “the glazing, with much black, imitates an aged layer, mitigating against an early date,” but noted that owing to the unusual stone support, other evidence was not available. There is no resemblance to François Clouet’s portrait miniature of Mary, Queen of Scots (Royal Collection), painted about 1558. The technique is perfunctory.


1. The painting may have entered the Western family collection through Robert Western of St. Peter’s, Cornhill, who on December 26, 1698, married Anne, sister and co-heir of Sir Richard Shirley, Baronet, of Preston, Sussex.
2. Helmut Nickel, former Curator of Arms and Armor, verbally, 1976, described the armor.
4. The dimensions of the work were given as 35 x 24½ in.
6. Cheesman, in an email, 2008. I am most grateful to Mr. Cheesman, who noted a resemblance between our portrait and the sitter for the Sadeler engraving, which caused me to revisit the entire matter.
4. Portrait of a Woman

Oil on wood, 44 1/2 x 34 1/4 in. (113 x 87.3 cm)
Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1911 (II.149.2)

Ex coll.: Henry North Holroyd, 3rd Earl of Sheffield, Sheffield Park, Sussex (until d. 1909; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, December 11, 1909, no. 115, as Queen Elizabeth. In richly embroidered white dress . . . holding her fan in her right hand, by F. Zuccero, on panel, 43 1/2 x 33 in., for £515 to Sabin); [Frank T. Sabin, London, from 1909]; J. Pierpont Morgan, London and New York (until 1911)


One hundred years ago, practically any Elizabethan portrait of a woman that came to light, or came on the market, was assumed to represent Queen Elizabeth I. The first point, therefore, is to state that this is not she. Elizabeth, born on September 7, 1533, died in her seventieth year, on March 24, 1603. In general terms, and particularly as she grew old, her portraits were based on patterns taken from key images in which she appeared as an ageless symbol of the state. While we do not know what she looked like toward the end of her life, we do know how she presented herself. The famous Ditchley Portrait (fig. 5), commissioned from Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger in 1592, shows her as she wished to be perceived—a haughty, iconic figure standing on a map of England. By contrast, the lady here, while costumed in the highest style, is of a rather gentle demeanor, and emblems of rank are entirely absent. Roy Strong, writing in 1963, was the first to point out that this is not Elizabeth, and unless a documented portrait of our sitter should come to light, there is little chance that her identity will be discovered.

As to the artist and date, the work was sold in 1909 as by Federico Zuccaro and published in 1934 as attributed to Lucas de Heere. Zuccaro was in London in 1575, which on grounds of costume is too early, and apparently no portraits painted by him in England survive. De Heere was also in London only in the 1570s, in 1571 and 1576; portraits that used to be ascribed to him on the basis of the monogram HE are now believed to be by Hans Eworth, who died in 1574. Strong, in 1983, referred to the style as in the manner of the miniaturist Nicholas Hilliard, a designation to which Graham Reynolds took exception. Reynolds proposed a date of about 1590, whereas Strong preferred 1595–1600. The later date is used here because the costume has a little of the flavor of dress in the first years of the reign of James I and Anne of Denmark, but such a distinction probably is not even measurable.

The one certain fact about our portrait is that the most important jewel the sitter wears, the aigrette pinned to her bodice, also appears in a portrait of a woman at Parham Park, Sussex (fig. 6). The black stones are table-cut diamonds set in gold, perhaps with enamel and with a pear-shaped pearl drop suspended at the base. Aigrettes of this type were popular early in the reign of James I and were most often worn as hair or hat ornaments. Reynolds and Strong believe that the two works represent the same person and are by the same hand. In the Metropolitan Museum picture, the lady also wears strands of pearls around her neck and wrists and fastened to her sleeves, pear-shaped pearl drop earrings, one of which is visible, and pearl ornaments in her hair. The handle of her fan is set with rubies and either jet or table-cut diamonds. The stiffened bodice and separate padded sleeves of her gown are trimmed with pearl aglets and more than ninety rossetti-like appliqués set with jewels of gold, rubies, and perhaps jet and enamel. Her skirt, worn over a drum-shaped farthingale, is pinned to form pleats or tucks at the edge of the frame. The wired veil, also trimmed with pearls, is cobweb lawn or cypress, which was made of silk and fine linen. The roses pinned to the starched lace ruff are probably also made of gauze or silk.
The most fashionable ladies at Queen Elizabeth’s court were her maids of honor, and the queen preferred that they dress in gowns of white, silver, and gold to set off her favorite colors, white and black. She often gave clothes from her wardrobe, as well as jewelry, to members of her household or immediate circle of whom she was fond. It must be assumed that this was a young woman of great wealth and high standing, if not of noble birth, who was present at court. Elaborate Elizabethan dress, now the subject of much valuable research, has long been an object of fascination (fig. 7). The costume in the present portrait is in general well preserved, but the flesh tones of the face have probably faded and worn, and an old layer of toned retouching over the forehead, left cheek, and neck does not read well. The hands are in better state, except for a damage at the top of the middle fingers of the left hand.

5. Thanks to Josephine Dobkin for her research on the costume. Her principal sources were Janet Arnold, ed., Queen Elizabeth’s Wardrobe Unlock’d: The Inventories of the Wardrobe of Robes Prepared in July 1600 . . . (Leeds, 1988); Jane Ashelford, Dress in the Age of Elizabeth I (New York, 1988); and Diana Scarisbrick, Jewellery in Britain, 1660–1837: A Documentary, Social, Literary and Artistic Survey (Norwich, 1994).
Robert Peake the Elder

Born ca. 1551; died London, 1619

Peake’s place and date of birth are unknown; his family belonged to the Lincolnshire gentry. On April 30, 1565, he was apprenticed to a London goldsmith, Laurence Woodham, and if this event took place at the customary age, he would have been born about 1551. He became a freeman of the Goldsmiths’ Company in 1576 and was employed thereafter by the Office of Revels for work as a painter in connection with Christmas festivities celebrated at Queen Elizabeth’s court. The earliest portrait by Peake that bears his name is dated 1593 (Yale Center for British Art, New Haven). The portrait of Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales, that is catalogued below dates to 1603, the year the sitter’s father, James I, ascended the English throne. In June 1607, with John de Critz the Elder, Peake was appointed joint sergeant painter to James I; he was later compensated for pictures ordered in 1606–7 by Queen Anne of Denmark. He painted Prince Henry many times and in 1612 received payment for two portraits of the prince that were sent abroad. Peake’s masterpiece is Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales, Accompanied by Time (private collection), which should probably be assigned to 1612, the year the prince died of typhoid fever. The painter began working for the future Charles I in 1612 and in 1613, for £13.6.8, supplied a full-length portrait of Charles I to Cambridge University that may still be found there. Peake is last recorded in 1616.
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5. Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales, with Sir John Harington, in the Hunting Field

Oil on canvas, 79 1/2 x 58 in. (201.9 x 147.3 cm)
Dated and inscribed: (center left) 1603 / fe. \& 41; (lower left) Sir John Harrington; (upper right) 1603 / fe. \& 39; (lower right) Henry Frederick Prince of Wales Son / of King James the 1st
Purchased, Joseph Pulitzer Bequest, 1944 (44.17)

Ex coll.: John Harrington, 1st Baron Harrington of Exton (until d. 1613); by descent to Thomas Pope, 4th Earl of Downe, Wroxton Abbey, near Banbury (until d. 1667); Sir Francis North, 1st Earl Guilford, Wroxton Abbey (1672–d. 1685); Sir Francis North, 7th Baron North and later 1st Earl of Guilford, Wroxton Abbey (by 1741–d. 1750); by descent to Susan, Baroness North, and Colonel John Sydney North, Wroxton Abbey (by 1837–his d. 1844); William Henry North, 11th Baron North, Wroxton Abbey (1894–1914); [Agnew, London, 1914–16, as by Isaac Oliver; sold to Davison]; Henry Pomeroy Davison, Locust Valley, New York (1946–d. 1952); Mrs. Henry Pomeroy (Kate T.) Davison, Locust Valley and New York (1952–d. 1964); sold through Duveen to MMA


In 1741 George Vertue visited Wroxton Abbey, where he saw and admired this “large Square painting,” hanging in a drawing room “over the chimney.” The double portrait was unmistakably described by Thomas Warton in 1772:

a very curious picture of Prince Henry while a boy. The date is 1603, and the prince’s age is marked II. Vertue could not discover the painter. He is represented large as life, cutting the throat of a stag after hunting. At some little distance is Sir John Harrington, a youth, the prince’s intimate friend, as appears by his arms hung up in a tree. This piece was probably painted to compliment some boyish achievement in hunting performed by the prince; for, almost from his infancy, he was remarkably fond of hunting.

The work may have descended in the North family; or, alternately, in the family of the Earls of Downe, passing to the Norths through Frances, daughter of the third Earl, who in 1672 married Francis North, Baron Guildford, and who later inherited Wroxton Abbey. Most likely, as it apparently never belonged to the royal family, the first owner would have been Baron Harington of Exton, father of the nine-year-old Prince of Wales’s companion, John Harington, pictured here at the age of eleven. Baron Harington may have commissioned it.

Henry Frederick was the son of Anne of Denmark and James VI of Scotland, who after the death of Queen Elizabeth I in late March 1603 succeeded as James I of England. Prince Henry was born in Scotland at Stirling Castle on February 19, 1594, and in accordance with tradition was given into the care of a Scottish nobleman, John Erskine,
second Earl of Mar. On June 1, 1603, the prince, traveling with Queen Anne and his sister, Elizabeth, followed his father to England, and on July 2, at Windsor, the king invested him with the Order of the Garter. (In this portrait he wears the Garter jewel, the George, on a blue ribbon tucked into his belt.) Thereafter he was removed to Oatlands, Surrey, where a household was established for him and where he may have sat for Peake in the autumn. Baron Harington had entertained the king with hunting in Yorkshire in the course of his progress from Scotland. In 1603 the Haringtons were placed in charge of the upbringing of Princess Elizabeth, who remained with them until her marriage. Harington, writing in 1606, mentioned that his son was with the prince, “from whom I hope he will gain great advantage from such a very genial and mature beyond his years.”

Well educated from an early age, following a program outlined by his father, Prince Henry was described in 1603 as personable and mature beyond his years. He particularly loved sports, including hawking and hunting, and a riding school was built at St. James’s Palace at his behest. The subject evidently suited very well, as the work exists in two versions, the second of which is slightly later in date, perhaps in or after 1605, and belongs to the Royal Collection (fig. 8):

A small full-length of Henry prince of Wales, son of James I. He is dressed in green, standing over a dead stag, drawing a sword, probably to cut off its head, according to the custom of the chase. A youth, Robert earl of Essex, afterwords the parlementarian general, is kneeling before him: each of them have hunting horns; and behind the prince is a horse; and on the bough of a tree are the arms of England; and behind the young lord, on the ground, are his own. These are the bearings of the Devereuxes.”

The prince is not cutting the throat of the stag, nor preparing to cut off its head. He is instead engaged in a specific ritual wherein, according to Turberville’s Booke of Hunting, 1576, at the climax of the hunt the prince strikes a ceremonial blow to the neck of the dead animal prior to the severing of the head, which was given to the hounds.

Writing in 1605, Roy Strong, on the advice of Oliver Millar, was the first to attribute the portrait to Robert Peake the Elder. Millar pointed out that the later version should be dated between 1604, when Robert Devereux, later third Earl of Essex, was restored to royal favor, and late 1607, when he left England for two years abroad. More recently, the present painting has been associated with a 1605 portrait of Princess Elizabeth (see fig. 9) by Peake that is now at Greenwich.

While Stuart painting in the reign of James I lacks the refinement of technique and characterization that mark contemporary miniatures and is old-fashioned by comparison with Continental styles, this is an important early example of the dismounted equestrian portrait, which would have such a long life in English art. Peake’s elaborate landscape setting of wooded deer park and distant mountain establishes a groundbreaking precedent. Prince Henry’s bold pose reiterates a pattern famously devised by Holbein for his portrait of Henry VIII in the Whitehall mural. The prince’s costume and that of his courtier are heavily embelished with gold lace, while the brightly colored horse furniture includes a bit, stirrup, and fringes of gold, drawing the eye like the angular patterns of a playing card. What Peake fails to convey, however, is the lively physicality and precocious maturity of the much admired, short-lived young prince.

1. It seems likely that Mrs. Davison had placed the picture on consignment with Duveen in 1934.
2. Vertue, a prolific engraver, publisher, and antiquary, was to all intents and purposes the first historian of British art; his invaluable notebooks have been published by the Walpole Society.
4. The second Baron Harington of Exton died in 1614; Lucy Russell, Countess of Bedford, his only sister, died childless in 1618.
6. Princess Elizabeth

Oil on canvas, 60⅜ x 31⅛ in. (154.3 x 79.4 cm)

Ex coll.: John Harington, 1st Baron Harington of Exton (until d. 1615); by descent to Thomas Pope, 4th Earl of Downe, Wroxton Abbey, near Banbury (until d. 1667); Sir Francis North, 1st Baron Guilford, Wroxton Abbey (1672–d. 1682); Sir Francis North, 7th Baron North and later 1st Earl of Guilford, Wroxton Abbey (by 1741–d. 1790); by descent to Susan, Baroness North, and Colonel John Sydney Doyle North, Wroxton Abbey (by 1857–his d. 1892); William Henry John North, 11th Baron North, Wroxton Abbey (1892–1914); [Agnew, London, 1914–16; as Elizabeth, Queen of England, by Zuccaro; sold to Davison]; Henry Pomeroy Davison, Locust Valley, New York (1916–d. 1922); Kate T. (Mrs. Henry Pomeroy) Davison, Locust Valley and New York (1922–53)


This painting descended in the North family and was sold by Agnew’s in 1916 to Henry Davison as Elizabeth I of England by Federico Zuccaro. It must have precisely the same history as Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales, with Sir John Harington, in the Hunting Field (no. 3). Lionel Cust, in 1914, suggested an attribution to Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger, remarking that the sitter had “at some time [been] called Queen Elizabeth, with an occasional variation into Elizabeth of Bohemia.” In 1956 J. F. Kerslake pointed out that the same artist had painted both the portrait of Prince Henry and another portrait of a young woman that was then at Wroxton (fig. 9) and belongs now to the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich.

In the last fifty years, close study of Tudor and Stuart images has resulted in significant advances in scholarship and, not surprisingly, it was Roy Strong who proposed the attribution to Peake for the present picture. This was probably in the early 1960s. Strong believed firmly that the sitter was Princess Elizabeth and noted that she wears the same jeweled chain in a miniature by Nicholas Hilliard (fig. 10) in the Victoria and Albert Museum as well as in a painting that has since been ascribed to Peake (fig. 11) and acquired for London’s National Portrait Gallery. Based on the sitter’s age, a date of about 1606 has been suggested.

Elizabeth was the only daughter of James VI of Scotland and I of England and Anne of Denmark. Born at Falkland Palace on August 19, 1596, the princess was two years younger than Henry, Prince of Wales, and four years older than Prince Charles, later Charles I. She spent her early childhood with Lord and Lady Livingstone at Linlithgow Palace, between Edinburgh and Stirling. In 1603 she accompanied her mother and older brother to England and thereafter grew up in the care of Lord and Lady Har-}

Fig. 9. Robert Peake the Elder, Princess Elizabeth, 1596–1602, Aged Seven, 1603. Oil on canvas, 53⅛ x 37⅛ in. (135.9 x 95.3 cm). National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, London. Acquired with the assistance of The Art Fund and the National Heritage Memorial Fund (8H44237)

Fig. 10. Nicholas Hilliard, Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, 1606–9. Miniature, vellum stuck onto playing card, oval, 21¼ x 17¼ in. (53 x 4.3 cm). Victoria and Albert Museum, London (9.4-1937)
Sir Peter Lely

Dutch, born Soest, Westphalia, September 14, 1618; died London, November 30, 1680

The artist was the son of a Dutch captain of infantry in the service of the Elector of Brandenburg. Born Pieter van der Faes, he adopted the pseudonym Lely. In 1637 he was a student of the Haarlem Classicist painter Pieter de Grebber. He arrived in England in the early or mid-1640s and, according to George Vertue, worked there with the portraitist and dealer George Geldorp. At first, Lely painted historical subjects and landscapes with small figures, such as The Concert (Courtauld Institute of Art, London), but he was already known as an able face painter and soon realized that it was principally portraits that were wanted. Neutral in color and contemplative in mood, his early work in England reflected his Dutch training. From the beginning, however, he was influenced by the style of Sir Anthony van Dyck, who had died in 1641, and perhaps hoped to take his place.

In 1647 Lely was made free of London’s Painter-Stainers Company. Among his major patrons was Algernon Percy, tenth Duke of Northumberland, who in 1648 commissioned from him a portrait of Charles I in captivity with James, Duke of York (Syon House, Middlesex). In 1654 he painted Oliver Cromwell (Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery), though perhaps not from life. Although Lely became Charles II’s principal painter in 1660, his most important royal patrons were the Duke of York, later James II, and his first wife, Anne Hyde. It was she who commissioned the famous series of ladies of the court called the Windsor Beauties (Royal Collection). Lely had a busy studio and many assistants and was a major collector and connoisseur who amassed hundreds of paintings and perhaps as many as ten thousand drawings and prints. He died aged sixty-two, at his easel.
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expression are also found in miniatures by Hilliard and Isaac Oliver. The loose, twining patterns of brightly colored leaves, flowers, and insects on her dress are duplicated in the tighter design of a rare silk-embroidered linen jacket (fig. 12) that is said to have been worn in the years 1610–20. The painted text in her book refers to a tablet, a flat, table-cut jewel of the sort she wears in her hair and of which the chain suspended from her shoulder is composed: the black color indicates that these are diamonds. The text suggests that instead of jewelry, the Catholic queen offered her beloved, absent daughter, a Protestant, a blessing in the form of a devotional text.

When the canvas came to the Museum, it was inscribed at the lower left with the name “Elizabeth Queen of England.” This proved, as anticipated, to be a later addition, which was removed during restoration in 1997. The state of preservation of the picture is in general very fine.

2. Strong, in a letter, before 1674 (the letter has been lost, but the information it contained had been transferred to a catalogue card). Millar, verbally, in 1964, rejected Strong’s attribution, which he came to accept only in 1994, in a letter.

Fig. 11. Robert Peake the Elder, Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, 1610. Oil on canvas, 67¼ x 38½ in. (171.3 x 96.8 cm). National Portrait Gallery, London (6121)

Fig. 12. Jacket worn by Margaret Laton, 1610–20. Linen, embroidered with silk, trimmed with silver and silver-gilt bobbin lace. Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Purchased with the assistance of the National Heritage Memorial Fund and the National Art Collections Fund (7.228-1994)
7. Mary Capel, Later Duchess of Beaufort, and Her Sister
Elizabeth, Countess of Carnarvon

Oil on canvas, 51 1/4 x 67 in. (130.2 x 170.2 cm)
Signed and inscribed: (lower left, on parapet) PL, [monogram]; (on flower painting) E Carnarvon / fecit; (on verso) Lady Carnarvon, & her Sister, / by, Sir Peter Lilley.
Bequest of Jacob Ruppert, 1939 (39.65.3)

Ex coll.: Arthur Capel, 1st Earl of Essex, Cassiobury Park, Watford, Hertfordshire (until d. 1693); the Earls of Essex, Cassiobury Park (1693–1716); Algernon George de Vere Capel, 8th Earl of Essex, Cassiobury Park (1716–22; his sale, Knight, Frank & Rutley, Cassiobury Park, June 15, 1922, no. 708, as Mary and Elizabeth Capell, daughters of Arthur, Lord Capell); [Scott & Fowles, New York, until 1925; sold to Ruppert]; Colonel Jacob Ruppert, New York and Garrison, New York (1925–d. 1939)


In 1721 George Vertue visited Cassiobury Park and was much impressed by a number of the pictures he saw there, notably a set of half-length portraits by Lely of members of the Capel family, Earls of Essex, that he termed "gracefully nobly & finely painted." He described seven of them more specifically as "a Gentleman with a Bust," "a Gentleman & Lady double half len[gth]," "a Lady in Mourning a most delightfull picture," "a Lady setting," "2 Ladys setting," "a Lady setting olive Colour drapery," and finally, "a Gentleman standing. his hand on a bust." Vertue thought them "the best and highest perfection that ever I saw painted.
Fig. 13. The Great Library, Cassiobury Park, 1922. From A Catalogue of the Contents of Cassiobury Park, Watford, Herts., sale catalogue, Knight, Frank & Rutley (June 12–23, 1922), opp. p. 17

Fig. 14. Cornelius Johnson, The Capel Family, ca. 1640. Oil on canvas, 63 in. × 8 ft. 6 in. (160 × 259.1 cm). National Portrait Gallery, London (4759)

Fig. 15. Sir Peter Lely, Arthur Capel, 1st Earl of Essex, and Elizabeth, Countess of Essex, 1653. Oil on canvas, 50 1/8 × 67 7/8 in. (127.4 × 171.2 cm). National Portrait Gallery, London (5461)

Fig. 16. Anthony van Dyck, Dorothy, Viscountess Andover, and Lady Elizabeth Thimbrelly. Oil on canvas, 52 × 58 3/4 in. (132.1 × 149 cm). National Gallery, London (NG6437)
by St. P. Lely especially so many & so compleat together. The paintings, which remained with the family until the house and its contents were sold in 1922, were installed above the bookcases in the Great Library (fig. 13) with, over the fireplace, a family portrait by Sir Joshua Reynolds that now also belongs to this Museum (no. 30).

Cassiobury had come into the Capel family in 1627, with the marriage of Elizabeth Morrison to Arthur, Baron Capel of Hadham (fig. 14), father of the first Earl of Essex. Both the Capels and the Morrison were ardent loyalists, and Lord Capel fought valiantly in the cause of Charles I. After the surrender at Colchester in 1648, he was taken into custody, condemned to death, and executed the following year, a few weeks after the king. At the Restoration, his eldest son, also Arthur Capel, born in 1632, was created Viscount Marden and Earl of Essex in recognition of his father’s services to the crown. A statesman of great probity, he served as Lord lieutenant of Ireland. The Capels’ marriages had brought them enormous wealth. After his return from Ireland in 1677, Essex moved to Cassiobury to rebuild and greatly enlarge the house, a commission he gave to Hugh May, and to extend the gardens. It would have been at this time that the portraits in their auricular frames were installed in the library. Essex later became disaffected and died in the tower in 1693 following his arrest for involvement in the Rye House Plot. He seems to have been murdered.

Lely was perhaps introduced to the family at the time of the marriage, on May 19, 1635, of Arthur Capel to Lady Elizabeth Percy, daughter of the tenth Earl of Northumberland. The sober elegance of his double portrait of the couple (fig. 15) and their youthful appearance suggest that it may have been painted at the time of the wedding or shortly thereafter. Arthur’s older sister, Mary, pictured here, was baptized on December 16, 1630, and died at eighty-five on January 7, 1715. She married first, on June 18, 1648, Henry Seymour, Lord Beauchamp, who died in 1654, and second, on August 17, 1657, Henry Somerset, Lord Herbert. At the time of her second marriage, she would have been twenty-seven, and the present portrait, which is clearly later in style than that of her brother and sister-in-law, may have marked the occasion. In 1660 Lord Herbert was among those deputed to invite the return of Charles II. He succeeded as third Marquess of Worcester in 1667, and in 1682 was created Duke of Beaufort. The couple devoted themselves to enlarging his family estate at Badminton House, Gloucestershire, and to developing extensive woods and formal gardens modeled on those at Versailles. The duchess was especially interested in botany and propagated exotic plants. Her younger sister Elizabeth, baptized on June 4, 1633, was married in or before 1653 to Charles Dormer, second Earl of Carnarvon. She was an amateur artist, and Lely pays her the elegant compliment of showing her with a small picture of her own, a study of a tulip inscribed with her name under a coronet.3

Lely’s Dutch training and earlier restraint here give way to the influence of the elegant court style of Van Dyck, by whom the younger artist was chiefly influenced. The picture is marked by the extraordinary beauty and depth of the colors, especially the bronze and blue, and the yellow tones, which Van Dyck also favored, and by Lely’s confident handling of the elaborate, shiny draperies. The flesh is soft and supple. The portrait of Elizabeth, in particular, is quite individualized for an artist whose sitters tend to look alike. What the picture lacks, however, is a sense of the ties that connect the sisters and of their unspoken communication, which Van Dyck would have provided. Lely’s model may have been Van Dyck’s portrait of the daughters of Viscount Savage (fig. 16), which was in the artist’s personal collection.4 Our painting and its companion are in notably good state and retain their original auricular frames.

8. Sir Henry Capel

Oil on canvas, 49¼ x 40½ in. (126.4 x 102.9 cm)
Signed (on base of column): PL [monogram]
Labeled (on reverse of frame): . . . Sir Henry Capel . . .
From / the Cassiobury Park Sale.
Bequest of Jacob Ruppert, 1939 (39.63.6)

Ex coll.: Arthur Capel, 1st Earl of Essex, Cassiobury Park, Watford, Hertfordshire (until d. 1693); the Earl of Essex, Cassiobury Park (1693–1916); Algernon George de Vere Capel, 8th Earl of Essex, Cassiobury Park (1916–24); his sale, Knight, Frank & Rutley, Cassiobury Park, June 15, 1924, no. 707, as Sir Henry Capell, . . . left hand on a marble bust; [Scott & Fowles, New York, until 1925; sold to Ruppert]; Colonel Jacob Ruppert, New York and Garrison, New York (1925–d. 1939)


The second son of Baron Capel of Hadham, Henry Capel was baptized on March 6, 1638, at Hadham Parva, Herefordshire. He married, in 1659, Dorothy Bennett, daughter and co-heir of Richard Bennett of Kew, Surrey. Their marriage was childless. Capel served for more than twenty years as member of Parliament for Tewkesbury and in 1692 was created Baron Capel of Tewkesbury. He was briefly first lord of the admiralty, a lord of the treasury, and both a lord justice and the lord deputy of Ireland. According to some sources, his political reputation was not entirely untarnished.3

At first, the picture (fig. 17) was a source of some confusion, as it was labeled on the reverse of the frame as coming from the Cassiobury sale but did not match the description of lot 707, “Sir Henry Cappell, second son of Arthur, Lord Capel, created Lord Tewkesbury, three-quarter-length, flowing wig, left hand on a marble bust.” In 1947 Ellis Waterhouse suggested that the bust mentioned in the catalogue could be “lurking under some very modern repaint,” which proved to be the case. If the sitter’s gesture indicates the plight of troth, then this may be the third in a series of Capel marriage portraits and would date to 1659.4 Four works from the series of eight described in 1731 by George Vertue are now known: these include “a Gentleman & Lady double half”
Fig. 17. Sir Peter Lely, *Sir Henry Capel* (no. 8), before cleaning

Fig. 18. Sir Peter Lely, *Anne Strangeys, née Capel, Seated by an Orange Tree*. Oil on canvas, 50 × 40 in. (127 × 101.7 cm). Lowell Libson Ltd., London


len[gh]," probably of 1653 (see fig. 15), in the National Portrait Gallery, London; the "2 Ladies setting," probably of 1657, in this Museum’s collection (no. 7); and, from 1659, the present work, "a Gentleman standing, his hand on a bust."4 The fourth portrait, recently come to light, must be the one Vertue referred to as "a Lady setting";5 it represents Anne Capel (fig. 18) and may have been painted at the time of her marriage to John Strangeys of Melbury Sandford, Dorset. This is unlikely to have been before the early 1660s, as she was born in 1640 or later.

Our portrait shows a handsome young man of serious demeanor. His wavy hair with its bright highlights is set off by rather extravagantly painted blue-and-copper draperies. His high, starched collar is correct for the late Commonwealth period. Comparison with a miniature by John Hoskins (fig. 19), apparently several years earlier in date, suggests that Lely exaggerated the sitter’s more attractive qualities. All of the Capels seem to have ordered portraits, which, judging from catalogues and photographs, have survived in great numbers, principally in private collections. Another Lely portrait (without a description) representing Henry Capel was in the artist’s own 1682 estate sale.6 A painting that must have been similar to the present work, sold in 1911, showed Sir Henry “in brown dress with slashed sleeves, resting his right hand upon a pedestal, upon which is a marble bust.”7 The Duke of Northumberland owns a smaller oval depicting the same sitter in a head-and-shoulders view, three-quarters to the left, inscribed with his name.8

The Capel family’s ardent interest in horticulture and gardening is worthy of emphasis. The Countess of Carnarvon painted flowers, while the Duchess of Beaufort laid out extensive gardens at Badminton and cultivated in her conservatory exotic plants from all over the world.9 Through his wife, Henry Capel came to own a garden at Kew in which he took much personal interest. There, according to John Evelyn, who visited in 1683, “the two green-houses for oranges and myrtles . . . are very well contrived. There is a cupola made with pole-work between two elms at the end of a walk, which being covered by plashing the trees to them, is very pretty.”10 Later Evelyn noted that Sir Henry “was contriving very high palisadoes of reeds to shade his oranges during the summer.”


2. Waterhouse, in a letter, 1947. Subsequently, he pointed out that such large bust-length sculptures appear only in Lely’s work of 1655–60. Becket 1991, p. 14, added that the copy of Lely’s portrait of the dwarf Richard Gibson in the National Portrait Gallery shows the same bust and that the original is supposed to have been dated 1658.

3. This suggestion was made by N. J. Barker, in a letter, 1965.


5. See Vertue’s description of seven of the paintings under no. 7. The sitter here is not in mourning and does not wear olive-colored drapery.

6. It is among “Half Lengths of Men” in the sale of April 18, 1683, for which see “Editorial: Sir Peter Lely’s Collection,” *Burlington Magazine* 65 (August 1945), p. 188. R. B. Beckett, in a letter, 1948, suggested that it might have been bought back by the family.


9. Study for a Portrait of a Woman

Oil on canvas, 26 1/2 x 21 3/4 in. (67.3 x 55.7 cm)
Rogers Fund, 1906 (06.1198)

Ex coll.: J. M. Stewart; John H. Foster, Fernside, Witley, Surrey (until d. 1906; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, March 24, 1906, no. 31, as Portrait of Nell Gwynne, for £105 to Colnaghi); [Colnaghi, London, 1906; sold to MMA]

The sketch is of high quality, if little known, and a good example of how Lely worked. After 1660 the artist was the recipient of steady royal and noble patronage, becoming the most successful portraitist at the Restoration court. A fine draftsman who was always exceedingly busy with important commissions, Lely soon developed the practice of supplying clients with chalk drawings in which he defined proposed compositions. He painted only the sitter’s head in his or her presence, sometimes laying in an outline for the pose and costume, and was widely criticized because he so often employed assistants for drapery and backgrounds. He must certainly have retained studies of heads, as he was often called upon to produce replica portraits of important sitters.

Over the years, this work has been accepted as Lely’s by R. B. Beckett, David Piper, and Oliver Millar, and dated to the 1670s. No credence has ever been given to the proposed identification of the sitter as Eleanor Gwyn, the comic actress of questionable origins who in 1669 became the mistress of Charles II. She was the mother of a son (see no. 11), born in May 1670 and christened with the king’s name, who rose to the rank of Duke of St. Albans. Nell Gwyn surely sat for Lely, and her appearance is preserved in several engraved portraits after his originals (fig. 10).

There are some small losses of paint on the exposed breast of the sitter, and an old repair is visible in the lower right corner. A nineteenth-century copy of the present study belonged to the Los Angeles County Museum of Art. In the Heinz Archive and Library at the National Portrait Gallery, London, there are photographs of copies and variants after what may have been Lely’s finished original of the same woman. All show drapery that is similarly arranged; in each case the face is in reverse to the present work.

1. Beckett, in letters, 1948 (the letters survive in the form of transcripts); Piper, verbally, 1962, and Millar, verbally, 1963, and in letters, 1978, 1990. Piper suggested tentatively that the sitter might be the Duchess of Cleveland, but this does not seem likely.
2. The copy was sold in 1977 at Sotheby-Parke-Bernet, New York, according to Patrice Marandell, in a letter, 2000.
3. Two of the images are titled Nell Gwyn; two others are called Catherine Sedley, Countess of Dorchester. If the sketch represents the countess, who was born in 1657 and also became a royal mistress, it must date to the late 1670s.
WORKSHOP OF SIR PETER LELEY

10. Barbara Villiers, Duchess of Cleveland

Barbara Villiers, born in 1640, was the daughter of William Villiers, Viscount Grandison, a royalist who died in 1643 of wounds received in the Civil War. In April 1649 she married Roger Palmer, a lawyer, while she was in the midst of an affair with Philip Stanhope, second Earl of Chesterfield, who in January 1660 had to leave England after killing an adversary in a duel. As the first of her children by Charles II, a daughter, was born on February 25, 1661, she must have met the king immediately after his arrival in London on May 29, 1660. To provide her with a title, he created her husband Earl of Castlemaine. The couple soon separated, and the countess bore Charles II a son in June 1662, the month following the first appearance at court of his new queen, Catherine of Braganza. The countess, who had great influence at court, was created Duchess of Cleveland in 1670, toward the end of the affair. She sat frequently for Lely, who was in a sense her publicist: his many portraits testified to her beauty and underlined the power of her position as the king’s acknowledged mistress.

Hermann Williams assigned the portrait to the artist’s workshop when it came into the Museum in 1939, and the attribution has been maintained despite the fact that in 1951 R. B. Beckett, judging from a black-and-white photograph, published it as by Lely. Beckett had already advised the Museum of his opinion in 1948. The following year, he reaffirmed his view, drawing attention to another version of the composition, without the inscription, that had belonged to “Sir John Foley Grey from Enville Hall” and had been sold at Christie’s on June 15, 1928, number 45, to the dealer Leggatt. He noted that the Grey picture had come from the Earls of Stamford and had been exhibited at Manchester in 1857. The provenances of our painting and the Grey picture as reported by Beckett were intertwined, and it is possible that there were (or are) three or even four paintings in all. The only other opinion of the Museum’s work on record is that of Oliver Millar, who in 1978 suggested that the head and bosom of the duchess might be autograph. He was unaware of the other versions to which Beckett had made reference.

The painting is in good condition despite many small losses. These have been retouched, and the retouching has discolored over time. The face is rather better preserved, while the blue is the most damaged, as the glazes over the white ground have rubbed off.

1. Beckett wrote twice in 1948 (the letters have disappeared, but partial transcripts are preserved). In the second letter, dated December 24, he advised that the picture “looks to me like a good original of the 1660’s, rather than a studio work. The French inscription is interesting, and suggests that it may have been sent abroad as a sort of ambassadorial present, in view of the lady’s semi-royal position in England.”

2. Beckett, in a letter, 1949. The picture is described in the sale catalogue as Barbara, Duchess of Cleveland, in brown dress with green scarf, and pearl ornaments, 82 in. by 52 in. Exhibited at the Art Treasures Exhibition, Manchester, 1857, No. 1284. The same picture may have been sold, under the heading Different Properties, as a Van Dyck (Christie’s, London, July 31, 1947, No. 114, Portrait of Barbara, Duchess of Cleveland, in grey and white dress, with green scarf, seated on a balcony, unframed, 82 x 52 in., for £600 to Iona). On the photo mount at the Heinze Archive and Library, National Portrait Gallery, London, Ellis Waterhouse noted that it must be a studio work.

3. For what may be another version, see sale, Christie’s, London, January 20, 1928, No. 79, Sir P. Lely, Portrait of the Duchess of Cleveland, in slate-coloured dress, with blue scarf; brown curtain background, 88 x 52 in., for £378 to Taylor.

The painter was born Gottfried Kniller in the Baltic Hanseatic city of Lübeck, where his father was a surveyor of mines and inspector of revenues. Gottfried studied mathematics at the University of Leiden. It was his father’s intention that he should have a career in the army, but his inclination for drawing led him to move to Amsterdam, where the elder Kniller reportedly placed him with Rembrandt. He may also have studied with Ferdinand Bol. His earliest recorded work is a portrait, painted in 1666, of Johan Philipp von Schönborn, Prince-Bishop of Würzburg (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), while his first dated history painting, from 1668, is *Isaac Blessing Jacob* (St. Annenmuseum, Lübeck). In 1672 Gottfried traveled to Italy, where he looked closely at the paintings of Titian and Raphael and worked with Gianlorenzo Bernini and Carlo Maratta; in 1676 he moved to England to study the style of Sir Anthony van Dyck.

The young German’s exceptional artistic education, sophistication, and diligence equipped him for service at the English court, where an important early patron was James Scott, first Duke of Monmouth, whom he painted in a lavish Baroque style in 1678 (private collection). Charles II gave him sittings for the first time in the following year. In 1681 he was granted permanent residency in England and in 1684 went at the king’s behest to Paris to take sittings for a portrait of Louis XIV (two versions in private collections). The artist was, by this time, the most important portraitist in England. Credited with an exceptional ability to capture a likeness, he had an immense practice, sometimes scheduling more than a dozen sitters a day, and his work was widely distributed in the form of engravings. He became principal painter to William and Mary in 1689 and began a series of portraits for the queen known as the Hampton Court Beauties. Knighted in 1692, Sir Godfrey was also honored on the Continent when, in 1700, he was ennobled by Emperor Leopold I. He continued in favor with Queen Anne, and in 1715 George I created him a baronet.

**II. Charles Beauclerk, Duke of St. Albans**

Oil on canvas, 49 7/8 x 40 1/2 in. (126.7 x 102.9 cm) Signed and inscribed: (lower left) GK [monogram] P; (top center) The Right Hon. / charles beauclaire / Baron Hedington / Earl of Burford.

Bequest of Jacob Ruppert, 1939 (39.64.8)

*Ex coll.*: Judge Evans, London; [Scott & Fowles, New York, until 1929; sold to Ruppert]; Colonel Jacob Ruppert, New York and Garrison, New York (1925–d. 1939)


Assuming the inscription to be correct, the sitter was the eldest illegitimate son of Charles II and the actress and royal favorite Eleanor, or Nell, Gwyn. He was born on May 8, 1670. The king, who had no legitimate children, was fond of his offspring by Gwyn and treated them with marked attention. On December 27, 1676, the boy was created Baron Hedington and Earl of Burford, and at thirteen, on January 10, 1684, he became the first Duke of St. Albans. Present at the taking of Belgrade in 1688, he was a soldier from an early age and later served directly under William III, who held him in high esteem. On April 17, 1694, the duke married Lady Diana de Vere, a famous beauty who was the daughter and sole heiress of the last Duke of Oxford. The couple had eight children. Their third son, Vere, married Mary, daughter of Thomas Chambers and Lady Mary Berkeley (see no. 12). St. Albans died on May 10, 1726, at Bath and was buried at Westminster Abbey.

The painting has been accepted as an autograph work by David Piper, in 1962, and

---

**Fig. 21. Robert White, Charles Beauclerk, 1st Duke of St. Albans, and James Beauclerk, 1679.**

Line engraving, 11 1/2 x 7 1/2 in. (29.3 x 18.2 cm). National Portrait Gallery, London (D20980)

**Fig. 22. Unknown artist, Portrait of a Boy, Called Charles Beauclerk, Duke of St. Albans 1670–1726, ca. 1680.**

Miniature, vellum, oval, 3 x 2 1/2 in. (7.7 x 6.4 cm). The Royal Collection, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II (RCIN 420350)
by J. Douglas Stewart, in 1990, but Stewart suggested that the sitter may be misidentified, as the inscription does not name him Duke of St. Albans, a title he had held since 1684. There is limited evidence to advance, since the only attested portrait shows the duke as a child, with his brother, in robes of state (fig. 2). A miniature traditionally believed to represent him is of a slightly older boy, wearing a breastplate, a falling lace collar, and a full wig (fig. 22). In neither case is there a compelling resemblance to our sitter. If the lettering on the canvas is correct, a date between 1690 and 1695, when St. Albans was twenty-five and newly married, seems appropriate. The present portrait would have complemented one by Kneller of the duke’s wife that is presumed lost but the composition of which is preserved in a print by John Smith (fig. 23). The broad, open, and highly accomplished brushwork is a hallmark of Kneller’s more personal style. He must have worked at speed and in total confidence. The state is good, and theauricular frame seems to be the original.

12. Lady Mary Berkeley, Wife of Thomas Chambers

Oil on canvas, 29 x 25 in. (73.7 x 63.5 cm)
Gift of George A. Hearn, 1896 (96.50.6)
Ex coll.: George A. Hearn, New York (until 1896)

Lady Mary Berkeley was the oldest of three daughters of Charles Berkeley, second Earl of Berkeley, who in 1677 had married Elizabeth, daughter of Baptist Noel, third Viscount Campden. At the time the present portrait was painted, Lady Mary probably was recently married to Thomas Chambers, whose father, Sir Thomas, had purchased the manor and park of Hanworth, Middlesex, in 1670. There was said to have been a room in the house with a ceiling by Kneller. (The house burned in 1797.) A portrait by Kneller of Lady Mary’s brother, James Berkeley, third Earl of Berkeley, belongs to the National Portrait Gallery, London. Lady Mary and her husband had two daughters and co-heirs, one of whom, Mary, married Lord Vere Beauclerk, third son of the first Duke of St. Albans (see no. 11).

This half-length portrait of Lady Mary in a feigned oval surround is unfinished. There is no evidence to suggest whether it was or was not delivered. The sitter wears a robe closed with a single large pearl button and a drapery over her left shoulder. Although the Museum has owned the picture for more than a century, it is unpublished. The attribution to Kneller has been accepted by Oliver Millar and J. Douglas Stewart, and while W. G. Constable thought it not good enough, it seems to fall within the canon, insofar as this has been established. There is also evidence of various kinds to suggest that Kneller worked for the Berkeley family. The last part of the inscription on the picture was read prior to cleaning in 1948 as “G. Kneller Esquire fecit 1700.” There are other inscriptions of comparable wording, and the date accords well with the style.

An area of damage measuring as much as an inch wide extends from the sitter’s hairline through her right eye to the ruffle and bodice of her dress. This was caused by exposure to excessive heat and takes the form of a large number of tiny pinpoint losses and blisters.

1. A color reproduction of the portrait can be found on the National Portrait Gallery website (no. 3195; www.npg.org.uk).
2. Constable, verbally, 1931; Millar, verbally, 1964, as “a good late work,” and verbally, 1991; and Stewart, in a letter, 1990.
Willem Wissing

*Dutch, born Amsterdam or The Hague, 1656; died Stamford, Lancashire, September 10, 1687*

Wissing studied in The Hague, where in 1669 he was recorded as the pupil of Arnold van Ravesteyn and Willem Doudijn, and he may have visited France before he arrived in London in the summer of 1676. He probably entered Sir Peter Lely’s studio more or less immediately, was listed among Lely’s assistants when the older artist died in 1680, completed portraits that Lely left unfinished, and made purchases from the estate. Three or four years later, Wissing was well established, with an important clientele. Charles II sat for him (Royal Collection), and he also found favor with James II and Mary of Modena (her portrait of 1687 is in the National Portrait Gallery, London). In 1685 Mary sent him to Holland to paint William III, Prince of Orange, and Princess Mary (signed versions are in the Royal Collection). Wissing was taken up by John Cecil, fifth Earl of Exeter, and died at Burghley House while painting members of the earl’s family.

The Dutch-born artist’s elegant style is characterized by a preference for elaboration and for brightly colored drapery, suggesting French influence, as well as by a profusion of naturalistic details in the backgrounds of his portraits. He worked with the drapery painter Jan van der Vaart, perhaps also with Francis Barlow, and certainly with the print publisher Edward Cooper. In 1687 Wissing and Van der Vaart both signed a portrait of Frances Teresa Stuart, Duchess of Richmond and Lennox (National Portrait Gallery, London), and Van der Vaart may have taken over Wissing’s studio after his early death. All the dated pictures by Wissing that have been identified thus far are from 1683 or later.

**Selected References**

**13. Portrait of a Woman**

Oil on canvas, 49¼ x 39¼ in. (126.4 x 102.2 cm)
Signed (at right): W. Wissing fecit
Bequest of Jacob Ruppert, 1939 (39.65.7)

*Ex coll.:* Sir Gerald William Henry Codrington, 1st Baronet, Dodington Park, Gloucester (until 1923; sale, Christie’s, London, July 13, 1933, no. 15, as Portrait of the Countess of Kildare, for £21 to Collings; [Scott & Fowles, New York, until 1926; their sale, American Art Galleries, New York, November 19, 1926, no. 95, as Mrs. Knott, for $425 to Ruppert]; Colonel Jacob Ruppert, New York and Garrison, New York (1926–d. 1939)


The anonymous sitter is painted in a typical studio pose, as if seated out of doors and leaning on a rock. Behind her is the trunk of a large oak tree, beside it a flowering shrub, and beneath a leafy branch a pungent view of a distant village of several buildings. She has been successively, and incorrectly, identified as the Countess of Kildare (fig. 24) and as Mrs. Knott (fig. 25). Hermann Williams thought the work similar to a portrait of Mary Musgrave that is signed and dated 1687; doubtless he was correct in presuming that it was painted shortly before Wissing’s death.

Had he not died young, Wissing would have been serious competition for Sir Godfrey Kneller, as in his last years the younger artist had very important aristocratic patrons and ran a busy studio. Perforce, he devised patterns with variations that he could use repeatedly, and the present work represents one such model. By comparison with our sitter, Mrs. Knott is dressed more simply and her hands are arranged differently; Mrs. Musgrave’s hands and costume, including a robe embroidered at the edges and fringed at one end, are identical in design, but her head is less individualized and the veil and drapery are not as well painted. Mrs. Musgrave’s plant is a vine, and our sitter has a flowering bush, while at Mrs. Knott’s elbow there is a flower arrangement. At least three other variations—figures posed identically and

---

*Fig. 24. Willem Wissing, Elizabeth Jones, Countess of Kildare, ca. 1684. Oil on canvas, 49½ x 39¼ in. (125.7 x 101 cm). Yale Center for British Art, New Haven, Paul Mellon Fund (81984.59.1)*

*Fig. 25. Willem Wissing, Mrs. Nott (Knott), 1680–83. Oil on canvas, 49 x 39¼ in. (124.5 x 101 cm). The Royal Collection, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II (RCIN402573)*
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dressed similarly, with brooches fastened to their sleeves—are recorded.\(^3\)

In 1996 conservator Charlotte Hale treated the painting, removing a very discolored and opacified varnish, as well as extensive overpainting from the blue dress, which is abraded.\(^4\) She found that the work relates to two full-length portraits by Wissing and Van der Vaart, that of the Duchess of Richmond and Lennox, signed and dated by both artists in 1687, referred to above, and an undated portrait of Queen Anne belonging to the National Portrait Gallery, Edinburgh. The blue draperies in particular are similar in their shapes, as are the fall of light and “the manner and degree of wear.”

Michael Dahl

Swedish, born Stockholm, September 29?, 1659; died London, October 20, 1743

Dahl’s friend George Vertue reported that the young Swede had studied in Stockholm with Martin Hannibal and David Klöcker Ehrenstrahl. While in London from 1682 until 1684, Dahl came under the influence of Godfrey Kneller and met Henry Tilson. He traveled with the latter to Paris, Venice, Naples, and Rome, where the two remained until 1687 and where Dahl converted to Roman Catholicism and was patronized by Queen Christina of Sweden. They returned in 1689 to London, where Dahl worked as a portraitist for the balance of his long life. Kneller had become London’s principal portrait painter and, from 1691, painter to William III and Mary, while Dahl had a good practice as Kneller’s less expensive and less pretentious competitor. Dahl followed Kneller in making large drawings of his sitters’ heads and in the mid-1690s emulated Kneller’s Hampton Court Beauties with his own series of portraits of titled ladies (Petworth House, Sussex), painted for Charles Seymour, sixth Duke of Somerset. After her accession in 1702, Queen Anne became his patron. Dahl died in London and was buried at St. James’s, Piccadilly. He had married an Englishwoman and had a son, Michael, said to have been a painter, who predeceased him; no works by the younger artist are known.

Selected References

14. Portrait of a Woman

Oil on canvas, 77 1/4 × 57 1/4 in. (196.2 × 131.4 cm)
Gift of Margaret Bruguère, in memory of Louis Bruguère, 1956 (56.214.1)


Fig. 26. Michael Dahl, Portrait of a Woman (no. 14), in the format originally conceived
Peter Monamy

Baptized London, January 12, 1685; buried London, February 7, 1749

Monamy’s father, also Peter, came from Guernsey and perhaps descended from a French Protestant family that had taken refuge in the Channel Islands long before. He was jailed in London in 1676 for forging customs documents. His son Peter was indentured in 1696 for seven years to William Clarke, a former master of the Painter-Stainers Company in the city. The young man was freed of the company in 1704 and may then have begun an independent career. According to George Vertue, he had “an early affection to drawing of ships and vessels of all kinds and the imitations of other famous masters of paintings,” coming in this way “into reputation” with people interested in marine painting. Monamy was probably too young to have visited the Van de Velde studio during the lifetime of Willem van de Velde the Elder, who had moved with his son of the same name to England in 1672 and died there in 1693, but he may have worked there later with Van de Velde the Younger. The Van de Veldes lived in Greenwich until 1691, and later in Westminster, where Willem the Elder worked principally as a draftsman and as a painter of naval battles. After Willem the Younger took over the family practice, his canvases increased in scale and dramatic effect but always with a preference for the calm seas that he had painted in his homeland. Monamy’s association with the Van de Velde shop would seem to be indicated by Vertue’s remark that at his death—“in indifferent circumstances”—he owned “prints and drawings, amongst which are many of William Vandervelde, Senior & Junior.” These were sold at the English artist’s house in Old Palace Yard in 1750.
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Van der Merwe 2004. Pieter van der Merwe.


15. Harbor Scene: An English Ship with Sails Loosened Firing a Gun

Oil on canvas, 48 × 59 in. (121.9 × 149.9 cm)
Gift of William P. Clyde, 1960 (60.94.2)

Ex coll.: Sir George Donaldson, Hove (sold for $20,000 to Clyde); William P. Clyde (by 1935–36; posthumous sale, American Art Association–Anderson Galleries, New York, November 12, 1931, no. 47, as British Frigate Firing a Broadside by Willem van de Velde the Younger, for $5,000, bought in); his son, William P. Clyde, Washington, D.C. (1931–60)


One of Willem van de Velde the Younger’s autograph late works, signed and dated 1703 (fig. 28), illustrates a similar ship and points up the greater variety and facility of that artist’s figural style, so different from what we see here. The present canvas cannot in fact be by him, and this may explain why...
it failed to sell at auction in 1931. The attribution to Peter Monamy, suggested in 1963, was several times reaffirmed by M. S. Robinson, formerly Curator of Paintings at the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich.\textsuperscript{2} He pointed out that Willem the Younger died in London in 1707,\textsuperscript{3} well before the accession in 1714 of George I and the adoption of the royal Hanoverian standard with the running white horse, which is depicted here.

The three-decker, starboard quarter view, flies the admiralty flag at the fore and the Union flag at the mizzen in addition to the Hanoverian standard at the main. The crimson flag of the lord high admiral would have been understood at the time as a potent symbol of the British claim to sovereignty of the seas. The same flags were flown for the launching of new ships and on models thereof.\textsuperscript{4} The red ensign at the stern indicates that this is the van of the fleet, while white was the color for the center, and blue for the rear, in order of seniority. Although the stern of the great vessel is similar to that of the Royal William, that ship cannot be identified with certainty as the one shown here because it was laid up throughout the period under consideration.\textsuperscript{5} Robinson believed that Monamy had been inspired instead by the putting to sea of the new Britannia in 1734.\textsuperscript{6}

The flagship depicted fires a salute to port, while a barge pulls away under its stern. The barge, manned by ten oarsmen who take their stroke from the coxswain, must carry sea officers or other important visitors. The orderly, nearly exact repetition of the rowers suggests the precise timing that would have been expected of them, but their identical silhouettes—practically a Monamy trademark—show a certain lack of imagination. The composition is typical, as is the profile of the ship’s stern against the white plumes of smoke. A fishing pink with a lowered sail lies aground in shallow water at the left, and two men in a rowboat lay a net to the right.
John Wootton

_Born Snitterfield, Warwickshire, possibly in 1681/82; buried London, November 3, 1764_

The birth date of John Wootton, of Snitterfield, may have been 1678, 1681, or 1684, when a baby that was baptized in the neighboring village of Hampton Lucy. Perhaps he was a page to Lady Anne Somerset, daughter of the first Duke of Beaufort, who in 1691 married the future second Earl of Coventry and moved to Snitterfield House. Wootton’s early work closely resembles that of the Anglo-Dutch painter John Wyck, who was patronized by the Beauforts, and it is thought that through Wootton may have gained entry to Wyck’s studio in Surrey in 1690. Wootton was established in London by 1706. His earliest dated work, from 1711, is a lifesize portrait of a horse, _The Duke of Rutland’s Bonny Black_ (private collection). A subscriber to the newly established Academy of Painting in 1711, Wootton was a steward of the Society of the Virtuosi of St. Luke by 1717. His role in the creation of a native English style of landscape painting is illustrated by the expansive topographical panorama _View from Box Hill, Surrey_ of 1716 (private collection). He continued in favor as a sporting artist, painting racing at Newmarket for various titled patrons and in 1726 publishing a popular series of prints after hare-hunting pieces. In pursuit of a more classical style, he studied works by Gaspard Dughet and Claude Lorrain, which were doubtless available to him in the collections of his patrons. The convivial and successful Wootton eventually found his work going out of fashion and ceased to paint about 1760.

**Selected References**


**Classical Landscape with Gypsies**

Oil on canvas, 55/4 x 51/4 in. (140.3 x 130.5 cm)
Signed and dated (on rock at lower center): J. Wootton / Feby 1748
Fletcher Fund, 1931 (32.33.2)

_Ex coll.:_ Sir James Dashwood, 2nd Baronet, Kirtlington Park, near Oxford (until d. 1779); the Dashwood family, Kirtlington Park (1779–1880); Sir George John Egerton Dashwood, 6th Baronet, Kirtlington Park (1889–1905); John David Leslie Melville, 14th Earl of Leven and 11th Earl of Melville (1909–1913); Archibald Alexander Leslie Melville, 15th Earl of Leven and 12th Earl of Melville (from 1913); in situ at Kirtlington Park (until 1931)


On March 27, 1749, in the accounts for his new house, Kirtlington Park, Sir James Dashwood recorded a payment to Wootton by a note on Hoare’s bank that was presumably for this picture. The sum is large, more than fifty pounds: Wootton, who was in high favor among the titled nobility, could set his prices as he wished. The Dashwood family had moved into their house in 1742. This canvas, signed and dated 1748, is in an interior (fig. 29) that was sold in the early 1930s and displaced from Kirtlington Park to the Metropolitan Museum. A photograph of the overmantel made in situ (fig. 30) before the room was dismantled for shipment shows that the painting with its gilded molding was never a perfect fit. Staffage from the Dutch genre painting tradition is here set in an English landscape embellished with a ruined classical temple on a hill, a Claudian motif inspired by Tivoli. As a distinguished male companion looks on, a lady in Van Dyck costume riding sidesaddle on a white horse with an exotic leopard-skin saddle blanket allows her fortune to be told by a barefoot gypsy woman. A servant cradling a weapon in his arms waits on the couple. Beyond a rocky arch, women camp beside a smoking fire and herders drive their cattle along a rutted pathway. Two
similar classical landscapes, *Morning* and *Evening*, were painted by Wootton for Sir John Shelley of Maresfield Park, Sussex, and belong now to the Yale Center for British Art, New Haven. The rough figure types are elaborately described in all three. Arline Meyer mentioned a small, more broadly painted variant of the present painting that was at Petworth; there seems also to have been one in the collection of the Duke of Bedford; and a third version (fig. 31) was on the art market.\(^5\) While it is recorded that Wootton frequently cooperated with portraitists, one may assume that he painted the figures in this case. The picture has darkened and is difficult to read from a distance.

1. The ledger is titled *A General Account of Money Expended on my New-house, and the outworks about it, begun 12: September: 1741*. A photocopy is in the files of the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts.


3. The painting formerly at Petworth measures 16 × 20 in. and is now in a private collection. Meyer 1984, p. 69, records a variant of the same size sold from the collection of H. J. L. Osborne at Christie’s, London, March 23, 1979, no. 82, and mentions another that was with Sabin in the 1960s. See Sparrow 1965, pp. 100–101, for the Duke of Bedford’s picture and for a landscape with "gypsies telling fortunes" that was sold in London on March 22, 1754, for thirteen guineas, well below Wootton’s usual charges at the time.

---

Fig. 29. Susan Alice Dashwood, *Kirtlington Park, Oxfordshire: View of the Dining Room*, 1876. Watercolor and gouache over graphite, 37 1/4 × 19 1/4 in. (94.5 × 50 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Edward Pearce Casey Fund, 1993 (1993.18)

Fig. 30. John Wootton, *Classical Landscape with Gypsies* (no. 16), in situ

Fig. 31. John Wootton, *An Extensive Wooded Landscape with a Lady Offering Alms*. Oil on canvas, 16 × 20 in. (40.6 × 50.7 cm). Location unknown
Enoch Seeman the Younger

German, born Danzig (Gdańsk), ca. 1690; died London, March 1744

The artist’s father, after whom he was named, was a painter of Flemish origin or descent who resided in Danzig before moving in 1704 to London. At that time, or at a later date, the younger Seeman also settled in the English capital, where he became a busy and quite successful if only moderately talented artist. He painted George I (Middle Temple, London), George II (Royal Collection), and Elihu Yale, whose portrait is at Yale University, New Haven. Seeman the Younger’s earliest documented work, *Colonel Andrew Bisset and His Family* (private collection), is inscribed with the name Enoch Seeman and the date 1708, and also gives his age at the time as eighteen and a half. For this reason, his birth is here tentatively assigned to the year 1690. He painted single figures, groups, and copies of earlier portraits, and the latest work by him that is presently known is from 1743.
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17. Sir James Dashwood

Oil on canvas, 96 x 60½ in. (243.8 x 153 cm)
Signed, dated, and inscribed: (lower right) Enoch Seeman / pinx. 1737; (lower left) Sir James Dashwood Bart. / (Painted in the 21st Year of his age) / Died 1779
Aged 64
Victor Wilbour Memorial Fund, 1936 (56.190)

Ex coll.: Sir James Dashwood, 2nd Baronet, Northbrooke House and later Kirtlington Park, near Oxford (until d. 1779); the Dashwood family, Kirtlington Park (1779–1889); Sir George John Egerton Dashwood, 6th Baronet, Kirtlington Park (1889–1933; on loan to Oxford City Buildings by 1922); Sir Robert Henry Seymour Dashwood, 7th Baronet (1933–47);
Sir Henry George Massy Dashwood, 8th Baronet (1947–56; on loan to Oxford Town Hall until 1956; sold to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1956; sold to MMA]


James Dashwood, born in Great Marlborough Street, London, on August 7, 1715, was educated at Eton and Abington. He departed on his Grand Tour in August 1732 and had returned to London by August 1736, the month in which he celebrated his twenty-first birthday. Dashwood spent the greater part of his time abroad in France, where he lived at Angers for eighteen months, studying French, drawing, and fencing. He also visited the principal cities of Italy and stopped in Belgium and Holland. As his
father had predeceased his grandfather, who
died in 1734, the young man succeeded as
second Baronet in the midst of his travels. In
1739 he married Elizabeth Spencer; the cou-
ples had eight children, three of whom died
young. Dashwood became high sheriff for
Oxfordshire in 1738 and was awarded the
degree D.C.L. by the University of Oxford,
where he was high steward from 1739 until
his death on November 10, 1779. He was
elected a member of Parliament for Oxford-
shire in 1761. His life was that of a very
wealthy gentleman and bon vivant.

The manors of Northbrook and Kirtling-
ton had come into the Dashwood family
through Sir James’s grandmother Penelope
Chamberlayne. From the time of her mar-
rriage in 1682 to the first Baronet, the Dash-
woods had lived at Northbrook House. Sir
James’s great work was the building of a new
house, Kirtlington Park, on high ground a
mile south of the old mansion and ten miles
from Oxford. Various architects contributed
to the design of the house, and Capability
Brown laid out the grounds. The founda-
tions were dug in 1742, and in 1746 the Dash-
woods moved in, although the building was still
incomplete. As one of the principal interiors
had been bought in 1741 by the Metropolitan
Museum, it was thought desirable to have a
portrait of the first owner of the house.

Since the picture is dated 1737 and Kirt-
linton Park was built between 1742 and
1746, the rudimentary view of the house in
the background must have been added later,
perhaps after the artist’s death (fig. 32).
(There is quite a large old tear in the back-
ground below and to the left of the house.)
Not too long after his twenty-first birthday,
Sir James must have commissioned this por-
trait of himself from Seeman, a respected
and established but very conservative painter.
He is shown at full length, accompanied by
his spaniel, pausing in the course of a walk in
the country. Rather than a formal wig, he
wears his short, dark hair unpowdered. His
coat and britches are velvet, his belted silk
vest and hat trimmed with gold lace. If his
silk-stockinged legs are rather thin and
shapeless, having been painted in accordance
with Seeman’s standard formula, his expres-
sion is exceptionally jaunty and agreeable.
Another portrait by Seeman shows John,
Lord Harvey, son and heir of the first Earl of
Bristol (private collection) in the same pose
and a similar costume.1

Bartholomew Dandridge

Baptized London, December 17, 1691; died in
or after 1754

Very little is known about Bartholomew
Dandridge, who was among the oldest
of fourteen children of the house painter
John Dandridge. Bartholomew entered
Sir Godfrey Kneller’s painting academy in
1712 and in or shortly after 1720 attended
the St. Martin’s Lane Academy, which had
been newly established by John Vanderbank
and Louis Chérion. Living in Westminster
in 1725, Dandridge later moved to Lincoln’s
Inn Fields and, by 1731, to the house and
studio that had belonged to Kneller. He
became a prominent portraitist, in 1732
painting Frederick, Prince of Wales, eldest
son of King George II and Queen Caroline
(Saddlers’ Company, London), but he is now
chiefly known for his conversation pieces.
According to George Vertue, Dandridge
used lay figures to work out the arrange-
ment of his figure groups. He provided cos-
tume studies, engraved by Louis Philippe
Boitard, for François Nivelon’s Rudiments
of Genteel Behaviour, published in 1737. His
work was influenced by the French Rococo
style, to which he was undoubtedly exposed
through the medium of prints.
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(bap. 1691, d. in or after 1754).” In Oxford Dictionary
Note Book A.1. (Add. MS. 23,076).” Walpole Soci-
ey 22 (1933–34), pp. 39, 57 (entries of 1725 and 1732).

Fig. 32. Enoch Seeman the Younger,
Sir James Dashwood (no. 17), detail of
the house, Kirtlington Park
18. Uvedale Tomkyns Price and Members of His Family

Oil on canvas, 40 1/4 x 62 1/2 in. (102.2 x 158.8 cm)
Inscribed (in ink, on one of two more or less identical handwritten labels of early date on the stretcher): Family . . . / Uvedale Price Esq* of Foxley Herefordshire & Geetar [De]nbigshire, assisting his / Cousin Miss Rodd from a Boat—his eldest Son Rob leading another Cousin Miss / Greuille—her Siste[...] Hester feeding Swans—the[r] Brother called Jockey Greville / fondling a greyhound—other Relatives and Attendants around—/ d . . . d by Mr. Robinson . . . / G . . . ner and Mrs. Horner to . . . by Hogarth
Rogers Fund, 1920 (20.40)

Ex coll.: Uvedale Tomkyns Price (until d. 1764); Sir Uvedale Tomkyns Price, 1st Baronet (1764–d. 1829); Sir Robert Price (from 1829); by descent to Thomas Price, The Albany, London (until d. 1893; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, May 6, 1893, no. 49, as The Price Family by Hogarth, for £315 to McLean); [Scott & Fowles, New York]; Catholina Lambert, Paterson, New Jersey (until 1916; his sale, American Art Galleries, New York, February 24, 1916, no. 347, for $3,700 to W. W. Seaman); [Agnew, London, 1919–20; sold through J. P. Morgan to MMA]

Selected exhibition: Detroit Institute of Arts, “English Conversation Pieces of the Eighteenth Century,” January 27–February 29, 1948, no. 2


Lables on the stretcher identify the bewigged gentleman as Uvedale Tomkyns Price, who was born in 1685, the second son of Judge Robert Price and his wife, Lucy Rodd, of Foxley in Herefordshire. Uvedale Price, a member of Parliament from 1713, married Anne, daughter of Lord Arthur Somerset, and their son, who was also called Robert, was born in 1717. Furthermore, as described on the reverse, a Miss Rodd, who must be a relative on Mrs. Price’s side, steps from a boat, while Robert Price escorts another cousin, Miss Greville, whose sister Hester feeds the swans and whose brother, “Jockey” Greville, is seated at the far left. Anne Price and her two sisters, the oldest of whom was Mary, were their father’s co-heirs. Mary Somerset married Algernon Goreville and had three children, Mary, Hester, and Fulke Greville, all of whom are pictured here. The three unidentified ladies seem to be portraits, while five other figures, including a boatman, as well as a black boy and an older man who must be servants, seem to have been imagined.
Fig. 33. Louis Philippe Boitard, after Dandridge, plate from François Nivelon, *The Rudiments of Gentle Behaviour* ([London], 1737). Engraving and etching, 8⅛ × 5⅛ in. (21.1 × 14.2 cm). The British Museum, London (1883,1209,760)

The Prices were a distinguished and well-connected Welsh family with estates at Foxley and at Giler in North Wales. Dandridge had painted Robert Price at half length in an oval at a slightly earlier date, and years later both Uvedale and Robert sat for Thomas Gainsborough. (From 1740 until his death in 1764, Uvedale Price lived by preference in Bath, and it was there that he and his son became Gainsborough’s personal friends.) Robert’s son, also Sir Uvedale Price, was a well-known writer on the picturesque.

Since its acquisition in 1920, this rather stilted conversation piece has been the object of limited scholarly attention. Accepted as a Hogarth, the canvas was first ascribed to Dandridge by Hermann Williams, writing in 1937 to C. H. Collins Baker, who published it the following year. The attribution is not in doubt, and the picture, which is not worthy of Hogarth, has been identified by Collins Baker as, and may well be, Dandridge’s earliest known conversation piece, but the date cannot be firmly established without additional biographical information about the sitters. Robert Price, born in 1717, is perhaps no less than twelve or thirteen, but his head is disproportionately large and his age is difficult to judge. On the basis of comparison with the costume studies by Dandridge that Boitard engraved for publication in 1737 (fig. 33), the picture may date to the early 1730s. The painting shares with the prints a finicky, detailed handling of the elaborate wigs and garments. Vertue says, and the awkward arrangement here bears him out, that Dandridge used lay figures to devise his compositions. The location is surely nameless, the highly artificial flight of stairs, the projecting bank, and the filmy trees having been staged by the painter. The soft pastel colors are unusual for the time, and rather French, as are the male figure in the boat and the ill-defined landscape. The various elements do not cohere in this historically rather interesting work, which is rarely exhibited. Portraits of Elizabeth (fig. 34) and Anne Scarborough (fig. 35) at Temple Newsam, one of which is signed, probably show Dandridge’s style for single figures at the same time or a little earlier. Dandridge did not complete this canvas. Some, but not all, of the heads, hands, and costumes are brought to a high degree of finish. The landscape background is indicated only slightly, and there is a major pentiment beneath the figures of Robert Price and his cousin.

1. Family portraits by Kneller, Gainsborough, Lawrence, and others were dispersed at the 1893 Thomas Price sale.

2. Susan Sloman, *Gainsborough in Bath* (New Haven, 2002), p. 150, identified the figure as Mrs. Price, but this entry follows the information provided by the old label on the reverse, which is unfortunately too damaged to reproduce.

3. Mrs. Price and Mrs. Grevelle almost certainly are not shown: they would have played prominent roles and would have been named.

4. While no Dandridge portraits of Robert were in the 1893 sale, two were later sold at Christie’s, London: November 21, 1930, no. 38, Master Robert Price in a blue coat with a white vest, and white stock, a painted oval, signed, 29 × 23½ in.; and December 18, 1933, no. 137, Master Robert Price in a blue coat with a yellow vest, a painted oval, signed, 29 × 24 in. The differences are so slight that the pictures could be one and the same. The work sold in 1930 is reproduced by C. H. Collins Baker, “The Price Family by Bartholomew Dandridge,” *Burlington Magazine* 72 (March 1938), pl. 14. Another portrait of Price, the same size but a little later, is in a private collection in New York.

5. Gainsborough painted Uvedale Price, his wife, Anne, and their son Robert; the portraits were sold for £352.5.0, £36.15.0, and £261.10.0, respectively. The portrait of Price Senior is in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich, while that of the younger Price was sold at Sotheby’s, New York, January 18, 1949, no. 456. Both are reproduced by Sloman, *Gainsborough in Bath*, figs. 33, 131, and see also fig. 136.

6. Williams, in a letter, 1957, to which Collins Baker replied later that year.

7. The date is based on the approximate life dates of the sitters and those of Elizabeth Scarborough’s husband, Charles Ingram (1696–1748).
William Hogarth probably had only limited formal education. He was the son of a schoolmaster and Latinist frustrated in his publishing ambitions, who spent a term in the Fleet Prison for debt and died in 1718. Hogarth was apprenticed to a silversmith in 1714, and in April 1720, the date of his first shop card, he set up as an independent engraver. He also enrolled at the St. Martin’s Lane Academy and, perhaps in 1725, entered the drawing school of the distinguished painter-decorator Sir James Thornhill at Covent Garden. By the late 1720s Hogarth was an accomplished engraver of satirical prints. Probably in 1728 he painted the first version of The Beggar’s Opera (this may be the painting in the Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery). In 1730, the date of The Wollaston Family (private collection), George Vertue acknowledged him as the leading specialist in the new field of conversations, the much sought after group portraits of family members or friends in contemporary dress, engaged in some form of activity or entertainment, inside or outside of doors. This was soon after his elopement and marriage, on March 23, 1729, to Jane Thornhill, the daughter of Sir James.

Shortly thereafter, the couple moved to Leicester Fields and Hogarth began to paint works in series, narratives based on contemporary life that he called modern moral subjects. The first of these, collectively titled A Harlot’s Progress, were destroyed, but the compositions survive in the form of his engravings, released in 1732 and an instantaneous success. He then took up A Rake’s Progress (Sir John Soane’s Museum, London), eight paintings of which the engravings were published in 1735, and meanwhile was awarded the commission for the main walls paintings for St. Bartholomew’s Hospital.

He had become a distinguished portraitist by 1740, when he painted the wonderfully vivid Captain Coram (Thomas Coram Foundation for Children, London). Hogarth gradually achieved the role to which he aspired: leading painter of a new national school that ranked comedy with tragedy, taking contemporary life for its principal subject. However, by 1753, when he published The Analysis of Beauty, satire as a literary and art form had begun to fall from favor. When he was appointed sergeant painter to George II in 1757, his work already represented the taste of an earlier time.
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19. The Wedding of Stephen Beckingham and Mary Cox

Oil on canvas, 50½ x 40½ in. (128.3 x 102.9 cm)
Signed, dated, and inscribed: (lower left)
Nuptia:S:C:Beckingham:Art / June:9:th 1729:
W:Th:Hogarth:pinx:it: (on minister’s book) of
Matrimony
Marquand Fund, 1916 (66.117)

Ex coll.: Stephen Beckingham, London and Bourne Place, Bishopbourne, Kent (until d. 1756);2 Stephen Beckingham, Bourne Place, London, and Ivy House, Hampton Court (1756–d. 1813; inv. n.d. [before 1768], as My Father’s Wedding—Hogarth pinxit); by family descent to Herbert William Deedes, Sandling Park and Saltwood Castle, near Hythe, Kent (1891—at least 1906; sold to Carstairs); [James Carstairs, London, by 1930–33]; [Knoedler, New York, 1933–36; sold to MMA]


Hogarth, when newly married, “commenced [as a] painter of small conversation pieces.” The artist made the point that this genre, “having novelty, succeeded for a few years. But though it gave somewhat more scope for the fancy, it was still but a less kind of drudgery; and as I could not bring myself to act like some of my brethren, and make it a sort of manufacture to be carried on by the help of backgrounds and drapery painters, it was not sufficiently profitable to pay the expenses my family required.”93 These workmanlike comments addressed practical realities. Conversation pieces, while a novelty, were necessarily commissioned, and the artist could not paint exactly what he wished. This may in part explain the unremitting sobriety of the present figure group. While weddings were not public occasions in the eighteenth century, and there was little precedent for depicting them, it seems clear that whoever commissioned the picture required the utmost solemnity of the painter.
As the contemporary inscription states (fig. 36), the canvas illustrates the marriage, on June 9, 1729, of Stephen Beckingham. It is among the earliest of the artist’s conversation pieces to have survived.

According to the register of the parish church of St. Benet, Paul’s Wharf, which is located between St. Paul’s Cathedral and the Thames in a neighborhood well known to Hogarth, Beckingham was married there to Mary Cox of Kidderminster, Worcester. The rector of St. Benet’s was Thomas Cooke, who may have presided. The gentleman in dark green may be the bride’s father, Joseph Cox, a widower, while the groom’s father, Ralph Beckingham, may stand beside the officiant. Or perhaps the identifications should be reversed, and the two people at the left are the Beckinghams, while the heavy-set man to the right is Mr. Cox, which seems more likely. Although the ceremony took place at St. Benet’s, the interior shown here is a modified diagonal view of one side of the apse of James Gibbs’s new church of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, consecrated in 1726 and located on what is now Trafalgar Square. The representation is in general accurate, even to the plaque on the side wall of the apse, but the barrel-vaulted transept does not exist and the pilasters are flat, not fluted.

The Beckinghams were from Wiltshire and later established in Essex. Generations of the family belonged to the legal profession and had been associated with London’s Inns of Court. The groom’s father was a barrister of Gray’s Inn, while Stephen had been
admitted a barrister to Lincoln’s Inn on January 8, 1773; his son, of the same name, would be admitted to Lincoln’s Inn in 1748. Stephen, the sitter here, eventually removed to Bourne Place, Kent, which came into his family through his second wife, Mary Catherine Corbett. Later a justice of the peace, he died at Bourne Place on October 5, 1756. The plaque recording his burial on the following day is still in situ (fig. 37). Joseph Cox, born in 1677, belonged to a family of equivalent professional and social standing. For forty years an attorney at Kidderminster, he also had an interest in iron foundries in the Stour Valley. He was widowed in 1727, and Mary Cox seems to have been his only child and sole heir, as he left her considerable property. Joseph Cox died in 1737 at Kidderminster; on October 4 of the following year, his daughter also died there, prematurely.

The picture, entirely unknown until exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1894, was described at the time more or less aptly, if rather dismissively, in the Athenaeum:

The general design, a mixture of humour and quaintness, is decidedly Hogarthian, and especially so is the group of chubby Cupids floating in the air above the heads of the happy pair, and emptying over them the very substantial contents of a huge cornucopia; quite Hogarthian too are the prim proprieties of some of the lookers-on, and the painter’s tendency to exaggerate the characteristic features of his sitters. On the other hand, Hogarth, who was mostly loyal to the laws of perspective, was napping when he drew so ill the altar-rails, a sort of pen in which the officiating parson—the type of an eighteenth century vicar—stands. The execution of this interesting picture is very slight and unequal, and the too monotonous brown of the architecture indicates that the artist never saw the church he depicted.

The groom holds the bride’s hand in one of his own and the ring in the other, while the minister reads from a service book inscribed “of Matrimony.” The faces of the couple and most of their attendants are expressionless. The young ladies in the foreground do not attend to the ceremony. The principal figures are arranged in an uninteresting flattened arc, each (with the exception of the parent behind the groom) is standing up straight, all are more or less equally visible, and most of the faces are in three-quarter view. The coloring of the costumes is delicate, but the principal figures are doll-like and without volition. Although the recently married Hogarth might have been expected to take a particular interest in the subject, it clearly gave him difficulties. Perhaps his brief from whoever commissioned the work was too narrowly circumscribed.

The penetrating observation and the satirical strain that characterize Hogarth’s work as a printmaker are visible in the fat face and heavy body of the clergyman with his academic hood and, to a lesser extent, in the impassive gentleman with both hands propped on his walking stick. These two, and the head of the attendant (possibly a servant of the painter), are sharply characterized. The inquisitive figures on the balcony play no narrative role but are well integrated into the background. Above the couple is the symbol of fruitfulness, a cornucopia spilling flowers and fruit, supported by cupids that resemble the ones on the artist’s trade card and are here shown gamboling about amid a bank of clouds.

Since Hogarth’s new wife was the daughter of the prominent painter and decorator Sir James Thornhill, Elizabeth Einberg has suggested that the church interior that serves as the background should perhaps be ascribed to someone practiced in painting architecture, such as an assistant in Thornhill’s studio. However, while some of the portraits are more fully worked up than the background, they are smoothly integrated technically, and there is no indication in the X-radiograph (fig. 38) of a difference in handling or, visually, of any sort of join or conspicuous contour marking the conjunction of the work of two different hands. Einberg also observed that the principal and secondary figures are lit from different angles, and this is so, but might simply indicate that the figures were painted in studio light by an artist not yet fully experienced as a portraitist. In the foreground, at the lower left, Hogarth introduced and then scraped out a figure arranging hassocks. He also painted out a second red velvet cushion on the top step and added an elaborate Turkey carpet to fill up the space at the front and to the right. Certainly the carpet has no other purpose and neither do the various objects—a small stool or desk, a roll of material of some sort, and an iron fence—in the left-hand corner. Despite the changes, the painting is well preserved and almost entirely free of restoration.

A comparably disjointed conversazione by Hogarth (Paulson uses the word “primitive”) from the same moment is Woods Rogers and His Family (fig. 39). The small canvas was painted before May 10, 1729, when Rogers departed to take up the governorship of the Bahamas, to which the letters patent held by an adjutant allude. The figures, awkwardly aligned with voids between them, are also not integrated with the background. In both cases the artist seems to have been seeking a style that was more French, more genteel, and outside the range of his experience.

1. “Art” is intended to be read as “armiger,” or entitled to heraldic arms.
2. Information on the Beckingham family and the history of ownership was provided in 1937 by a descendant, Sir Charles Fortescue-Brickdale. The bride had been confused with Beckingham’s second wife, Mary Catherine Corbett, whom he married at Bishospourne in 1739. The younger Stephen Beckingham was born in 1739 and entered Westminister School in 1744. He was Mary Cox’s only child, whereas his stepmother had three children but no grandchildren. The relevant plaque at the local church (fig. 37) reads: “To the Memory of / Stephen Beckingham Esq. / of Bourne Place. / Interred in Bourne Vault / October 10th 1756. / Yr. Wife Mary Cox / died 4th Oct. 1758.” I would like to thank Gerald Crease, who in 2008 supplied photographs of the various family plaques.
4. Little new information has emerged since the publication of Williams’s article in the 1937 Bulletin, upon which this entry largely depends.
6. This proposal was first put forward verbally, on a visit to the Museum in 1983.
20. **Portrait of a Man**

Oil on canvas, 47 3/4 x 37 in. (121.3 x 94 cm)
Gift of Francis Neilson, 1946 (46.60)

**Ex coll.:** [Agnan, London]; [Scott & Fowles, New York, until 1929]; Francis Neilson, Chicago (1929–46, as George Frederick Handel by Thomas Hudson)

The painting, which the Museum received as a portrait of the composer George Frederick Handel by Thomas Hudson, is unpublished. The attribution to Hudson has been rejected by John Kerslake in 1959, by Oliver Millar in 1964, and by Jacob Simon in 1979. Kerslake and Simon also agreed that the sitter is not Handel, and Simon recently reaffirmed his opinion. Elizabeth Einberg suggested in 2007 that the artist could be John Theodore Heins, called Dirck Heins, whose work is represented at the Norwich Castle Museum and Art Gallery. However, for Andrew Moore, Senior Curator
at Norwich, this represents only a slight possibility. The portrait remains unattributed. For the approximate date, compare a costume plate by Louis Philippe Boitard after Bartholomew Dandridge, published in 1737 (fig. 33). Essentially, the painting is in good state, but wear and fading of the red lake glaze give the coat a mottled appearance. Discolored retouching is visible in the background.


2. Simon, in a letter, 2008. Handel's name had been retained because of the view, expressed in 1991, of Laurence Libin, then Curator of Musical Instruments.


Samuel Scott

Born London, ca. 1702; died Bath, October 12, 1772

Other than the fact that his father seems to have been a barber-surgeon, nothing is known of Samuel Scott's family or early life. He married in 1723, at St. Mary's Church, Newington Butts, London, and in 1724 his wife, Ann, had a daughter, Ann Sophia, who was christened at St. Paul's, Covent Garden. His first sea piece was sold at auction in 1725. Two years later, Scott was appointed comptant (comptroller) in the Stamp Duty Office, Lincoln's Inn Square. The fact that he was attached to that office for twenty-eight years suggests that the position may have been a sinecure. His earliest recorded commission was in 1732, when he added the ships to the views of East India Company forts and settlements that George Lambert painted for company headquarters in Leadenhall Street. In the 1730s Scott's work comprised principally sea pieces and battles in a style reminiscent of Willem van de Velde the Younger, while in the course of the 1740s he turned to views along the Thames: Old London Bridge, the Tower of London, and, in Westminster, the new bridge, Montagu House, and York Buildings Water Tower.

Scott became a governor of the Foundling Hospital in 1746. He lived in Tavistock Row until 1747, when he moved to Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, and finally, in 1755, to Twickenham, where he painted views of Alexander Pope's villa. In 1766, 1764, and 1765 he exhibited at the Society of Artists; in 1771 he showed at the Royal Academy. Scott moved to Ludlow, Shropshire, where he was cared for by his married daughter from 1765 until her death in 1769. He then retired to Bath and died there after a long illness, reportedly at the age of seventy.
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21. The Building of Westminster Bridge

Oil on canvas, 24 × 44 7/8 in. (61 × 113.7 cm)

Signed (lower right): S. Scott

Purchase, Charles B. Curtis Fund and Joseph Pulitzer Bequest, 1944 (44.56)

Ex coll.: ?William John Kerr, 5th Marquess of Lothian (until d. 1853); Field Marshal Sir Maynard William Gomm (until d. 1853); Gomm collection (1875–1914; sale, Christie's, London, March 6, 1914, no. 26, for £346.10.0 to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1914–15; sold to Morgan; J. P. Morgan, New York (1915–d. 1943; his estate, 1943–44; sold through Knoedler to MMA)


Scott recorded in minute detail the building of Charles Labelye’s Westminster Bridge (1739–50), one of the most important engineering enterprises of the Georgian era. The great bridge was constructed from the center outward: by the time Scott made the watercolor (fig. 40) that he kept in the studio and used for the background of the present picture, the first two arches were turned, the timber center for the arch to the east was finished, and that to the west was in hand. The bridge project is comprehensively documented, and Scott’s study, which consists of joined sheets from a sketchbook, can be assigned securely to the late spring or early summer of 1742 because the completion certificate for the fourth center is dated June 30 of that year. The pile-driving machine, which emits clouds of smoke, is located beside the next pier to the east. The tower at the west side of the facade of Westminster Abbey, which was under construction and would be finished in 1742, is not visible in the sheet. Curiously, the nave of the abbey is incorrectly angled with respect to the crossing and the east tower is incorrectly angled.
with respect to the nave, topographical anomalies that were carried over to the finished picture.

While the barge at the center must be that used by the lord mayor of London, the picture does not show his annual visit to Westminster Hall on October 29 to be sworn in. Here a less formal occasion is depicted, probably a trial run, which was called for because the currents on the approach to the landing stage were treacherous. The arms on the sternpost of the barge are those of the Ironmongers' Company and may refer to the tenure of Robert Godschall of their guild, who was the lord mayor until his death in June 1742. The second of the two versions that show the Ironmongers' barge (fig. 41) was painted for Sir Robert Littleton in 1749.
and must therefore refer to the rehearsal for the procession of Lord Mayor Sir Samuel Pennant. This being the case, the landscape in the second version is seven years out-of-date with respect to both the abbey and the bridge. Our painting of Westminster Bridge was separated in 1914 from its pendant, a view of Old London Bridge (fig. 42), signed and dated 1747. The Littleton version is paired with a 1749 Old London Bridge (fig. 43) that is more or less identical.1 The later pictures are significantly larger.

1. See Kingzett 1982, p. 56, who presumes that the picture descended from the fifth Marquess of Lothian to his granddaughter, Elizabeth Anne Kerr, who married Maynard Gomm in 1930. The couple had no children.
4. There are probably as many as a dozen versions of Old London Bridge, Scott’s most popular subject, for which see Deuchar 1996, p. 185. Walker, Old Westminster Bridge, p. 231, and Kingzett 1982, pp. 56–58, recorded six of that subject, but there are more. Other versions are dated 1749 and 1750.

James Seymour

Probably born London, ca. 1702; died Southwark (London), June 30, 1752

The artist, an only son, was named for his father. James Seymour Senior, according to his 1739 obituary, was a prominent Fleet Street banker. Keenly interested in horses and race meetings, he was also an able amateur draftsman, a collector, and a connoisseur. The younger Seymour, of whose life practically nothing is known, apparently grew up constantly observing, drawing, and painting horses. In 1720 he enrolled in the academy established that year in St. Martin’s Lane by Louis Chéron and John Vanderbank for what seems to have been his only formal training. George Vertue gives a poor account of the artist he called Jimmy Seymour, stating that he was extravagant and loose-living, interested principally in gaming, women, and horse racing. Seymour did not have George Stubbs’s understanding of anatomy, but he observed and described animals with a lively sympathy in his extensive and workmanlike oeuvre. Among his principal paintings are A Kill at Ashdown Park of 1743 (Tate, London) and The Chaise Match Run on Newmarket Heath on Wednesday 29th of August 1750 (private collection). Numerous prints after his works were published in the 1740s and early 1750s.

Selected References

22. Portrait of a Horseman

Oil on canvas, 37 × 41⅛ in. (94 × 103.1 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): J.S./1748.
Gift of the children of the late Otto H. and Addie W. Kahn (Lady Maud E. Marriott, Mrs. Margaret D. Ryan, Roger W. Kahn, and Gilbert W. Kahn), 1956 (56.54.1)

Ex coll.: Mr. and Mrs. Otto H. Kahn, New York (by 1937—he d. 1934, as by William Hogarth and John Sartorius); Mrs. Otto H. (Addie W.) Kahn, New York (1934—d. 1949; her estate, 1949—56, as Portrait of a Horseman)


Fig. 44. James Seymour, Sir Roger Buzgeyn Riding “Badger,” 1740. Oil on canvas, 48⅞ × 69 in. (124.1 × 175.3 cm). Yale Center for British Art, New Haven, Paul Mellon Collection (2007.35.756)
When the painting came to the Museum, the figure was attributed to William Hogarth, and the horse, owing in part to the presence of the monogram, to John Sartorius.1 There the matter stood until 1977, when John Brealey suggested writing to Judy Egerton, who responded that it is a good example of the work of James Seymour, and similar to two others then in Paul Mellon’s private collection, one of which, representing Sir Roger Burgrove, is illustrated here (fig. 44).2 The comparison with the Mellon paintings leaves no room for argument. John Harris later identified the main building shown in the background as St. George’s Hospital, London, as it appeared after the remodeling by Isaac Ware in 1733.3 The view, therefore, was taken from a fairly distant point in Hyde Park Gardens, and, as Harris also pointed out, includes Chelsea Hospital to the right. The handling is typically sharp, neat, and legible, while the portraits of the horse and dog are superior to the rather wooden, expressionless portrait of the rider, whose head is large for his stiffly erect body. Several old tears in the green areas of the background do not impinge on either the figure or the animals.

Charles Philips
Baptized London, May 8, 1703; died London, between October 20 and November 23, 1747

Charles Philips probably trained with his father, a minor artist. The two earliest group portraits by Philips the younger that are presently known are dated 1730: *Thomas Hill of Tern with His Family* (Arthingham Park, Shropshire) and *Tea Party at Lord Harrington’s House, St. James’s* (Yale Center for British Art, New Haven). Evidently influenced by Hogarth, he had by 1731 attracted the interest of “People of fashion—even some of ye Royal Family,” according to George Vertue. The small conversation piece was just coming into favor at the time, and Philips had a number of distinguished patrons who evidently responded to his straightforward, highly descriptive, and increasingly elaborate style. He eventually moved on to portraiture in large, and the Prince and Princess of Wales sat for him in 1737 (the former portrait is in the Royal Collection, the latter in a private collection). As Philips’s last dated work is from 1740, his career seems to have spanned a single busy decade. He died prematurely seven years later.

Selected References


23. The Strong Family

Oil on canvas, 29 7/8 × 37 in. (75.4 × 94 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): CPhilips [initials in ligature] pinnat 1732
Inscribed (on frame): MRS.STRONG Sir GEORGE NARES LADY NARES LADY WHEELER MR. EDWARD STRONG / BUILDER OF ST. PAUL’S LADY STRANGE
Gift of Robert Lehman, 1944 (44.159)

Ex coll.: by descent to Vice Admiral John Dodd Nares, R.N. (until 1750); sale, Christie’s, London, June 30, 1950, no. 38, as “The Churchill Family . . . with portraits of Mr. Strong, Sir George and Lady Nares, Lady Wheeler, Mr. Edward Strong, builder of St. Paul’s, and Lady Strange, for £250 to Ehrich; [Ehrich Galleries, New York, 1930–31; their sale, American Art Association—Anderson Galleries, New York, November 20, 1931, no. 66, for $500 to Weil]; M. S. Weil (from 1931); [sale, American Art Association—Anderson Galleries, New York, December 14, 1933, no. 56, for $510 to Ehrich]; [Ehrich Galleries, New York, from 1933]; [Averell House, New York, until 1934; sale, American Art Association—Anderson Galleries, New York, May 17, 1934, no. 71, for $220 to Ehrich—Newhouse for Lehman]; Robert Lehman, New York (1934–44)

Selected Exhibition: Minneapolis Institute of Arts, “English Paintings of the Eighteenth Century,” November 8–December 1, 1930, no. 23 (tent by the Ehrich Galleries)

Selected Reference: Belsey 1996

Edward Strong of Greenwich succeeded his uncle, Thomas, and his father, also Edward, as a master mason at St. Paul’s. The cathedral was built between 1675, when Thomas laid the first stone, and 1708, when Edward Senior laid the last. Born in 1676, the younger Edward accompanied Sir Christopher Wren’s twenty-three-year-old son to the Continent in 1681.5 His daughter Susan, or Susanna, married Sir John Strange. Their daughter Lucy, born in 1731, married in 1762 the Reverend Sir Charles Wheler, seventh Baronet, prebendary (honorary canon) of York Cathedral. Her sister, Mary, born in 1726, married in 1751 Sir George Nares, an attorney, and the painting descended in the Nares family until 1930. The names on what is evidently a later frame are at once helpful and a source of confusion. The boy at the left cannot be Sir George Nares, who was
sixteen in 1732, nor can he be the Stranges’ younger son, John, born in 1732, who much later was British Resident in Venice and an important collector.

If the identifications on the frame are in great part correct, then Mrs. Strong is probably flanked by three or four of her Strange grandchildren (including Mary and Lucy) while Mr. Strong, clearly the central figure, in black, stands behind his daughter Susan, Lady Strange, the children’s mother. The Strange family would have been a good connection, and Lady Strange, larger in scale than the others, wears an elaborately embroidered apron that further sets her apart. Most of the adults play cards while Mr. Strong drinks tea. The cups and saucers, sugar bowl, and tongs are nearly arranged on the tea
table in front of his wife. The interior space is ruthlessly centralized and symmetrical but for the presence of a curtained window on one side and a door opposite. The cast shadows are not caused by light entering through the window; although the faces are little differentiated, each one is brightly lit. The wainscoting, patterned panels, and carpet are typical for Philips. Tables for tea, cards, and gaming are also commonly met with, as the appurtenances of grander or wealthier people (fig. 45) being simply more elaborate.

1. I have used Adrian Tinniswood, *His Invention So Fertile: A Life of Christopher Wren* (London, 2002), pp. 311, 337. Very recently, in 2009, additional information about those represented has been provided by a descendant, Oliver Nares, and I thank him for his help. The name of the seller in 1930 was provided in the first instance by Lady Dorothy Lygon of Christie’s. The title of the picture was changed from *The Churchill Family to The Strong Family* in 1945. Nares points out that there is a connection: Sir George’s son, Dr. Edward Nares, married in 1977 Lady Charlotte Spencer Churchill, daughter of the fourth Duke of Marlborough.

**Thomas Frye**

*Irish, born in or near Dublin, ca. 1711 or 1712; died London, April 2, 1762*

Frye may have been born in Edenderry, some forty miles west of Dublin in County Offaly. His precise date of birth has not been discovered, nor is anything known of his life in Ireland. His earliest signed and dated work is a pastel from 1734 (private collection), one year before the first of his five children was born. By 1736 Frye was in London and had received an order from the Saddlers’ Company for a portrait of Frederick, Prince of Wales (destroyed in 1940), a version of which is in the Royal Collection. The award of this prestigious commission indicates that he must have been well established in the capital. There are important dated works from 1739 and 1740, and in 1741 he made a mezzotint of his portrait of the Prince of Wales. In 1744 Frye and Edward Heylyn took out a patent for a new method of making china, and Frye became the manager of the porcelain manufactory that was established in the London parish of Bow. He continued to paint portraits while preparing designs for porcelain, but gave up the porcelain business in 1759, as it had proved damaging to his health.

Frye was also a miniaturist and an excellent printmaker. In 1760, with the assistance of William Pether, he prepared a series of Twelve Mezzotinto Prints, from Designs in the Manner of Piazzetta, Drawn from Nature and as Large as Life, and the next year a set of Six Ladies, in Picturesque Attitudes, and in Different Dresses of the Present Mode. He died of consumption.

**Selected References**


**ATRIBUTED TO THOMAS FRYE**

24. **Girl Building a House of Cards**

Oil on canvas, 30/8 x 25 3/8 in. (76.5 x 64.4 cm)

Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1890 (91.26.1)

Ex coll.: J. H. Ward, London, until 1886, as Miss Rich Building a House of Cards by Hogarth; sold to Marquand]; Henry G. Marquand, New York (1889–90)

In 1890 this canvas, attributed to William Hogarth, was among the first English pictures to enter the Metropolitan Museum’s collection. It was the gift of Henry Gurdon Marquand, banker and patron of the arts, who had become the second president of the Museum’s board of trustees in 1889 and whose gifts considerably improved the quality of the Museum’s holdings of old masters. Although never published, the painting has been ascribed over the years by Roger Fry to Henry Robert Morland; by W. G. Constable to Joseph Highmore; and by Harry B. Wehle to George Knaptton, a provisional attribution that was long retained.1 Ellis Waterhouse, in

---

Fig. 46. Thomas Frye, *Mrs. Wardle*, 1742. Oil on canvas, 49 3/4 x 40 in. (125 x 101.5 cm). Yale Center for British Art, New Haven, Paul Mellon Fund (81984.19.2)
1968, mentioned George Beare, and Elizabeth Einberg, in 1985, tentatively proposed the young Richard Wilson, a suggestion that was later rejected by David Solkin.²

Thomas Frye is not an artist well known to many, and it is owing to Einberg that this new attribution is advanced.³ She pointed out that the model or sitter here exhibits two Morellian details typical of Frye's style, "the intense stare of the slightly over-large eyes (he tends to emphasize the lower eyelid), and muscular, well-articulated hands with a strong straight thumb, most unusual in a child portrait." She drew attention to two comparable portraits (figs. 46, 47), while observing that differences in the handling of costume suggest that Frye used drapery painters for major works. The present canvas seems to be entirely by one artist. The handling of the child's fine, wispy hair is apparently quite typical for Frye.⁴ A pastel by him that exhibits similar traits (fig. 48) is dated 1746.

1. Frye's proposal must date to 1907 or 1908, while Constable's opinion was given verbally in 1931 and Wehle's change of attribution was made in 1935, according to the catalogue cards of the Department of European Paintings.
2. Waterhouse, verbally in 1968, thought of Charles (but evidently intended George) Beare. Einberg, verbally in 1985, noted that the painting exhibits a lack of interest in detail but a firm understanding of structure, proposing that it might be an early Wilson. Solkin, in a letter of 2005, remarked upon its "Frenchified character" and suggested the influence of Chardin through the medium of prints.
3. Einberg, in a letter of 2007, rejected Waterhouse's attribution to George Beare because the artist was unable to paint hands. She proposed Frye.
4. See, in addition to the portrait of Mrs. Wardle (fig. 46), that of Mrs. Benjamin Day, which is reproduced in Wynne 1972, fig. 22.

Richard Wilson

*Welsh, born Penegoes, Montgomeryshire, August 1, 1712 or 1713; died near Llanferres, Denbighshire, May 11, 1782*

Wilson, who belonged to an established, well-connected Welsh family, was schooled in the classics by his father until that gentleman's death in 1728. The following year, he went to London, where he was apprenticed to a portraitist, Thomas Wright, for six years. In 1737 a landscape and a cityscape by Wilson were sold at public auction, and in 1738 he was paid for a portrait, the earliest independent work by him for which there is documentary evidence. Wilson painted roundels showing the Foundling Hospital and St. George's Hospital (Thomas Coram Foundation for Children, London) in 1746, but he was still working principally as a portraitist. In 1748–49 the Princes George and Edward Augustus, eldest sons of Frederick, Prince of Wales, sat for him with their tutor, the Reverend Francis Ayshcough (versions belonging to the National Portrait Gallery, London, and Yale Center for British Art, New Haven).

Wilson departed for Italy the following year. He was in Venice in July 1751 and some months later traveled with William Lock of Norbury to Rome, settling there to paint landscapes for English Grand Tourists. He was influenced by contemporary Venetian styles and by the example of earlier artists, principally Claude Lorrain and Gaspard Dughet. Wilson painted views of the city (Yale Center for British Art and Tate, London) for William Legge, second Earl of Dartmouth, in 1753–54, and in 1754 began work on sixty-eight landscape drawings of Italy for the same patron. Having left Rome in August 1756, he is first recorded in London on November 5, 1757. Soon a successful and important painter, he became a director of the Society of Artists in 1765 and a founding member of the Royal Academy in 1768. Wilson specialized in Italian views and classical narrative subjects, repeating the most popular of them many times; he also favored country house views and his native Welsh landscape, including Snowdon, Cader Idris, and Caernarvon Castle. After 1771, partly owing to drink, his career collapsed, and he died indigent.
25. Lake Nemi and Genzano from the Terrace of the
Capuchin Monastery

Oil on canvas, 16 7/8 x 21 1/4 in. (42.9 x 53.7 cm)
Stamped (red wax seal, square imprint, on stretcher bar): MFord
Gift of George A. Hearn, 1905 (05.32.3)

EX COLL.: William Lock, II Norbury Park, near Leatherhead, Surrey; William Parsons; Benjamin Booth, London (by 1790–d. 1807; inv., n.d., no. 25, as Lake Jensano from a Convent Garden / a finish Picture—was Mr. Locke’s 21–17); Reverend Richard Sawley Booth (d. 1807); his sister, Marianne, Lady Ford, London (by 1814–d. 1849); ?Richard Ford (1849–at least 1851); ?Hon. G. A. F. Cavendish-Bentinck (until d. 1891; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, July 15, 1891, no. 537, as An Italian Lake Scene, with figures on a terrace, and buildings on a rock in the background. 17 in. by 20½ in., for £310.0 to Lesser); [Lesser Lesser, London, from 1891]; George A. Hearn, New York (until 1905)

Wilson's subject is the terrace of the Capuchin monastery at Genzano, with Lake Nemi below and Monte Circeo and the Mediterranean Sea in the distance to the west. On a rocky promontory at center right is the little hill town with its two monuments, the church and bell tower of Santa Maria della Cima and the Palazzo Sforza Cesarini, which had been constructed on the medieval fortifications and greatly enlarged during the eighteenth century. The buildings lie along the ridges and sloping wall of the volcanic crater, in the Alban Hills along the Via Appia, less than twenty miles southwest of Rome. Deep and very dark in color, the lake had been called by the ancient Romans the specchio di Diana, the mirror of Diana, goddess of the hunt, who was thought to have been a denizen of the surrounding woods. Embracing both classicism and naturalism while he lived in Rome, Wilson developed a grand, lyrical style that is anticipated here on an intimate, domestic scale.

A sketchbook he used in 1754 contains a shaded outline drawing in graphite of Genzano with the wooded slopes to the north and the walls of the terrace briefly indicated (fig. 49); it is inscribed "Genzano / from the Capuchin." A finished sheet that belonged to the second Earl of Dartmouth (fig. 50)
follows the sketch and shows in addition the
terrace in the foreground populated by five or
more bearded and tonsured monks in hooded
robes, several of whom are playing bowls.3
This elaborate drawing, which must have been
completed (if not begun) in the artist’s
studio, was signed and dated on the mount
the same year.

The composition was used for several
paintings; the present canvas from the Ford
collection has been known since the publica-
tion of the engraving in 1825. It may date
either before or shortly after Wilson returned
to London in 1756–57. William Lock of
Norbury, a connoisseur who had been Wil-
son’s traveling companion in Italy, was its
first recorded owner, and their association
seems to have ended with the journey they
shared. Wilson may have given it to Lock,
or Lock may have commissioned it. The
painting, which is more elegiac than the
finished drawing, is a step away from what
Wilson evidently had observed. He replaced
the Roman pines behind the palace with a
cypress, heightened the bell tower, and
reduced the number of buildings. Here a
monk receives a supplicant, and a shepherd
waits over a flock grazing in a cypress grove.

Brinsley Ford was shown a version of this
painting, of about the same size and from a
Welsh collection, which was with the Lon-
don dealer Dudley Tooth in December 1955.4
He thought it of “fine quality” and “by Wil-
son.” Its present location is unknown. In 1998
Christie’s offered for sale views titled Lake
Nemi from a Convent Garden (Capucins at
Gensano) and Lake Nemi, with Two Friars
(figs. 51, 52).5 The first of these shows the
same grove as our picture, but a different
number and arrangement of figures, fewer
buildings, and a finished structure behind
the Palazzo Cesarini. If Ford had seen this
variant, he would certainly have mentioned
its pendant, of which he owned a version.6
So ours must be one of at least three of the
same subject.

---

2. Ann Clements in An Italian Sketchbook by Richard
Wilson, R.A.: Drawings Made by the Artist in Rome
and Its Environs in the Year 1754 (London, 1968),
vol. 2, pp. 28–29, no. 6; and David H. Solkin,
“Some New Light on the Drawings of Richard
Wilson,” Master Drawings 16, no. 4 (Winter 1978),
p. 406–7, 412n11, pls. 21, 22.
3. There seem to have been sixty-eight drawings in
all, commissioned in Rome by the second Earl
through the agency of Thomas Jenkins and first
mentioned in a letter of June 1, 1754. By June 30,
Wilson had been paid for twelve of an intended
twenty views of Rome and the environs. Some
twenty-five drawings are at present known. Brins-
ley Ford, “The Dartmouth Collection of Drawings
by Richard Wilson,” Burlington Magazine 90
(December 1948), pp. 337–45.
4. Ford, in a letter of 1779, noted the measurements,
16½ × 20½ in. For a related view at Bowwood that
is not by Wilson, see W. G. Constable, “Richard
Wilson: Some Penitentiary,” Burlington Magazine
96 (May 1954), p. 147, no. 6. It shows the road to
the monastery from nearer the lake, which is
not visible.
5. See Christie’s, London, November 24, 1998, no. 66,
oil on canvas, each 43.2 × 53.4 cm; see also Gemälde
alter und moderner Meister, exh. cat., Galerie
Fischer (Lucerne, 1994), no. 15, oil on canvas,
each 43.5 × 54.5 cm; Sotheby’s, London, November
18, 1987, no. 69, oil on canvas, each 42 × 52 cm. These
paintings have been associated with a pair exhib-
ited at the Society of Artists in 1761 as nos. 137
and 138.
6. For Ford’s painting, see Constable 1953, p. 207,
pl. 94b. Signed and dated 1768, it had belonged to
Sir George Beaumont and Benjamin Booth.

---

Sir Joshua Reynolds

Born Plympton, Devon, July 16, 1723; died
London, February 23, 1792

Joshua was the seventh child of Samuel
Reynolds, a schoolmaster, and his wife,
Theophilia Potter. He would have received a
sound classical education under his father,
who had been a fellow at Balliol College,
Oxford, and was encouraged to read widely.
He owned a copy of Jonathan Richardson’s
Essay on the Theory of Painting (1715). Little
else is known of Reynolds’s life in the west of
England before 1740, when he was
apprenticed for four years to the painter
Thomas Hudson, an artist from Devon who
was established in London. Certainly he
had begun to draw at an early age, as his
style in the 1740s was accomplished, and in
London he also attended auctions, studying
old master paintings. After working there
and in the West Country, Reynolds departed
in 1749 for Italy and by April 1750 had set-
tled in Rome, where he lived for two years.

Having visited Italy’s other principal
cities—Naples, Florence, Bologna, and
Venice—and stopped in Paris, Reynolds
returned to London in 1753 to set up a stu-
dio. He moved in 1760 to Leicester Fields;
that year he dispatched several portraits
to London’s first major public exhibition at
the Society of Artists. By then he was
scheduling a half-dozen sittings a day, had
raised his fees by a multiple of five, and
counted the Prince of Wales, later George III,
among his clients. Reynolds was appointed
first president of the Royal Academy when
that institution was founded in 1768, and he
was knighted the following year. On January
2, 1769, when the academy opened, he
gave his initial Discourse on Art; with the
publication in 1778 of the first seven Discor-
des, he achieved recognition as a man of
letters. He continued to travel, to Paris in
1768 and 1771, to the Netherlands in 1781,
and, in 1785, to Brussels, Antwerp, and
Ghent. Despite suffering strokes in 1779 and
1782, he was appointed principal painter to
George III in 1784. In July 1789 he com-
plained of difficulty seeing; by October he
had lost the use of his left eye, and by the
end of the year he had ceased to paint.

Reynolds was a student of antique sculp-
ture and European old master painting, a

---

1. An etching of the picture was made in 1830 when
it belonged to Lady Ford, whose stamp it bears.
Benjamin Booth (1732–1807) was related to the
Fords and formed their collection of works by
Wilson. In his inventory, Booth described it as
having been “Mr. Locke’s,” assumed to be Lock of
Norbury, while in an undated list, Booth recorded
it as “Late Parsons,” that is, owned previously by
William Parsons. See Constable 1953, pp. 2,
122–25, 208.

---
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voracious and discerning collector, and occasionally a picture dealer. He worked in many genres but, keenly practical and ambitious, fed the demand and met the need for portraits, espousing a grand classicizing manner enhanced with learned references to the art of the past. He overcame an inadequate grasp of anatomy and perspective and a flawed technique with broad and vigorous handling, sonorous color, and a profound understanding of portraiture’s rhetorical possibilities as well as its public role in contemporary culture.

Selected References

26. Thomas and Martha Neate with His Tutor, Thomas Needham

Oil on canvas, 66½ x 71 in. (168 x 180.3 cm) Signed and dated (lower right, on edge of plinth): J Reynolds pinxit 1748 Gift of Heathcote Art Foundation, 1986 (1986.264.3)

EX coll.: Mrs. Samuel Vandernal, London (until d. 1794); Thomas Neate, Binfield, Berkshire (1794–d. 1821); by descent to Captain Arthur Charles Burnaby Neate (1821—at least 1918); [Horace Buttery, London]; Ogden Mills, New York (until d. 1929); Ogden L. Mills, New York (until d. 1937); Mrs. Ogden L. Mills, New York (1937–32; sale, Parke-Bernet, New York, January 23, 1931, no. 87, for $2,000); Josephine Mercy Heathcote Haskell, New York (until d. 1982); Heathcote Art Foundation (1982–86)


The children’s father was Harris Neate, a merchant of Jamaica and London, who in 1734 married Martha Barrow and who died just eight years later. The sitters were identified in the text of an old label on the reverse that was transcribed in 1918:

Boy the paternal grandfather of the Rev. A. Neate.
Girl sister of the above married—
Williams of—, Esq."

Tall figure Needham tutor of the Boy.
Painted by Sir Joshua Reynolds.

In or after 1718, the picture passed out of the family’s hands; by the time it reached the Museum, the label had disappeared, but a transcript of its contents survives. The little boy is Thomas Neate, born in London in 1740, and his sister is Martha, also born there but in 1742. Two years later, their widowed mother married Samuel Vandewater, and the couple lived in London until his death in 1761. If the picture was not commissioned by Martha Vandewater, it must have been ordered for her by her second husband and would in either case have belonged to her. Conceivably, it is the “landscape over my parlour chimney” that was the only painting she bequeathed in her will of 1783 to her son.3

Martha Neate married, in 1766, John Williams of Panthowell, Trelach a’r Betws, Carmarthenshire. In 1771 Thomas Neate married Charlotte Seward; their first child and heir was the Reverend Thomas Neate, born in 1775. The picture descended in his family, and it was understood among them that Harris Neate had been a friend of the young Reynolds, though there is no evidence to support this improbable assumption. More likely, the connection to Reynolds was made through Thomas Hudson and Vandewater, who sat to Hudson for a three-quarter-length standing portrait in Van Dyck costume that has been tentatively dated between 1744 and 1746.4 The Thomas Neates eventually settled in the village of Binfield, not far from London, renting the house in which, a century before, the great English poet Alexander Pope had spent his teenage years. Rather little else is known about them. With respect to the boy’s tutor, it is worth noting that Samuel Vandewater, in his will of August 11, 1757, left eight hundred pounds to “Thomas Needham of Clifffords Inn London Gentleman.”5

Fig. 53. Sir Joshua Reynolds, Master Neate. Oil on canvas, 50 x 40½ in. (127 x 102.9 cm). Location unknown
Needham seems to have maintained his relationship with the family over time.

In 1968 Ellis Waterhouse listed, in addition to this work, two other Reynolds portraits of members of the Neate-Vandewall family. The first, representing Samuel Vandewall, was dated by Waterhouse to the years 1744–46 because he found its style close to that of Hudson. According to Waterhouse, the portrait was with Agnew's in 1962, but the firm can find no trace and Mannings did not know of it. The second picture (fig. 53) Waterhouse called “Miss (?) Vandewall (or Neate?),” noting the existence of a faded label on the reverse that had been read “child born to Mr. Vanderwall after his marriage to Mrs. Neate.” Mannings titles the portrait “Master or Miss Vanderwall” and dates it about 1746. However, the Vandewalls had no children, and the sitter must be either Thomas or Martha Neate.

The child wears Van Dyck costume, a white satin dress with a lace collar, a muslin apron trimmed with lace, and leather shoes with large rosettes. Mannings mentions the blue hussar cap with white feathers, which would have been more suitable for the boy, Thomas Neate. He is accompanied by a handsome brown-and-white King Charles spaniel. Thomas, if it is he, was born in 1740 and looks no more than two years old, which would suggest a date for the picture of 1742.
Reynolds had gone up to London in the autumn of 1740 to study with Hudson, and while he was there a young Irish painter, John Astley, also entered Hudson's studio for training. Astley's earliest known work is a double portrait of two young children, George and John Osborne (private collection), which is signed and dated 1746. It shows the younger child, George, in exactly the same pose as Thomas Neate. I would suggest that Astley's picture reflects Reynolds's, particularly in that the rather inept foreshortening of the left arm of the sitter is common to both.

Reynolds again deployed Van Dyck dress for his portrait of Thomas and Martha Neate. Under a plain starched collar, Thomas wears an elaborate costume of satin knee britches and a matching ermine-trimmed coat. His sister, also in satin, carries a basket of flowers and cradles loose blossoms in her overskirt. The exceptionally awkward lamb with an immense bushy tail looks stuffed. The arrangement of the tutor's right arm is not well managed. The background incorporates elaborate draperies, cords, and tassels as well as a platform, all set up in front of a landscape of trees and plants on a riverbank. The young Reynolds was perhaps a little overwhelmed by the scale and complexity of this important work. His portrait heads, though, are forthright and direct, and the children show a strong family resemblance. This elaborate, expensive picture, one of the artist's first major commissions, must have been painted in London.

27. Portrait of a Woman

Oil on canvas, 29½ × 24½ in. (75.2 × 62.2 cm)
Bequest of George D. Pratt, 1935 (42.152.1)

Ex coll.: R. W. G. Tyringham (until 1907; sale, Christie's, London, February 23, 1907, no. 145, as A Lady, in white dress and blue cloak lined with ermine, her right arm resting on a red velvet cushion, for £609 to Rutley); [Agnew, London, 1907; sold to Lewis]; Bartlett, London and Foxbush, Hildenborough, Kent (1907–30); his posthumous sale, Christie's, London, February 28–March 3, 1930, no. 151, for £1,890 to Labey; [J. P. Laby, from 1930]; [John Levy, New York; sold for $21,000 to Pratt]; George D. Pratt, Glen Cove, New York (until d. 1935, as Lady Charlotte Johnstone; life interest to his widow, Vera Amherst Hale Pratt, 1935–43)


The sitter is not Lady Charlotte Johnstone, as had been alleged: her appearance is recorded in another portrait by Reynolds (private collection), in which she appears to have been younger and more slender and with a very pronounced cleft chin.
28. The Honorable Henry Fane with Inigo Jones and Charles Blair

Oil on canvas, 8 ft. 4 1/4 in. × 11 ft. 10 in. (254.6 × 360.7 cm)
Inscribed (bottom edge): INIGO-JONES-ESQ' THE-HON-BE
HENRY-FANE-ESQ' CHARLES-BLAIR-ESQ'
Gift of Junius S. Morgan, 1887 (87.16)

Ex coll.: by descent to John Fane, 10th Earl of Westmorland, Apethorpe, Northamptonshire (by 1829–d. 1841); John Fane, 11th Earl of Westmorland, Apethorpe (1841–d. 1899); Francis William Henry Fane, 12th Earl of Westmorland, Apethorpe (1859–87; sold for £23,500 through Agnew to Morgan); Junius S. Morgan, London (1887)

Selected Exhibition: British Institution, London, “Pictures by Italian, Spanish, Flemish, Dutch, French, and English Masters,” June 1866, no. 165 (lent by the Earl of Westmorland)


Henry Fane was the younger of two sons of Thomas Fane, merchant of Bristol, attorney, and member of Parliament for Lyme Regis from 1753 to 1762, who served as eighth Earl of Westmorland upon the death of his distant cousin on August 26, 1762. The Fanes had been long established at Fulbeck Hall, near Grantham, Lincolnshire, and Henry Fane was born at Fulbeck on May 4, 1739. Fane is seated at the center here, while the older man to his right is Inigo Jones, whose Welsh family claimed descent from the famous architect of that name. Jones, who lived in Bristol and at Fulbeck Lodge, was a commissioner of Guadaloupe and for the Lottery Office. The standing figure, Charles Blair, was born in the village of Blandford St. Mary, Dorset, and married at Fulbeck the younger of Henry Fane’s two sisters, Mary Fane. Blair and Henry Fane died at Fulbeck, in the same house, in the summer of 1802.

Henry followed his father and elder brother to Parliament as member for Lyme Regis (a Westmorland pocket borough), serving from 1772 until 1802. A clerk in the treasury from 1757 to 1762, he held the title of keeper of the king’s private roads from 1772. On January 12, 1778, he married Anne Batson, daughter of a London banker, with whom he had fourteen children, the first born that November. Their family was raised at Fulbeck, which he inherited. Henry Fane seems first to have sat for Reynolds for this portrait in the course of his twenty-first year and, as it has not been possible to discover any achievements that he then had to his credit, we can only assume that the picture constitutes a particularly monumental celebration of traditional ties of family and friendship.

Four members of the immediate family were painted by Reynolds in the early 1760s:

1. Thomas Fane sat in 1761. Some of the four appointments with “Mr. Fane” that year were presumably with “Mr. Fane” (he did not then have a courtesy title), and others with Henry Fane. Thomas’s portrait may have been paid for by Henry, as Reynolds wrote to him on June 26, 1762, at Brympton, Yeovil, another family property, requesting the remaining half payment for what must have been a full-length portrait. Ann Fane, Henry’s sister, had a number of sittings between January 30 and March 4, 1762. A payment of twenty guineas on March 29, 1763, is associated with her portrait, which is presumed lost. Reynolds’s pocket book for 1763 has not survived. John Fane, Henry’s elder brother, the future ninth Earl, must have sat in 1763; receipt of the sum of one hundred guineas for his portrait was recorded by Reynolds on July 16, 1764. However, the three surviving pictures (this one and two others in a private collection) do not in any sense constitute a set. Thomas Fane, wearing a velvet suit and a rather old-fashioned powdered wig, displays an uncompromising directness of posture and glance. His heir, John, Lord Burghersh, leaning against a tree with a view of Apethorpe in the distance, is in his pose and expression removed from the viewer and does not have the mien of the great landowner that he would become.

It seems likely that the present, enormous canvas was painted in great part in 1761 and 1762, and was well under way by November 28, 1761, when the diarist Charles Brietzecke wrote that he went to “Mr. Reynolds in Leicester Field, [to] see Fane’s & Jones Pictures there.” Between April 7, 1760, and July 3, 1900.

Fig. 54. Sir Joshua Reynolds, The Honorable Henry Fane, Half-Length, in Uniform. Oil on canvas, 30 × 25 3/4 in. (76.2 × 64 cm). Location unknown

Fig. 55. Sir Joshua Reynolds, Charles Blair. Oil on canvas, 24 1/2 × 18 1/2 in. (62.2 × 47 cm). Private collection
1762, eleven appointments are noted for Mr. Jones, and between March 3, 1761, and May 10, 1762, nine appointments for Mr., and eleven appointments for Captain, Blair.\footnote{It is not clear which of the appointments between March 2 and September 21, 1761, were with Thomas and which with Henry Fane.\footnote{Mannings also mentions entries for dogs in 1765 that might apply to the greyhound.\footnote{The artist referenced “Mr Fane Mr Jones Mr Blair in one Picture” in his receipt of payment in the sum of £200, which is dated February 18, 1766.} Two head-and-shoulders portraits by Reynolds, one of Fane (fig. 54) and one of Blair (fig. 55), are connected with the commission. Even though he wears a red coat and waistcoat, that of Blair is a study.\footnote{Sold in 1929 by Gerard Phelps, and coming from Montacute House, Somerset, the picture may well have descended from the time it was painted in the Phelps family, which was connected to the Fanes, whose house at Brympton was not far away. The head-and-shoulders portrait of Henry Fane, sold at auction in 1989, shows him in uniform, facing to his right, and is an independent work.\footnote{Fane looks businesslike and serious, by comparison with the fine, idle gentleman of the conversation piece, who is seated under an arbor in a lavishly embroidered coat and waistcoat (fig. 56). His dog is his most elegant attribute. Fane is fair and, like the others, does not wear a wig. Blair is dressed informally in a loose coat, nearly buckled breeches, and boots. Mainly because he is standing, wearing red, and occupies so much more space, he has often been confused with the principal sitter. The landscape was certainly invented in the studio.} In 1829 the Literary Gazette reported that the painting, then in the possession of the tenth Earl of Westmorland, was found “lying neglected among lumber of various kinds; and . . . in so deplorable a state of decay (the surface being in many parts cracked, and the whole obscured by dirt), that the noble earl doubted the expediency of any attempt to restore it.” On the recommendation of Sir Thomas Lawrence, however, it was sent to and admirably restored by John Dunthorne of Grafton Street, Fitzroy Square, the same Dunthorne who had been John Constable's studio assistant. The three Fane family portraits were together at Apethorpe from at least 1850, when G. F. Waagen saw them there, until 1887, when they were all sold to}}
Agnew’s. Waagen reported that this one was faded in the flesh tones. A mezzotint engraving of the triple portrait by James Scott was published in 1863.10

The painting has just been treated and proves to be in much better state than had been anticipated. The commentary that follows has been provided by Michael Gallagher, Conservator in Charge of Paintings Conservation.

1. Edinburgh Magazine; or, Literary Miscellany, n.s., 20 (July 1802), p. 80.
3. Portraits of the other family members are cataloged by Mannings 2000, vol. 1, pp. 183-85, nos. 592, 594, 596, vol. 2, figs. 556, 701; see also vol. 1, p. 91, no. 184, fig. 62.
4. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 185. The letter, of which a photocopy is in the MMA files, reads: “Leicester fields June 26 1762 / Sir / I am extremely glad to hear / your Picture is arrived safe, in / Compliance with your order I have / sent your Account and remain / Sir / your most humble / and obedient servant / J Reynolds / The remaining half-payment—42-o-o / Packing case—0-12-o / / Porters—0-2-o / / Framed 13-11-o / / £70-o-o.” It is addressed to Henry Fane Esq. at Brympton near Yeovil / Somersetshire.
5. Appointments (eleven) for Mr. Jones, in 1760: April 7, 8, and 14; in 1761: January 17, 22, and 27; March 19, 20, and 21, and September 21; in 1762: July 5. Appointments (nine) for Mr. Blair, in 1761: September 19 and 21; in 1762: January 22, March 29, April 1, 3, 15, and 20, May 10. Appointments (eleven) for Captain Blair, in 1761: March 3, 10, 14, and 16; April 10 and 13; in 1762: April 6, 8, 24, 26, and 29. The dates for Mr. and Captain Blair dovetail, but the total is twenty, an exceptionally large number of sittings for one portrait. Messrs. Fane (see note 6 below), Jones, and Blair were all with Reynolds on September 21, 1761.
6. Appointments (fourteen) for Mr. Fane (both Thomas and Henry), in 1762: March 2, 3, and 7; April 15, 20, and 27; May 4, 8, 13, 16, 19, and 23; June 8; September 21; and (one) for Lord Westmorland, on June 19, 1764.
7. Mannings 2000, vol. 1, p. 284. Appointments for dogs in 1765: September 27; November 27; and December 2 (the 1766 dates for dogs would have been too late).
8. The provenance: Gerard Philips (until 1729; sale, Christie’s, London, November 29, 1729, no. 47, as Hon. Henry Fane [in], 23½ x 18 in, to Agnew’s); [Agnew, London, 1929-30; sold to Trumbauer]; sale, Sotheby’s, London, March 20, 1934, no. 75, as Charles Blair; sale, Sotheby’s, New York, June 5, 2008, no. 92, for $250,000. Mannings 2000, vol. 1, p. 91, suggested that the red costume may have been completed by another hand.
9. Sale, Christie’s, London, July 14, 1899, no. 94, as Hon. Henry Fane, half-length, in uniform, 30 x 25¼ in., inscribed “The Honble Henry Fane,” for £1,000 to I. A. Steele.

TECHNICAL NOTES

It is unusual to know something of the early conservation treatment of a painting made in the mid-1700s because conservation documentation did not begin to emerge as a desirable and necessary component of the process of cleaning and restoration until the early twentieth century. This grand conversation piece was described as “raised from the dead” in a short notice in the Literary Gazette on August 22, 1829, which recounted how the picture had been restored by John Dunthorne following a period of neglect.3 It is not clear if the work was lined at that time, but, after entering the Museum’s collection in 1887, it was sent out for that purpose in 1908, according to archival records. In 1952 the painting was cleaned and restored, and several coats of synthetic varnish were applied.5 The discoloration of these coatings prompted the most recent intervention, in 2008-9. The synthetic varnishes were failing to saturate the surface, leaving it dull and lifeless. These were removed along with a considerable amount of broad toning that had been used to disguise the more pronounced areas of drying cracks. Considering Reynolds’s notoriety as a fundamentally flawed technician, cleaning revealed a surprisingly well-preserved paint layer.

The painting is executed on a moderately fine, plain-weave canvas composed of three strips of fabric. The turnover edges at the reverse of the two vertical seams had been cut away during the 1908 lining process, though the original tacking edges were retained. The seams are now rather prominent, and there is also a gap in the lower portion of each between the edges of the canvas strips. The most plausible explanation for this is that the picture must have sagged in its unlined state, which caused the seams in the lower section to come apart. The edges of the canvas strips would then have gradually pulled away from one another during fluctuations in relative humidity. Paint cross sections prepared for pigment analysis during the course of the recent treatment indicate that the ground of the painting consists of two layers of white lead mixed with calcite. Examination with infrared reflectography has revealed that a number of changes were made at the painting stage and suggests that a relatively free brush sketch was used to position the sitters and indicate general forms and volume.4 Naturally, other types of preparatory drawing may also be present that cannot be detected; however, given the scale of the picture, a painted sketch and blocking-in of the composition seem to be the most logical inference. The pigments identified by recent analysis are consistent with a mid-eighteenth-century palette: lead white, carbon-based black, yellow ochre, iron-based earths, Naples yellow, green earth, Prussian blue, vermilion, and organic red lake. The overall color has inevitably dropped in tone, but in general there appear to be no severe changes. While the hands of the sitters are now very pallid, their faces have thankfully retained a certain natural blush. The purplish cast to portions of the sky was clearly intentional, as these areas were handled with a mixture of lead white, Prussian blue, and red lake. It would also seem that there has been no significant color change to the chair in which Henry Fane sits: there is no evidence of a fugitive pigment having faded, and the chair was probably simply intended to match the marble-top table.

It comes as no surprise that the painting exhibits drying defects, although nothing as severe as the catastrophic tearing of the surface found in many of Reynolds’s mature works. The most badly affected area is in the bottom left corner, where broad traction cracks have opened in the medium-rich dark paint used to describe the foliage and the central table support, revealing the paler underlayers. Finer drying cracks, found throughout the painting, are particularly pronounced in areas of pentiments or complex layering, such as the foreground shrubs and the trees to the right of Charles Blair. These elements were added on top of the completed distant hills and the stretch of water, which had been painted all the way across to the right edge of the canvas.

The painting exhibits a pronounced age craquelure, in particular a series of overlapping, concentric, circular cracks. These are the result of multiple impacts and no doubt occurred when the picture was hanging for
several decades in a domestic interior, where it was clearly at times the target of less than favorable attention.

A number of significant changes were made to the composition during its development. Infrared reflectography has revealed that a large lidded jar was originally sketched in next to the silver jug on the table but was omitted in the final painting. Examination also confirmed that the handsome pale greyhound sitting to the left of Fane, its head resting devotedly on his thigh, was added at a late stage over the previously completed legs of Inigo Jones and the shadowed area under the table. When the hound was added, a layer of paint was also brushed over parts of Fane’s britches as part of the adjustment. At the time, this would have matched the existing color of the sitter’s clothing, but it has aged differentially and is now noticeably warmer in tone.

A whole series of more fundamental revisions were made to the clothes worn by all three sitters. Beneath Jones’s blue frockcoat there is a consistent and fully modeled bluish gray layer that is visible wherever the overlying blue paint is abraded or has flaked away. The embroidered gold buttonholes were added before the application of the blue, suggesting that Reynolds had rethought the color of the coat rather than that the bluish gray was simply intended to function as a preparatory underlayer. The plum red collar of the coat was added after the blue layer of paint had been applied. Similarly, Fane’s frockcoat was painted a much darker lavender gray hue with silver rectangular bands of embroidery around the buttonholes, similar to the gold ones seen on Jones’s coat. This outfit was subsequently given a much more silvery tone, and a blue waistcoat and lining with elaborate gold foliate embroidery around the buttons were added. The Prussian blue, used relatively thinly over the pale gray paint in the waistcoat, is now somewhat faded, but the original, deeper-toned blue contrasting with the gold would have appeared particularly luxurious, emphasizing the formal nature of Fane’s dress.

Blair was originally sketched with his left hand on his hip (fig. 57). It is not clear whether the intention at this stage was also to have his right hand gripping the walking stick, as it is in the finished painting, though such a confrontational posture seems unlikely. What is evident is that Reynolds made radical changes to Blair’s clothing. He was originally painted wearing the same type of embroidered frockcoat as his companions, complete with gold braiding and buttons, elaborate lace cuffs (fig. 58), buttoned britches, and gold-buckled shoes. The hat in Blair’s left hand seems to belong to this first campaign of painting since it retains its gold braid, which is rather at odds with the essentially informal riding attire he wears in the final picture. Paint cross sections indicate that mixtures of lead white, red lake, and black were first used to paint both the frockcoat and waistcoat, though areas of abrasion suggest that the waistcoat was a warmer, pale plum color whereas the frockcoat was more mauve in hue. Although Reynolds completely repainted Blair’s clothing, he appears to have retained the pattern of folds in both versions of the coats. In the green waistcoat he reinforced the folds with a darker green color, but in the red frockcoat he almost uniformly applied vermilion over the original mauve color, relying on the folds painted at the earlier stage to provide most of the modeling of the garment.

The radical changes in Fane’s and Blair’s clothing appear indicative of a certain crisis.
in resolving the visual coherency and hierarchy in the portrait group. By virtue of his frontal position, direct gaze, and placement on the same picture plane as Fane (the principal sitter), Charles Blair dominates the painting. It would seem reasonable to assume that the numerous changes were made in an attempt to compensate for this: the simplification of Blair’s costume to a more modest outdoors outfit, the elaboration of Fane’s clothes with rich gold embroidery, and the addition of the elegant greyhound to add weight and nobility to his figure. Unfortunately, the trio of bold colors in Blair’s outfit and the strong diagonal created by the hound lead the viewer’s eye inexorably to Blair’s engaging face. Nonetheless, whether Reynolds struggled in resolving these issues is in many ways a moot point, since the real impact of this remarkably well preserved painting is to remind the viewer of his marvelous skill as a painter.

MICHAEL GALLAGHER

2. Treatment notes in the files of the Sherman Fairchild Paintings Conservation Center, Metropolitan Museum, state that two brush coats of methacrylate and two of polyvinyl acetate were applied.
3. All pigment analysis and cross-section investigation was undertaken by Research Scientists Silvia Centeno and Mark Wypyski. Microscopic samples were removed from the painting under high magnification. These samples were mounted as cross sections in a synthetic resin, polished, examined by polarized light microscopy, and analyzed by Raman microscopy and scanning electron microscopy-energy dispersive X-ray spectrometry (SEM-EDS) to obtain the chemical composition of the ground preparation and paint layers. Raman spectra were recorded with a Renishaw System 1000 spectrometer, using a 785nm laser. The laser beam was focused on the various paint layers using a 50x objective lens. Powers in the order of 1-5mW were used, with accumulation times of 40 seconds. The materials were identified by comparing the spectra of the unknown with those of reference compounds. SEM-EDS elemental analyses were carried out using an Oxford Instruments INCA analyzer equipped with a Link Pentafet high resolution Si(Li) SATX X-ray detector attached to a LEO Electron Microscopy model 1450VP variable-pressure scanning electron microscope. Analyses were performed under high-vacuum conditions at an accelerating voltage of 20kV on uncoated sample cross sections.
4. The infrared reflectogram was captured by conservator Charlotte Hale, using an Indigo Systems Near Infrared Merlin camera with an InGaAs (Indium Gallium Arsenide) target sensitive to wavelengths from 0.9 to 1.7 microns. The camera is fitted with a StingRay macro lens optimized for this region of the spectrum. I am grateful for Charlotte’s insights into the handling of the medium.
5. I am grateful to Andrew Bolton, curator of The Costume Institute, for discussing the correct terminology and cultural implications of the clothing depicted.
6. Abrasion from previous cleaning campaigns has revealed some of the earlier color and form of the embroidered outfit. The vermilion layer seems to have been particularly susceptible to solvent erosion, and Blair’s coat is undoubtedly a little more muted than when first painted. The braid and buttons, thinly applied with earth pigments, Naples yellow, and lead white, were also partially revealed by abrasion, but these were overpainted with red and green in an earlier restoration campaign. This overpaint was broadly applied and has discolored. However, because it is extremely tenacious, the decision was made to leave it in place, integrating it at the retouching stage rather than risk damage to the original paint layer.

29. Anne Dashwood, Later Countess of Galloway

Oil on canvas, 52 1/2 x 46 1/4 in. (133.4 x 117.7 cm), with strip of 7 1/4 in. (18.1 cm) folded over top of stretcher. Signed and dated (right, above relief): Reynolds 1764.

Pinxit
Gift of Lillian S. Timken, 1950 (50.218.2)

Ex coll.: William W. Burdon, Haddon House, Newcastle (by 1850-64; sale, Christie’s, London, June 28, 1863, no. 31, for £424 to Cox); Joseph Gillott, Edgbaston, Birmingham (until 1872; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, April 27, 1872, no. 294, for £357 to M. Colnaghi); [Martin Colnaghi, London, from 1872]; Mrs. Charles Stewart (in 1904); Captain Arthur Courtenay Stewart (by 1911-12; sold to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1912; sold to Bevan]; G. L. Bevan (1912-19; sold to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1919-25; sold to Fearn]; [Fearn Galleries, New York, 1923]; Mrs. James Creelman, New York (from 1933); Lillian S. (Mrs. William R.) Timken, New York (by 1933-50)


A nne Dashwood, who belonged to a prominent and wealthy landholding family in Oxfordshire, was the second daughter of Sir James Dashwood, second Baronet (see no. 17), and his wife, née Elizabeth Spencer. On June 13, 1764, Miss Dashwood married at St. George’s, Hanover Square, John Stewart, Lord Garlies (fig. 59), member of Parliament for Morpeth, who in 1773 would succeed as seventh Earl of Galloway. Lord Garlies was childless, having lost his eighteen-year-old first wife and infant son in May of the preceding year. Anne would give him sixteen children. She long survived him, and at her death in 1830, at eighty-seven, she had seen the births of eighty-six grandchildren and thirty-five great-grandchildren. She may have been as pensive as she appears here, but frail she was not.

Fig. 59. Anton Raphael Mengs, John Stewart, 7th Earl of Galloway. Oil on canvas, 41 x 32 in. (104.2 x 81.3 cm). Location unknown
Gourlay pointed out, the figure of Psyche was inspired by that of Iphigenia on the Medici Vase, of which Reynolds had made a careful drawing while in Rome in 1750.

The subject would suggest, but does not absolutely require, sheep. In 1839 it was claimed that a painting ascribed to Reynolds that came up for auction, *Two Lambs, in a Landscape*, was a fragment of the portrait. This has disappeared without a trace. A mezzotint engraving of 1863 shows the present work without any sheep and before seven additional inches of painted canvas were folded over the top. While the painting was certainly larger, Nicholas Penny has suggested that it may not have been a full-length, in which case it could have had a format similar to the portrait by Hudson. As quite often happens with Reynolds, the modeling tones have faded over time, and the face, drained of red lake, does not look as he intended.

In the three weeks prior to her marriage, Miss Dashwood gave the painter only four sittings, on May 21 and 26 and on June 2 and 7, which was fewer than was customary. Reynolds stated that three sessions of an hour and a half were usually enough for the painting of a face, so perhaps after four sessions he had the design fixed and no longer required the presence of the sitter, who was doubtless busy with her preparations for the ceremony. Elegantly dressed in blue silk, as a shepherdess with a crook, she wears red buttons set in gold, a quantity of pearls, some of which are twined with the ribbons in her hair, and a primrose-colored figured scarf knotted at her hip. It was quite customary at the time to show an eligible young woman as a shepherdess, and the costume was also popular for masquerades and country outings, on the model of Watteau and the fête champêtre. In this instance, Reynolds may have been following the example of his teacher, Thomas Hudson, who in 1743 had painted Mary Carew of Crowcombe, Somerset, as a shepherdess with a crook, a straw hat, and a nosegay of flowers, accompanied by a sheep. Hudson's picture had been engraved in 1744 (fig. 60).

The relief on the pedestal to the right shows an appropriately amorous subject, Cupid Awaking Psyche. As Alexander

---

**30. George Capel, Viscount Malden, and Lady Elizabeth Capel**

Oil on canvas, 11 1/2 x 7 1/4 in. (29.2 x 18.4 cm)


Gift of Henry S. Morgan, 1948 (48.181)

Ex coll.: Lady Frances Hanbury-Williams (until d. 1785); George Capel-Coningsby, Viscount Malden, later 5th Earl of Essex, Cassiobury Park (1782–d. 1789); Arthur Algeron Capel, 6th Earl of Essex, Cassiobury Park (1839–d. 1892); George Devereux de Vere Capel, 7th Earl of Essex, Cassiobury Park (1892–1955); sold through Christie's to Agnew; [Agnew, London, 1892–96; sold to Morgan]; J. Pierpoint Morgan, London and New York (1910–d. 1913); J. P. Morgan, New York (1913–d. 1943); Henry S. Morgan, New York (1943–48)

**Selected Exhibitions:** Royal Academy of Arts, London, *Works by the Old Masters*, 1878, no. 213 (lent by the Earl of Essex); Royal Academy of Arts, London, *Works by the Old Masters*, 1896, no. 121 (lent by J. Pierpoint Morgan)


The sitters were the only children of William Anne Capel, fourth Earl of Essex, by his first wife, Frances, who died in childbirth in 1759. Viscount Malden, born on November 13, 1757, was educated at Cambridge and sat as a member of Parliament for Westminster in 1779 and for various other boroughs in 1781, 1784, 1794, and 1796. He took the name Coningsby upon the death of his grandmother. He succeeded his father in 1799 and died on April 23, 1839. The unhappily married fifth Earl was long separated from his first wife, Sarah. Upon her death in 1838, he married a well-known actress and singer half his age, Catherine Stephens. He had no children by either wife and was succeeded by his nephew, the son of his half
brother. He was a considerable supporter of the arts, lavishing his attention on Cassiobury (fig. 65) and his house at 9 Belgrave Square and patronizing many painters, including Turner and Landseer (fig. 62). His sister, Elizabeth, was born on August 20, 1755. She married, in 1777, John, third Baron Monson, and the couple had two daughters and a son.

The commission for this portrait would have been regarded as an important one, and there were many sittings. Lord Malden and Lady Elizabeth sat for Reynolds sixteen times between them in the spring and early summer of 1767; Lord Malden sat also on April 19, 1768. The picture was commissioned by their grandmother, perhaps in connection with the boy’s tenth birthday. The artist recorded two payments: “May 17. 1768 Lady Frances Coningby for Lord Malden and Sister 175-0-0,” and “May 1768 Lord Essex two children, 150 151-10.” David Mannings found the total of the two payments high, in view of the fact that at the time Reynolds was charging one hundred fifty guineas for a full-length, but noted that the artist would have subcontracted the painting of the flowers.

Viscount Malden holds a stick and wears a Van Dyck costume: satin coat, cape, and knee britches, lace collar, silk stockings, and shoes with rosettes. He looks to be a rather tentative little boy, different from the assertive individual he became. His sister, older and taller, must take second place and is therefore shown seated on a stone bench. Dressed in white draperies of a vaguely classical sort, with a large jewel at her breast, Lady Elizabeth holds a garland of flowers. A bouquet in a wicker basket is at her feet. The composition is not entirely successful, despite the attention that must have been lavished on it: the figure of the girl is large, she looks older than her age, and the angle of her face, seen from below, is an awkward one. Nevertheless, this would have been an attractive and popular subject, and the picture was engraved twice, by Charles Turner in 1817 and by R. B. Parkes in 1864.

The 1992 treatment report notes scattered losses throughout as well as abrasion that particularly affects the figure of Lady Elizabeth, the flower garland, and the sky. The boy and the green vegetation are rather better preserved. There is evidence of extensive traction cracks, the surface is distorted, and the condition has been further compromised by an old wax lining.

1. The sale catalogue of the contents of Cassiobury Park (Knight, Frank & Rutley, June 15, 1922, no. 706) lists as by Reynolds a portrait of the sitters measuring 71 × 57 in. That picture, not recorded since, must have been a copy installed about 1895 in place of the original. A smaller copy, given in 1824 by the fifth Earl to Richard Ford, who married the Earl’s only child and natural daughter, Harriet Capel, descended to art historian Brinsley Ford (d. 1990), whose letter of 1971, together with a photograph, is in the archives.

2. The eight sittings in 1767 with Lord Malden were on April 9 and 14; May 9, 14, and 16; June 8; and July 9 and 14. Lady Elizabeth sat the same year (eight times) on April 8, 10, 15, and 22; May 1, 4, 12, and 14.


31. Mrs. Horton

Oil on canvas, 36¼ × 28 in. (92.1 × 71.1 cm)

Fletcher Fund, 1945 (45.59.3)

Ex coll.: by descent to Frances, Countess of Warwick; [Sabin, London, until 1928; sold to Agnew]; [Agnew, London, 1928; sold to Bache]; Jules Bache, New York (1928–d. 1944; cats., 1929, 1937, no. 60, 1943, no. 60; Bache Foundation, 1944–45; sold to MMA)


R eynolds’s portraits suggest that he enjoyed the company of women. “It may well be significant,” Ellis Waterhouse once opined, “that the pictures which he almost seems to have painted with love are those of the great courtesans of the day.” This is presumably one of them, Anne, or Nancy, Parsons, the daughter of a Bond Street tailor. As is usual, the circumstances of her birth and details of her life are clouded with uncertainty. She may have married a slave trader from the West Indies, Mr. Horton, or Houghton (there was a Houghton family in Hanover, Jamaica), whom she accompanied there. She
A note on technique at the end of the artist’s ledger dates before January 22, 1770, and seems likely, on account of the color scheme, to refer to our picture. The state, for a work by Reynolds, is fairly good.

2. Venetia Harlow, archivist at Agnew’s, writing in 1980, copied a note, difficult to read, from the firm’s records, “Nancy Parsons, from the [?] Colln. of the Countess of Warwick” with a “signed letter by her.” The countess’s letter (surely not the sitter’s letter) unfortunately cannot be found and may have been with Sabin, not Agnew’s, in any event. The note suggests that the Bache catalogues may be correct.
4. Graves and Cronin list Mrs. Horton, sitting in February 1767 and January 1769; Miss Houthon, two payments for a portrait in 1767; Mrs. Houghton, a portrait paid for in 1773; and Miss Houghton, who sat in January 1767.
5. Mrs. Horton’s appointments were on January 31, February 13, August 29 and 30, September 7, 19, and 21.
6. “Mrs. Horton. Con capivi senza Giallo / Giallo [word canceled] quando / era finito / Di Pingere [prima? canceled] con Lacca e giallo quasi solo e poi / Glaze with Ultramarine.” Conservators Dianne Moretti and Dorothy Mathon have contributed to this proposed, and entirely provisional, reading. “Capivi” may be a misspelling or misreading of “cappello,” or hat (in this case turban), thus “Mrs. Horton. With a turban [painted] without yellow. When it [presumably the costume] is finished, varnish with yellow lake almost exclusively and then, Glaze with Ultramarine.” No trace of blue remains.

32. Captain George K. H. Coussmaker

Oil on canvas, 93/4 x 77/4 in. (23.8 x 19.4 cm)
Bequest of William K. Vanderbilt, 1920 (20.155.3)

Ex coll.: Lieutenant-Colonel George Kein Hayward Coussmaker (until d. 1802); Edward Southwell, 21st Baron de Clifford (by 1817–d. 1852); Sophia Coussmaker Russell, later Baronesse de Clifford (until d. 1874); Edward Southwell Russell, 3rd Baron de Clifford (1824–d. 1877); Edward Southwell Russell, 4th Baron de Clifford (1873–84; sold to Wertheimer); [Charles J. Wertheimer, London, from 1884]; William K. Vanderbiilt, New York (probably from 1884–d. 1920)

Selected Exhibitions: British Institution, London, “Pictures by the Late Sir Joshua Reynolds,” 1813, no. 69 (as Colonel Coussmaker, lent by Lord de Clifford); Royal Academy of Arts, London, “Works by the Old Masters,” 1875, no. 159 (lent by Lord de Clifford);
George Kein Hayward Coussmaker was born in London on September 10, 1759. His grandfather John de Coussmaker, a follower of William III, had emigrated to England and in 1720 settled in Surrey. He left a large family. George Coussmaker’s father, Evert Coussmaker, died in 1763, and his mother, Mary, was remarried, to Sir Thomas Hales, Baronet, of Howlett, Kent. At sixteen, evidently destined for a career in the military, George joined the First Regiment of Foot Guards in the lowest commissioned rank, ensign and lieutenant, on February 7, 1776. He was promoted to the rank of lieutenant and captain on December 19, 1778, and to that of captain and lieutenant colonel on April 2, 1788. He saw no active service and retired from the military on March 18, 1795. Coussmaker married, in 1790, Catherine Southwell, eldest daughter of the late Edward Southwell, twentieth Baron de Clifford. She was born on September 19, 1768. He died in 1801, she in 1802. They had a son, George, who was member of Parliament for Kinsale from 1818 until 1821 and died unmarried. Their daughter Sophia, born in 1791, became Baroness de Clifford in 1833.
Reynolds noted an exceptionally large number of sittings connected with this portrait: he had twenty-one appointments with the twenty-two-year-old Coussmaker between February 9 and mid-April 1782, always in the afternoon, and perhaps as many as six or eight sessions with his horse. Payments were made on February 9, 1782, and possibly also in May, or within the year following, in the amounts of one hundred and one hundred and five pounds plus ten guineas for the frame. (In 1782 Reynolds raised his charges for a full-length portrait, for the last time in his career, to two hundred guineas.) Although the painting was not exhibited until 1813, it was engraved by James Scott in 1784. A small replica ascribed to Reynolds, but not by him, was twice sold at Christie’s.

The canvas, thickly impasted, is painted throughout with an extravagant freedom, flexibility, and variety of stroke, indicating, as does the large number of sittings, that Reynolds may well have executed it in its entirety, without benefit of studio assistance. Coussmaker evidently spent many an hour in Reynolds’s painting room leaning on a pedestal, here transformed into the trunk and the stump of a branch of a tree. He wears a stylish uniform coat, breeches, boots, spurs, a sword, and riding gloves, as if he were out of doors. In his left hand (which, inexplicably, is painted as his right) he holds his tricorn hat, crown down to reveal the lining. His expression is mild; his hair is powdered. The composition, a succession of arcs, is tight and complex. The captain’s legs are crossed, as apparently are the legs of the horse (only one is visible). The horse, head down, wide-open eye glinting, is wrapped round the trunk of the tree, and both animal and foliage enfold the quiet figure.

In 1950 Ernest Hemingway visited the Museum and offered his opinion of this Reynolds in an interview with Lillian Ross, published in the New Yorker:

“I don’t want to be an art critic. I just want to look at pictures and be happy with them and learn from them. Now, this for me is a damn good picture.” He stood back and peered at a Reynolds entitled “Colonel George Coussmaker,” which shows the Colonel leaning against a tree and holding his horse’s bridle. “Now, this Colonel is a son of a bitch who was willing to pay money to the best portrait painter of his day just to have himself painted,” Hemingway said, and gave a short laugh. “Look at the man’s arrogance and the strength in the neck of the horse and the way the man’s legs hang. He’s so arrogant he can afford to lean against a tree.”

That just about covers it, except to note that it can be risky to comment upon a sitter’s temperament, which in the present case does not seem to have been arrogant, at least not according to Fanny Burney, who met him in 1777. She wrote, “Mr. Coussmaker stayed for supper. He is a very pretty sort of young man, but rather too shy and silent, which, though infinitely preferable to forwardness and loquacity, nevertheless may be carried too far, either for the comfort of the owner or pleasure or satisfaction of those with whom he converses.” The seemingly modest Coussmaker was rewarded by Reynolds with one of his finest portraits.


2. The regiments of Foot Guards practiced a double-rank system, in accordance with which a lieutenant in the Foot Guards ranked the same as a captain in a line-infantry regiment. Information on the sitter’s military service was provided by Stephen Wood, Keeper, Scottish United Services Museum, Edinburgh Castle, in a letter, 1998. See also F. W. Hamilton, The Origin and History of the First or Grenadier Guards (London, 1874), vol. 1, p. 458.

3. Coussmaker’s (twenty-one) sittings were on February 9, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, and 22, March 2, 5, 8, 14, 18, and 19; and April 1, 3, 6, 10, 13, and 16.

4. These were possibly on March 20 and 21; on March 26 (the artist specifies “Mr Coussmaker’s Horse”) and probably on March 29; and on April 5, 6, and 10. The April dates for sittings for man and horse coincide; the horse was brought round in the morning while its owner came in the afternoon.

5. The work was owned by Lord Tweedmouth (until 1905; his sale, Christie’s, London, June 3, 1905, no. 46, as Reynolds, Vincent Ligonier, 24 x 18 in., for £462 to C. Davis); Hon. Mrs. George Keppel (until 1949; her posthumous sale, Christie’s, London, July 15, 1949, no. 120, as Reynolds, Vincent Ligonier, for £231). See also Der Kunstmarkt 2 (1904–5), p. 216.

6. As Judy Egerton pointed out, Reynolds had used the pose for the horse in his 1756 portrait of Captain Robert Orme (National Gallery, London), to rather different effect.


8. The Early Diary of Frances Burney, 1768–1778, ed. Annie Raine Ellis (London, 1907), vol. 2, p. 194 and no. Coussmaker’s sister Catherine was an intimate friend of Fanny’s sister Susan.

33. John Barker

Oil on canvas, 68½ x 47½ in. (173.4 x 120.7 cm) Gift of Ruth Armour, 1954 (54.192)

Ex coll.: Sir Thomas Lawrence (until d. 1830; his sale, Christie’s, London, May 15, 1830, no. 106, for £15.2.0 to Gilmore); Mr. Snell (until 1872; sale, Christie’s, London, May 25, 1872, no. 63, for £475.0 to J. Holmes, bought in); Edward Cheney, Bedgebury Hall, Shropshire; by descent to Francis Capel-Cure (until 1905; his sale, Christie’s, London, May 6, 1905, no. 131, for £205 to Lawrence); (sale, Christie’s, London, June 14, 1907, no. 84, 93 x 57 in., for £141.15.0 to Wallis); Edward Ratthbone Bacon, New York (until d. 1915; his estate, 1915–at least 1919; cat., 1919, no. 54, 67 x 46 in.); B. Svenonius, Stockholm, and L. Picard, Geneva (until 1931; sale, National Art Galleries, New York, April 16, 1931, no. 51, for $3,750); Mr. and Mrs. Hubert K. Dalton, Rumson, New Jersey (until 1941; their sale, Parke-Bernet, New York, October 16, 1941, no. 56, for $4,753); Bernard R. Armour, Englewood, New Jersey (until d. 1949); Ruth Armour, Englewood (1949–54)

Selected Exhibitions: Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1786, no. 235 (as Portrait of a gentleman, whole length); Suffolk Street, London, “Works of Deceased and Living British Artists,” 1812, no. 102 (as Mr. Barker, the celebrated Engineer,—View of Ramesgate Harbour in the distance)


Mr. Barker, who was a highly trained engineer, had seven appointments for sittings with Reynolds between mid-February and early April of 1786, and on April 7 he paid the artist two hundred guineas for his portrait. Barker died on November 1 of the following year at the age of eighty, and the work may perhaps be understood to have been commissioned as a proud reprise of his long life and accomplishments. Originally, it was even larger, ninety-three by fifty-seven inches (236.2 x 144.8 cm), the size of a standing full-length (it was cut down between 1907 and 1915). A curious choice for the 1786 Royal Academy exhibition, it was not particularly well received by the press. Nobody could identify the sitter.
The portrait was later described as “in the Artist’s finest manner” by the compiler of Lawrence’s estate sale catalogue. “Over the table is thrown a carpet, in the painting of which this great master has shewn how easy it would have been for him to produce those deceptive imitations of the appearances of inanimate objects, so much admired in the works of the Dutch painters, had he not considered such ‘tours de force,’ as he states in his lectures, to be beneath the dignity of his art.” And the portrait is conservative: not only the sitter’s velvet suit but also the composition, style, and rather finicky treatment of detail all probably accorded with the old gentleman’s wishes. It could have been painted in the 1760s (compare, for example, no. 53). The work was engraved in the year it was painted. It has deteriorated over time in the most important passages, that is, the face, hands, wig, and red costume, all of which are thickly impasted.

John Barker was baptized in Lowestoft, a Suffolk port town, on November 9, 1707. His father was a merchant, from whom he inherited property in Lowestoft and an interest in ships sailing from Great Yarmouth. In 1741 he was elected to membership in the Younger Brethren of the Corporation of Trinity House, London, which was England’s leading lighthouse and harbor-pilot authority. He joined the Elder Brethren in 1750 and in 1762 became the warden. From 1771 until his death he served as governor of London’s principal marine insurance company, London Assurance. In the 1750s Barker had become interested in philanthropy; he was at various times a governor or director of the London Hospital, the Smallpox and Inoculation Hospital, St. Thomas’s Hospital, the Royal Naval Hospital at Greenwich, and the Magdalene Hospital for Penitent Prostitutes. In the background of the portrait there is a view of the enclosed basin and jetty of Ramsgate Harbour, Kent, the development of which occupied Barker from 1749 until his death. He was elected chairman of the Ramsgate Harbour Trustees’ Works Committee in 1760 and served for almost twenty-eight years. Although modernized, the harbor has not changed greatly in appearance since.

2. The 1786 engraving was by John Jones; one by Granger was published by Hardy in 1802. See Edward Hamilton, The Engraved Works of Sir Joshua Reynolds (London, 1844; repr., Amsterdam, 1973), pp. 5, 104.

34. **Lady Smith and Her Children**

Oil on canvas, 55 1/8 x 44 1/8 in. (140.7 x 112.1 cm)

Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900 (15.210.10)

**Ex coll.** Sir Robert Smith, 5th Baronet (until d. 1802); Sir George Henry Smyth, 6th Baronet, Berechurch Hall, Colchester, Essex (1802–d. 1852); his grandson, Thomas George Graham White, Berechurch Hall and Wethersfield, Essex (1852–78); posthumous sale, Christie’s, London, March 23, 1878, no. 40, as Portrait of Lady Smyth and Her Children, for 1,250 guineas to Graves; [Henry Graves, London, from 1878; sold for 65,250 to Stirling-Crawford]; William Stuart Stirling-Crawford, London and Milton (by 1882–d. 1883); his widow, Caroline Agnes, Dowager Duchess of Montrose (1883–d. 1894; her sale, Christie’s, London, July 14, 1894, no. 30); withdrawn; [Martin Colinagh, London, 1895]; [Sedelmeyer, Paris, from 1895]; [cat., 1895, no. 89; sold to Huntington]; Collis P. Huntington, New York (until d. 1900, life interest to his widow, Arabella D. Huntington, later [from 1913] Mrs. Henry E. Huntington, 1900–d. 1924; life interest to their son, Archer Milton Huntington, 1924–terminated in 1953)


On September 17, 1776, Charlotte Sophia Blake, daughter of the late Sir Francis Blake Delaval, married at St. George’s, Hanover Square, Sir Robert Smith, fifth Baronet. He had been a member of Parliament for Cardigan borough and later, from 1780 to 1790, would be a member for Colchester; he died in Paris in 1802. The little boy is George Henry Smith, the sixth and last Baronet, born in 1784, who changed the family name to Smyth. He was a member of Parliament for Colchester from 1826 to 1830 and from 1835 to 1850. His sisters are Louisa, born in 1782, who married Thomas Este, and Charlotte, born in 1783, who married, in

---

1. The (seven) sittings in 1786 were on February 15, 17, 23, and 24; March 9 and 17; and April 7. It is possible that he also sat on May 1.

---

Fig. 65. Francesco Bartolozzi, after Reynolds, *Lady Smith and Her Children*, 1789. Stipple engraving and etching, 11 1/8 x 9 1/8 in. (28.9 x 23.3 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of Archer M. Huntington, 1942 (42.108)
1803, Charles Este. Lady Smith died in 1823 and was buried at Versailles. As her son had no legitimate children, the baronetcy became extinct at his death in 1842.

Sir Robert Smith visited Reynolds’s studio on February 20, 1787, presumably to commission this portrait. His wife’s first appointment was two days later, and she had eleven sittings in all, in February, March, and April 1787; it is not clear how many of them involved the children. The picture was exhibited at the Royal Academy in the late spring as “Portrait of a lady and three children.” Sir Robert paid £162.10.0 in March for “Lady Smith and three children and likeness for a fancy Child” and, in May, the further sum of £152.10.0. The portrait was engraved by Francesco Bartolozzi (fig. 65) in 1789. When it changed hands in 1789, it was described as much damaged by damp; afterward it was “carefully restored.” Its condition is compromised by extensive drying cracks, particularly in the dark foliage, which are quite typical for Reynolds.

This is a fashionable, up-to-date image. Lady Smith wears a full white muslin dress with a fichu at the neck under a transparent ruffled and dotted black shawl as well as a shiny hat crowned with a quantity of feathers. Despite the presence of her three small children, she looks calm and impassive, resting her chin on her fingers and her elbow on an (invisible) pedestal. The composition has been imagined, as the children cannot have posed in this way and must have sat separately: they form an attractive, lively group, but only two of their hands are visible and it is impossible toathom how their limbs are arranged. It is quite unusual, as David Mannings observed, to show one of the little girls from the back. Complex and colorful, the picture very much reflects the taste of the moment and it must have had tremendous appeal. An oval miniature by Samuel Shelley closely duplicates the portrait group but shows Lady Smith without her hat.4

35. Mrs. Lewis Thomas Watson

Oil on canvas, 50 × 40 in. (127 × 101.6 cm)
Bequest of Mrs. Harry Payne Bingham, 1986 (1987.47.2)

Ex coll.: Richard Milles, North Elmham, Norfolk, and Nackington, Kent (until d. 1820); the Milles family (1830–74); George Watson Milles, 1st Earl Sandes, Lees Court, Faversham, Kent (from 1874; sold to Wertheimer); [Samson Wertheimer, London, until 1892]; his posthumous sale, Christie’s, London, March 19, 1892, no. 713, as Lady Sandes, for £4,305 to Haines; [Charles John Wertheimer, London, 1892–95; sold to Agnew]; [Agnew, London, 1895; sold to Orrock]; James Orrock, Rhode Island (1895–at least 1896; sold for £12,000 to an American collector); Colonel Oliver H. Payne, New York (until d. 1917); Harry Payne Bingham, New York (by 1920–d. 1935); Mrs. Harry Payne Bingham, New York (1935–d. 1956)


The sitter was born Mary Elizabeth Milles on May 26, 1767. The only daughter and heiress of Richard Milles, she was married on November 30, 1785, to Lewis Thomas Watson of Lees Court, Kent. Watson was descended collaterally from the Earls of Rockingham, and his mother had been a granddaughter of the second Duke of Rutland and a daughter of Henry Pelham, a former prime minister. The young couple’s prospects were good. The first of their four sons was born in 1792, and in 1795 Lewis Watson succeeded his father as second Baron Sandes of Lees Court and of Rockingham Castle, Northamptonshire. He died in 1806. Three years later, Lady Sandes married Brigadier General Sir Henry Tucker Montresor. She died in Kent on September 29, 1818.

Mrs. Watson is well and simply dressed, with a black ribbon around her neck, a lace-trimmed shawl, and a cap under a large beribboned hat with a veil. The jewels on her bodice match her tightly wrapped sash. The muslin dress with a falling collar and a fichu, popular at the French court from about 1785, had been immediately adopted and modified by fashionable Englishwomen. Although the silhouette was supposed to be soft and natural to go with the masses of frizzed and powdered hair then in favor, the sitter here shows her small waist.

Reynolds charged one hundred guineas, his standard price from 1782 on for a fifty-by-forty-inch half-length, for each of two portraits of Mrs. Watson. She sat for the artist seven times in March 1789 and twice in May. A fifty-guinea payment is recorded in March and another in July 1789. In May 1789 there was another payment in the same amount, for a “copy,” which was “paid by Mr. Milles,” and a like sum in July of that year under the heading “Mrs. Watson; given to Mr. Mills.” Watson or his father must have commissioned the first portrait. Before it was finished, a copy (we would call it a replica) was ordered for or by the sitter’s father, Richard Milles, although it is unclear who paid for it. That the second picture was in great part if not entirely by Reynolds is indicated by the fact that he asked the same amount for it. Were the copy to have been painted by one of his assistants, the buyer would have been charged half, but even so, it should not be assumed that the draperies and the background in either picture were painted entirely by the artist himself.

Reynolds sent the first version to the Royal Academy in the latter half of May 1789. In the first edition of the catalogue it was listed in error as Portrait of a Gentleman, a mistake later corrected to Portrait of a Lady (sitters other than royalty and a few prominent persons were not named, though their identity was usually known). The version still at Rockingham Castle (fig. 66) is
The registry entry for Georgiana Elliott’s christening at St. Marylebone Church on July 30, 1782, states that Georgiana Augusta Frederica Elliott, daughter of His Royal Highness George, Prince of Wales, and Grace Elliott (see no. 45), was born on March 30 of that year. While it is possible that Georgiana was the prince’s daughter, she was raised in the Cholmondeley family, and her father may instead have been George James Cholmondeley, fourth Earl and later first Marquess, who was among the several people present at her baptism. When a child, she was known as Miss Elliott, and as such she apparently sat for Reynolds in March 1784, just before her second birthday. Later she took the name Seymour. She married on September 21, 1808, Lord William Charles Augustus Cavendish-Bentinck, third son of the third Duke of Portland, and died five years later at thirty-one. The couple had a daughter, Georgiana Augusta Frederica Bentinck, or Cavendish-Bentinck, who died unmarried.

The picture was introduced into the literature by Graves and Cronin in 1901 as the portrait of Miss Elliott that Reynolds painted in 1784. According to their text, the third Marquess of Cholmondeley, writing in 1874, thought that his late brother had “had charge of it until Miss Bentinck had her house in Chester.” It is unlikely that the Cholmondeleys and later the sitter’s daughter would have owned a copy, but ninety years passed before this work, presumed to be the same, turned up in the collection of Morris Jesup. No other versions are known.

In the present canvas the modeling of the child’s arms and hands is weak, and the dead coloring of the shadows is bright blue, though the effect must now be bluer than the artist intended. Conservator Charlotte Hale notes that the combination of abrasion of the overlying paint of the flesh tones and dress with the increased transparency of the oil paint over time has exaggerated the underlying hue. Blue shadows were added to the fichu as part of the final paint layers; however, as there is evidence that the fichu was originally pinker (a red lake seems to have faded, a feature not uncommon in Reynolds’s work), this would have provided a warm counterpoint.

There is new evidence in the form of an X-radiograph that shows a major change from what must have been the artist’s original

presumed to be the first, while that at the Metropolitan Museum, having changed hands a number of times and having been acquired through the trade, is thought to be the second. This is probably—but not certainly—the case. Richard Milles’s picture reverted through his only daughter to her sons, the third and fourth Barons Sondes, who would have owned both. How then is it possible to determine, other than on grounds of quality, if at all, which is which?


2. The appointments for (nine) sittings for Mrs. Watson were on March 18, 19, 20, 23, 25, 27, and 28; and on May 13 and 18.

SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS AND WORKSHOP

36. Georgiana Augusta Frederica Elliott

Oil on canvas, 35 x 30 in. (88.9 x 76.2 cm) Bequest of Maria DeWitt Jesup, from the collection of her husband, Morris K. Jesup, 1914 (55.30.98)

Ex coll.: George Horatio Cholmondeley, and Marquess of Cholmondeley; Georgiana Augusta Frederica Bentinck, Chester (d. 1833); Morris K. Jesup, New York (by 1901–d. 1908); Maria DeWitt (Mrs. Morris K.) Jesup, New York (1908–d. 1914)

Selected exhibition: Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1785, no. 423 (as A little girl)


Fig. 66. Sir Joshua Reynolds, Mary Watson (née Milles), Wife of Lewis Thomas Watson, Later 2nd Lord Sondes. Oil on canvas, 50 x 40½ in. (127 x 102.9 cm). Collection of James Saunders Watson, Rockingham Castle
conception (fig. 67). At first the child wore a hat with a wide, stiff brim that was tied under the chin and decorated around the crown with large bows. The X-radiograph also reveals indications of different clothing: what appears to be a cloak, with a slightly narrower contour on the right. Deep black paint from the original hat and cloak show through cracks in the surface. In addition, the position of the eyes was shifted slightly; the gaze originally seems to have been lower and a little more to the right. The surface suffered severe damage in an old relining. The distinction between a portrait of this sort and Reynolds's subject pictures is a very fine one, and the subject pictures vary tremendously in quality. Many of them must involve workshop intervention. Martin Postle, who knows them best, is unwilling to state that this picture is not by Reynolds.


4. The X-radiograph was made by Charlotte Hale in March 2009.

5. Postle recently stated that he "could not exclude Reynolds."

**Workshop of Sir Joshua Reynolds**

37. Mrs. George Baldwin

Oil on canvas, 36 1/8 x 29 1/8 in. (91.8 x 74 cm)
Gift of William T. Blodgett and his sister Eleanor Blodgett, in memory of their father, William T. Blodgett, one of the founders of the Museum, 1906 (66.1141)

Ex coll.: Earl of Charlemont; William T. Blodgett, Paris and New York (by 1874–d. 1879); Mrs. William T. Blodgett, New York (from 1879); William T. and Eleanor Blodgett, New York (until 1906)


Jane Maltass, daughter of a merchant of the Levant Company, was born at Smyrna in Ottoman Turkey in 1765. She married George Baldwin, a merchant of Alexandria, who later became the British consul there. Mrs. Baldwin sat for Reynolds in London in February and March of 1782. One of two versions of her portrait, presumably the one now at Bowood in Wiltshire, was exhibited at the Royal Academy that year as number 159, Portrait of a Grecian lady. Both were in the artist’s studio at the time of his death, and this bust-length copy, which employs the same palette, was probably painted there as well, by an assistant.

George Stubbs

Born Liverpool, August 25, 1724; died London, July 10, 1806

Stubbs, the son of a Liverpool currier, was a self-taught painter, draftsman, and printmaker. In the late 1740s, he studied anatomy at York County Hospital and prepared, from his own sketches, eighteen etchings illustrating Dr. John Burton’s Essay towards a Complete New System of Midwifery, published in 1751. Stubbs made a brief visit to Rome in the spring of 1754. Some two years later, in the remote village of Horkstow, he began the defining project of his career: meticulously dissecting the carcasses of horses and drawing their anatomy with skill and elegance. While he himself was probably hardened to the work by his exposure to tanneries as a child, he perhaps settled in Horkstow to escape the hostile attention that his dissecting activities might have attracted elsewhere. The forty-two magnificent sheets that survive from this endeavor belong now to the Royal Academy, London.

About 1759 Stubbs moved to London, taking with him the anatomical studies of the horse, which he showed to potential patrons and which must have won him his first major commission, from the third Duke of Richmond, for three large sporting canvases to be painted at Goodwood in Sussex, where they still are. The pictures include fine portraits of the duke’s family, friends, and staff—as was typical, Stubbs had begun his career as a portraitist—as well as views of the duke’s property. Richmond belonged to a group of Whig aristocrats, upon whose favor the artist’s future would depend. Among these was the second Marquess of Rockingham, a wealthy and influential Whig who became prime minister. Stubbs’s work for the marquess included Whistlejacket (National Gallery, London) and Horse Attacked by a Lion of 1762 (Yale Center for British Art, New Haven), as original in conception as they are monumental in scale. Stubbs himself prepared the plates for his Anatomy of the Horse, which was published in 1766 at a price of five guineas and remained in print until the mid-nineteenth century. From 1761 until 1774, he exhibited each year at London’s Society of Artists; thereafter, until 1803, he showed less regularly at the Royal Academy.

Elected an academician in 1781, Stubbs declined to submit a diploma piece and remained an associate. In the 1770s he experimented with painting in wax on panel and in 1781 exhibited an enamel painting on a ceramic tablet supplied by Josiah Wedgwood. With his representations of wild animals in combat and with such mythological subjects as Phaeton and the Horses of the Sun (The National Trust, Saltram), Stubbs aspired to the realm of history painting. Some of his pictures of exotic creatures suggest a touching awareness of their rarity and uniqueness. Having worked for the last several years of his life on studies of comparative anatomy, Stubbs died, a solitary figure, at eighty-one. In time he passed into the oblivion then accords to sporting artists. He returned to the public eye and interest in the second half of the twentieth century on account of the scholarship of Basil Taylor and Judy Egerton and the enthusiasm of Paul Mellon, whose collection of Stubbs’s work was given in great part to the Yale Center for British Art.

38. The Third Duke of Dorset’s Hunter with a Groom and a Dog

Oil on canvas, 40 x 49 1/4 in. (101.6 x 126.4 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): Geo. Stubbs / pinxit. 1768
Bequest of Mrs. Paul Moore, 1980 (1980.468)

Ex coll.: John Frederick Sackville, 3rd Duke of Dorset, Knole (until d. 1799; invs., 1778, 1799); the Sackville and Sackville-West family, Knole (1799–1928; invs., 1828, 1863); Charles John Sackville-West, later 4th Baron Sackville, Knole (from 1928); Mrs. William H. Moore; Mr. and Mrs. Paul Moore, New York, and Convent, New Jersey (until his d. 1959); Mrs. Paul (Fannie H.) Moore, Convent, New Jersey (1959–d. 1980)


This painting of a bay hunting horse was given to John Frederick Sackville, who in 1769 at twenty-three became the third Duke of Dorset, heir to the family fortune and the family seat, Knole, at Sevenoaks, Kent. The third Duke was a courtier, diplomat, and philanderer whose sporting passion was cricket. In a 1788 inventory of his belongings at Knole, the picture is listed as “A Horse and Groom—Stubbs 1768 / a present.” Unfortunately, by that time, nobody remembered who had given it to him. The groom is in livery, and at his knee is a dog of indeterminate breed with curly hair and white markings, wearing a fine collar. While the canvas dates to the artist’s mature and most inventive period, Stubbs employed a standard format, somewhat in the manner of James Seymour, the leading horse painter of the previous generation. Stubbs’s landscape backgrounds vary from the specific to the Romantic; in the present case, Judy Egerton presumed that the setting is Knole. The thick tree trunk arching over
the composition at left and the outsize burdock leaves in the right foreground are typical for this date, while the horse is unusually small in relation to the setting, considering that the picture is in essence an animal portrait. The handling of the sky and the dappled light in the foreground and middle distance contribute much to the quality of the picture, the state of which is quite good for a work by Stubbs.

1. This information, in the form of notes from Knole inventories, was supplied to Judy Egerton by Alistair Laing of the National Trust, London, at her request, and was first published in 2007.
Francis Cotes
Born London, May 20, 1726; died Richmond (London), July 19, 1770

The son of a prominent apothecary and the older brother of Samuel Cotes, the miniaturist, Francis Cotes was born in the Strand on May 20, 1726. According to Horace Walpole, he studied with George Knapt. Cotes was skilled in the materials and techniques of pastel and became one of England’s most gifted practitioners in this intimate, spontaneous, and demanding medium. His earliest dated pastels are from 1747; by 1752 he was offering for sale prints that he had commissioned after his pastel portraits of well-known sitters. In 1753 he was painting in oils, which from 1757 on outnumbered his pastels. Cotes exhibited works in both media at the Society of Artists between 1760, the year of its inauguration, and 1768. Striving to compete with Reynolds, Cotes was successful enough by 1763 to buy the lease of a large house in fashionable Cavendish Square. He employed Peter Toms as a drapery painter (Reynolds had employed Toms as well) and took in pupils, notably John Russell. Cotes’s prices in the last ten years of his life were between those of Reynolds and Gainsborough. In 1767 he painted the pastel Queen Charlotte and the Princess Royal (Royal Collection), and in 1768 he was among four petitioners who brought to George III the proposal, which the king accepted, to establish the Royal Academy. Cotes showed eighteen portraits at the first two exhibitions of the Royal Academy and was at the peak of his fame when, in 1770, he took a medicine that was supposed to cure him of stones in his kidney or gall bladder but instead killed him at the age of forty-four.

Selected References

39. Admiral Harry Paulet, Sixth Duke of Bolton
Oil on canvas, 50 x 40 in. (127 x 101.6 cm)
Inscribed: (on verso) Harry 6th and last Duke of Bolton / Grandfather of Viscountess Templetown; (printed label, on stretcher) This, by the Will of the Right Honble Henr[y] / Montagu Viscount Templetown, deceased, is given in / the way of an Heirloom, with Castle Upton, in Ireland. / June 1863. Bequest of Jacob Ruppert, 1939 (39.65.1)

Ex coll.: Harry Paulet, 6th Duke of Bolton (until d. 1794); Lady Mary Montagu, later Viscountess Templetown (1794–d. 1824); Henry Montagu Upton, 2nd Viscount Templetown, Castle Upton, County Antrim (1824–d. 1863); George Frederick Upton, 3rd Viscount Templetown, Castle Upton (from 1863); Arthur Sanderson, Edinburgh; [Tooth, London, 1917; sold to Knoedler]; [Knoedler, New York, 1917–18; sold to Scott & Fowles]; [Scott & Fowles, New York, 1918–20; sold to Ruppert]; Colonel Jacob Ruppert, New York and Garrison, New York (1930–d. 1939)


The second son of the fourth Duke of Bolton, Harry Paulet, or Powlett, born November 6, 1720, entered upon a naval career. In 1740 he was promoted to the rank of captain of the Port Mahon, a ship lying off Cadiz. Quarrelsome and litigious from an early age, Paulet was unfavourably depicted in 1748 as Captain Whiffle in Tobias Smollett’s novel The Adventures of Roderick Random:

Our new commander came on board, in a ten-o’ar’d barge, overshadowed with a vast umbrella... being a tall, thin, young man, dressed in this manner; a white hat garnished with a red feather, adorned his head, from whence his hair flowed down upon his shoulders, in ringlets tied behind with a ribbon. — His coat, consisting of pink-coloured silk, lined with white, by the elegance of the cut retired backward, as it were, to discover a white satin waistcoat embroidered with gold.... The knees of his crimson velvet britches scarce descended so low as to meet his silk stockings, which rose without spot or wrinkle on his meagre legs, from shoes of blue Meroquin, studded with diamond buckles. ... In this garb, captain Whiffle, for that was his name, took possession of the ship, surrounded with a crowd of attendants... and the air was so impregnated with perfumes, that one may venture to affirm the climate of Arabia Felix was not half so sweet-scented.

Walpole noted in brief that he was silly, brutal, and proud.

Captain Paulet was appointed in 1755 to the Barfleur, of eighty guns, attached to the fleet commanded by Admiral Sir Edward Hawke. In the course of a cruise Paulet was ordered to chase a ship that had been sighted. He lost contact with the fleet, and, having been informed by his carpenter that the sternpost of his vessel was loose, returned to Spithead. A court-martial demonstrated that the carpenter had exaggerated, and Paulet was acquitted of the charge of unjustifiably

Fig. 68. James Watson, after Reynolds, Sr. George Bridges Rodney, Rear Admiral of the Blue, 1780. Mezzotint, 6 1/2 x 4 7/8 in. (16.4 x 12.5 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Bequest of Charles Allen Munn, 1924 (24.90.746)
returning to port, but he was admonished for separating from the fleet and thereafter was referred to mockingly as Captain Sternpost. He advanced nonetheless: named rear admiral of the White Squadron in 1756, he attained the rank of vice admiral of the White in 1775.

Paulet’s first wife died in 1764, and a year later he married Katharine, younger sister of the first Earl of Lonsdale; there were no sons of either marriage. When, on July 5, 1765, Paulet’s elder brother shot himself, the admiral succeeded as sixth Duke of Bolton. He died at Hackwood Park in 1794. Paulet’s eldest daughter married the fifth Earl of Sandwich and was the mother of the Viscountess Templeton mentioned in the label on the reverse.

Cotes, who painted in oils principally in the 1760s, was influenced by and tried to compete with Reynolds. An engraving by James Watson (later reproduced as a mezzotint, fig. 68) of Reynolds’s 1761 portrait of Admiral George Bridges Rodney was shown at the Society of Artists in 1762, and Edward Mead Johnson suggested that Cotes, who was also exhibiting, saw Watson’s print and adopted Reynolds’s composition for this work. While there may be a connection, the formula had been popular since the seventeenth century. Perhaps Paulet commissioned the portrait to celebrate his second marriage or his succession to the title, both in 1765. Cotes underpainted but never completed the face, yet the sitter apparently accepted the canvas. The outlines are carefully delineated, as was Cotes’s practice, while the chalky colors read well from a distance. Typical also are the legibility and fine handling of the lace, buttons, and gold braid of the sitter’s splendid uniform.

1. Knoodler’s supplied the further provenance by telephone in 1986.
2. While there are discrepancies in the various genealogical records, where his birth date is also given as 1719, the details of Paulet’s naval career were confirmed by Stephen Wood of the Scottish United Services Museum, Edinburgh Castle, in a letter of 1998.

Thomas Gainsborough
Baptized Sudbury, Suffolk, May 14, 1727; died London, August 2, 1788

Gainsborough, the son of a tradesman, was probably born in a small town near the North Sea coast. About 1740 he traveled to London, where he may have trained with the French émigré printmaker Hubert François Gravelot and with Francis Hayman, artist and illustrator. It has been suggested that he assisted with the decoration of the supper boxes in the Vauxhall pleasure gardens. In 1746 Gainsborough married Margaret Burr, an illegitimate daughter of Henry Somerset, third Duke of Beaufort. The annuity of two hundred pounds that she had received upon her father’s death earlier the same year was to give the couple a large steady income. Having set up on his own in London, Gainsborough failed to make a career as a painter of landscapes, a genre for which there was little or no market at the time. In 1749, therefore, he took his wife back to his native Sudbury, where the couple’s daughters, Mary and Margaret, were born in 1750 and 1751. Gainsborough’s commissioned work in Sudbury principally comprised small portraits; in search of additional clients, he moved his family to nearby Ipswich in 1752.

Despite his prodigious natural ability, Gainsborough achieved limited success until, in the autumn of 1758, he settled in the fashionable West Country spa town of Bath, where he painted dazzling portraits to the scale of life for the first time. From 1761 he sent these portraits to the exhibitions of the Society of Artists, while from 1769 until 1784 he exhibited intermittently at the Royal Academy, of which he was a founder member. In 1774 Gainsborough moved permanently to London and settled at Schomberg House in Pall Mall, numbering among his clients members of the royal family, aristocrats, actresses, and musicians. Equally gifted as a landscape and portrait painter, the artist devised a particular kind of genre scene, known at the time as a fancy picture. Gainsborough was a prolific draftsman, an occasional printmaker, and an able amateur musician. His surviving letters, of which there are a significant number, indicate that he was shrewd, witty, and observant and suggest something of his moody and complex character.

Selected References

40. Mrs. Ralph Izard
Oil on canvas, oval, 30 1/4 × 25 1/4 in. (76.8 × 63.8 cm)
Inscribed (on verso): Mrs. Alice Izard / formerly Alice Delancey / painted in London / by / Gainsborough / 1772
Bequest of Jeanne King deRham, in memory of her father, David H. King Jr., 1966 (66.88.i)
Ex coll.: Ralph Izard, London and Charleston (until d. 1804); Mrs. Ralph Izard, Charleston and Philadelphia (1804–d. 1812); Mrs. Allen (Anne Izard) Deas, New York (1812–d. 1865); Mrs. Robert (Charlotte Deas) Watts, New York (1865–d. 1868); Dr. Robert Watts, New York (1868–at least 1912; sold to King); David H. King Jr., New York (until d. 1916); Jeanne King deRham, New York (1916–d. 1966)

Presuming that the inscription on the reverse of the canvas is correct—and there is no reason to think that it is not—Gainsborough painted this portrait of Alice De Lancey Izard in 1772, in Bath, a couple of years before he moved permanently to London.2 Mrs. Izard came from Westchester, New York, was probably in her mid-twenties, and had excellent loyalist credentials: Cadwallader Colden, her grandfather, and James
De Lancey, her uncle, had both been loyalist lieutenant governors of New York. On May 1, 1767, in New York City, she had married Ralph Izard, only surviving son and heir of Henry Izard, of The Elms, Goose Creek, a plantation near Charleston, South Carolina. Born in 1742 and a wealthy orphan, Ralph had been educated from the age of twelve in England, at Hackney, Eton, and Cambridge. He returned to Charleston in 1764 and lived principally at his plantation until 1771, when he and his wife settled in a house he bought on Berners Street, London. In 1774 and 1775 the Izards traveled on the Continent, and in 1777 the family moved to Paris for the duration of the Revolutionary War. Alice Izard remained there until 1784, when she went back to The Elms and gave birth to her fourteenth and last child. Her husband became a United States senator. After his death, she moved to Philadelphia, where she died in 1832.

Mrs. Izard wears a lace fichu under a gown wrapped at the waist and fastened with a sash, a pearl necklace, and a corsage of a pink rose with its foliage. Her hair, dressed high with pearls, is un powdered. The costume is typical of Gainsborough’s portraits at that date.3 The sitter’s unsimiling face is sober, her glance direct. There are some preliminary indications of the contours of the shoulders, sketched in white on the colored ground.

Various American portraits of members of Alice Izard’s family belong to the Metropolitan Museum, including two of her mother, Elizabeth, a canvas by Matthew Pratt (fig. 69) and a miniature by George Engleheart (fig. 70), as well as a pair of portraits of her grandparents Mr. and Mrs. Cadwallader Colden by John Wollaston.4

In 1933 Ellis Waterhouse, in his preliminary checklist, mentioned for the first time a portrait of Mrs. Izard by Gainsborough that was referred to in her husband’s will of 1800 and that was said to have been destroyed in a fire in California. The work presumed destroyed descended to Mrs. Henry Fulton of New York, to whom it belonged in 1878; it was (and still is) untraced.5 It seems likely to have been one of several copies, for which the family had a predilection. Three others are known: an oval canvas of the same size as the present work, which once was ascribed to John Singleton Copley; a rectangular canvas with a feigned oval, also the same size, by the Charleston artist Charles Fraser; and a late nineteenth-century pastel. An engraving in which the composition was extended to show the sitter with a basket of flowers in her left hand also dates to the nineteenth century.6

1. In 1966 a descendant, Mrs. Hugh C. Wallace, supplied details of the previous history of ownership. She remembered seeing the portrait when it was with Dr. Watts, her grandfather.
2. See Angela D. Mack et al., In Pursuit of Refinement: Charlestonians Abroad, 1740–1860, exh. cat., Gibbes Museum of Art (Columbia, S.C., 1999), passim, for portraits of Alice Izard and her husband, including a double portrait of the couple painted in Rome in 1775 by John Singleton Copley, and a miniature of Alice by George Engleheart. This entry is based in great part on Mack’s account in In Pursuit of Refinement, pp. 112–15, no. 11.
3. A similar portrait is that of Mrs. Scoope Egerton, which is said by Ellis Waterhouse to have been painted in 1768; see Waterhouse 1978, p. 66, pl. 106.
5. Waterhouse 1978, p. 61; see also Waterhouse 1978, pp. 75–76. A small photograph is reproduced by Clarence Winthrop Bowen, ed., The History of the Centennial Celebration of the Inauguration of George Washington as First President of the United States (New York, 1892), opp. p. 59, and p. 47814. The work is said to have been inscribed “Mrs. Alice Izard, formerly Alice De Lancey. Painted in London by Gainsborough, 1772.”
6. For the paintings attributed to Copley and by Fraser and the engraving, see Mack et al., In Pursuit of Refinement, pp. 114–15, figs. 73–75.
41. Portrait of a Man

Oil on canvas, 20 1/4 x 24 1/4 in. (74.9 x 61.9 cm)
Bequest of Lillian S. Timken, 1959 (60.71.7)

Ex coll.: Sir Joseph Robinson, Baronet, Cape Town (until 1923; his sale, Christie’s, London, July 6, 1923, no. 8, as General Blyth, for £325 to Knoedler); [Knoedler, New York, and Scott & Fowles, New York, 1923–24, as General Thomas Bligh (1685–1773); sold to Timken]; Mr. and Mrs. William R. Timken, New York (1924–his d. 1949); Lillian S. (Mrs. William R.) Timken, New York (1949–d. 1959)


Selected References: Waterhouse 1953, p. 9; Waterhouse 1958, p. 55, no. 69

The picture was first recorded on the London art market in 1923, when it was offered for sale as a portrait of General Blyth. No trace of such a person having been found, one or the other of the dealers who had the work for sale, probably Knoedler’s, must have decided to identify the sitter as the famous, or infamous, General Thomas
Bligh (or Blighe), who was born in Rathmore, County Meath, in 1685. Bligh, a member of the Irish Parliament from 1715 until his death, was a career officer in the army for forty years, rising to the rank of lieutenant general. In 1758 he accepted command of an expeditionary force that suffered tremendous loss of life on the French coast during what had originally been planned as a siege of St. Malo. He was censured and retired to Ireland, where he died in 1775. The present portrait was painted in the mid-1770s or a little later, to judge by the uniform, and the person represented probably is not a man of more than eighty years, which was a great age in the eighteenth century. If he is neither General Blyth nor General Bligh, then he is simply another retired officer, who shall be nameless.

The sitter’s expression is mild, his gaze distant and unfocused. He wears a traditional powdered wig, a neckcloth and cravat, and a uniform coat with braid, large buttons, and a high collar. Gainsborough often, as here, used a feigned oval for portraits of the smallest of the standard sizes. This could have been a matter of efficiency, as the format limits the scale of the figure and is one in which the hands are normally excluded.

1. Stephen Wood, Keeper, Scottish United Services Museum, Edinburgh Castle, in a letter of 1998, agreed with Ellis Waterhouse (1958) on these points. A portrait by James Latham said to represent General Bligh and presumably painted some fifty years earlier than the present work was sold at Christie’s, London, April 8, 1998, no. 12, ill.

42. Portrait of a Young Woman, Called Miss Sparrow

Oil on canvas, 30¼ × 24¼ in. (76.5 × 62 cm)
Mr. and Mrs. Isaac D. Fletcher Collection, Bequest of Isaac D. Fletcher, 1937 (17.120.224)

Ex coll.: Louis Huth, London (by 1870—at least 1885); Stephen T. Gooden, London, by 1906—at least 1909; Sir George Donaldson, London; Mr. and Mrs. Isaac D. Fletcher, New York (until his d. 1937)


Selected References: Engravings from the Works of Thomas Gainsborough, R.A. [London, ca. 1880], no. 103, ill.; Armstrong 1898, p. 202; Waterhouse 1933, p. 100; Waterhouse 1938, p. 90, no. 626

The portrait, “from the original Picture in the possession of Louis Huth Esq.,” is first recorded as Miss Sparrow in an 1870 engraving by G. H. Every. At least one copy had been titled Miss Sparrow, Duchess of Gloucester, presumably to make it more salable. Nothing is known of a Miss Sparrow in the 1770s, when the present work was painted. Maria Walpole sat for Gainsborough twice, after her first husband’s death in 1763, as the widowed Countess Waldegrave (Los Angeles County Museum of Art), and in the 1770s, as the wife of William Henry, Duke of Gloucester, the younger brother of the future George III, whom she had married in 1766 (fig. 71). The resemblance between the two sitters, if any, is slight.

Miss Sparrow, supposing that it is she, wears an enormous ruby-and-pearl brooch and a tightly draped wrapping gown tied with a sash under a blue coat edged with ermine and trimmed with large pearls. She seems tall because of her sloping shoulders and the towering height of her powdered hair, which is embellished with more pearls and a gauze veil. The rather generic costume is similar to that of Mrs. Thomas Mathews in her portrait of 1772 (fig. 72), but the soft, feathery touch and the pastel palette suggest a somewhat later date. Gainsborough cannot have been unaware that for years, beginning in the late 1750s, Reynolds had often chosen a wrapping gown and a blue ermine-trimmed coat for his sitters (an example of the type, from about 1760, is in this Museum; see no. 27).

Fig. 71. Thomas Gainsborough, Maria Walpole, Duchess of Gloucester. Oil on canvas, 36¼ × 28¼ in. (92.1 × 71.8 cm). Taft Museum of Art, Cincinnati, Ohio, Bequest of Charles Phelps and Anna Sinton Taft (1931.406)

Fig. 72. Thomas Gainsborough, Mrs. Thomas Mathews. Oil on canvas, 30¼ × 23½ in. (76.8 × 64.7 cm). Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Juliana Cheney Edwards Collection (25.113)
43. Lieutenant Colonel Paul Pechell

Oil on canvas, 30 1/2 x 25 1/2 in. (77.5 x 65.8 cm)  
Inscribed (upper left): Sir Paul Pechell Bt./ an Original by Gainsborough  
Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Payne Bingham Jr., 1990 (1990.200)

Ex coll.: Lieutenant Colonel Sir Paul Pechell, 1st Baronet, Paglesham, Essex (probably until d. 1800); Cecil Sebag-Montefiore, Stisted Hall, Braintree, Essex (until 1912; sale, Christie’s, London, July 12, 1922, no. 83, for £5,620 to Colnaghi); [Colnaghi, London, and Knoedler, New York, 1912; sold to Payne]; Colonel Oliver H. Payne, New York (1912–d. 1917); Harry Payne Bingham, New York (1917–d. 1955); Mrs. Harry Payne Bingham, New York (1955–d. 1986); Mr. and Mrs. Harry Payne Bingham Jr., Shaftesbury, Vermont (1986–90)

Selected references: Waterhouse 1953, p. 83;  
Waterhouse 1958, p. 84, no. 139

Paul Pechell, born at Owenstown, County Kildare, in 1724, was the grandson of a Protestant who had fled Montauban for Ireland after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. He married, in 1752, Mary Brooke of Paglesham, Essex. Pechell entered the British army in 1744 as cornet-en-second in the First Regiment of Dragoners, and by 1747 he had become a distinguished officer, serving in Flanders. In 1754 he was gazetted guidon and later captain in the Second Troop of Horse Grenadier Guards; in 1759 he was promoted to major. He appears in the regimental List (Army) as a lieutenant colonel from 1762 until his retirement in 1768, and thereafter, until 1785, in the List of General and Field Officers. He was created a baronet in 1777.¹

For this half-length portrait, Pechell wears a red uniform coat with a high collar and epaulet, probably that of lieutenant colonel of the Second Troop of Horse Grenadier Guards. Ellis Waterhouse dated the Metropolitan Museum’s portrait to the London period, after 1774, and it is difficult to be more precise. The work is in good state, although the varnish is moderately discolored. What seems from photographs to be a replica or a good copy (fig. 73) was sold as by Gainsborough at Christie’s in 1952.²

1. Additional information about Pechell was provided in a letter of 1998 by Stephen Wood, Keeper, Scottish United Services Museum, Edinburgh Castle. Portraits of his son and daughter-in-law by Hoppner are also in the Museum’s collection (nos. 96, 97).
2. Sale, Christie’s, London, December 12, 1952, no. 77, as Gainsborough, Portrait of Sir Paul Pechell, Bart., in scarlet military coat with white vest, powdered hair, for £204.15.0 to Sellesi. The dimensions are more or less the same, 29 by 24 1/2 inches. The New York dealer Newhouse applied for the Board of Trade export license, but unfortunately their records are not available for consultation.

Fig. 73. Thomas Gainsborough,  
Sir Paul Pechell. Oil on canvas, 29 x 24 1/2 in. (73.7 x 62.2 cm). Location unknown
The youngest son of Richard Burney of London and Barborne Lodge, Worcester, C. R. Burney was born in 1747. He was a nephew and pupil of the celebrated musicologist Dr. Charles Burney and, in 1770, married Dr. Burney’s eldest daughter, Esther, called Hetty, whom he had known since childhood. The couple had five sons and three daughters. A composer and virtuoso musician, the younger Burney performed brilliant duets with his wife on two harpsichords. Writing from his home in St. Martin’s Street, Leicester Square, in 1775, Dr. Burney reported that “we had all the great Volk here on Sunday to nothing but Harp Lessons & duets.” His daughter, the diarist Fanny Burney, added that the guest of honor was Count Orlov, lover of Catherine the Great, who desired to “hear Mr Burney & my sister in a Duet before he left England.” C. R. Burney eventually retired to Bath and in 1819 died at nearby Lambridge.

Gainsborough was an able amateur musician with a wide acquaintance in London’s musical circles, and there is every reason to suppose that he knew members of the Burney family. The sitter is shown holding sheet music in this sympathetic portrait. The high collar and large buttons of his coat suggest a date of about 1780. The handling is fluid and assured. The picture had been set into the paneling of an old family house at Woburn Sands, from which it was removed subsequent to the death of Colonel H. E. Burney and sold in 1930 at Christie’s. A drawing of the sitter inscribed “Mr. C R Burney” and traditionally ascribed to his brother, Edward Francisco Burney, belongs to the National Portrait Gallery, London (fig. 74).

---


2. Of thirteen lots from Woburn Sands, most were paintings of family members by Edward Francisco Burney; two other works were attributed to Gainsborough.

---

Fig. 74. Edward Francisco Burney, Charles Rousseau Burney, 1773–80. Watercolor and graphite, 7 × 6 3/4 in. (17.8 × 17.1 cm). National Portrait Gallery, London (1860)
45. Mrs. Grace Dalrymple Elliott

Oil on canvas, 42 1/8 × 60 7/8 in. (107.3 × 154.7 cm)
Bequest of William K. Vanderbilt, 1920 (10.355.1)

Ex coll.: George James Cholmondeley, later 1st
Marquess of Cholmondeley, Houghton Hall, King's
Lynn, Norfolk (until d. 1837); by descent to George
Henry Hugh Cholmondeley, 4th Marquess of
Cholmondeley, Houghton Hall (1884—at least 1885;
sold, probably through an agent, for £70,000 to
Vanderbilt); William K. Vanderbilt, New York
(1886–d. 1910)

Selected Exhibitions: Royal Academy of Arts,
London, 1778, no. 114 (as Portrait of a lady; whole
length); Tate, London, “Thomas Gainsborough,
National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., February
9–May 11, 2003; and Museum of Fine Arts, Boston,
June 9–September 14, 2003, no. 53 (shown in
Washington and Boston only)

Selected References: George Williams
Fulcher, Life of Thomas Gainsborough, R.A., ed. E. S.
Fulcher (London, 1856), p. 218; F. G. Stephens,
Exhibition of the Works of Thomas Gainsborough, R.A., exh.
cat., Grovenor Gallery (London, 1886), p. 38;
Montezuma (pseud.), “My Note Book,” Art Amateur 19,
no. 3 (August 1888), p. 51; Armstrong 1898, pp. 125–135;
Whitely 1915, pp. 154–157, 288, 243; Waterhouse 1955,
p. 293, 114; Waterhouse 1958, p. 66, no. 259, pl. 184;
Malcolm Cormack, The Paintings of Thomas Gainsbor-
ough (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 19, 27–28, 124, pl. 47
(colorpl.); Katharine Baetjer, “British Portraits in
The Metropolitan Museum of Art,” MMA Bulletin, n.s., 57,
no. 1 (Summer 1999), pp. 14, 36–39, colorpl.2; Michael
Business for the Eye” (New Haven, 1999), pp. 96, 277;
pl. 91 (colorpl.); Christine Riding in Thomas Gainsbor-
ough, 1727–1788, ed. Michael Rosenthal and Martin
Myrone, exh. cat., Tate and other venues (London,

When this portrait of a woman in mod-
ern dress was exhibited at the Royal
Academy in April 1778, Gainsborough’s
friend Henry Bate, editor of the London
Morning Post, referred to the sitter as “the
beautiful Mrs. E.” His avid readers knew
her to be Mrs. Elliott (as she signed herself),
demimondaine and divorced wife of the
wealthy and well-placed Scottish physician
Dr. (later Sir) John Eliot. Grace’s parents
separated when she was in her infancy, and
her mother died while Grace was still a
child. She may have attended a convent
school in France (or Flanders) and then
joined her father, the Scottish advocate
Hew Dalrymple, in London. Reportedly she
was seventeen in 1771, when she married the
thirty-five-year-old Dr. Eliot. Her career in
polite society and their unhappy union were
both of short duration. In 1774, Grace’s hus-
band applied to the criminal and ecclesiasti-
courts and to the House of Lords for a
divorce, presenting evidence of her elop-
ment with a young Irish peer who was mar-
rried and the father of several children. Two
years later the divorce was granted with
twelve thousand pounds in damages.

In a letter of June 8, 1774, Horace Walpole
remarked snappishly that although Grace Eliott
had not “married another husband in
[Dr. Eliot’s] lifetime . . . she has eloped with
my Lord Valentia, who has another wife.”
According to one of Grace’s contemporaries,
she was “as rosy as Hebe and as graceful as
Venus.” Striking rather than conventionally
beautiful, she came to be called Dally the
Tall, because of her exceptional height. By
January 27, 1776, the Morning Post was
reporting that “the sentimental Mrs Eliott”
was reported “arm-in-arm with Lord Chol-
mondeley” at a masquerade at the Pantheon
in Oxford Street. They were together until
May 1779:

The separation between Lord C——y and
his beloved Miss D——le was occasioned by
the warmth with which the latter urged the
promise of marriage said to have been made
to her by her noble lover. His lordship hesi-
tated, and she flew into a paroxysm of rage,
ordered post-horses, drove off instantly to
Dover, and crossed the water to seek an
asylum in a cloister.

The journalist’s account, leaving aside the
cloister, could be substantially correct, and
there would seem to be little doubt that
Cholmondeley commissioned this picture.

Grace later returned to London and gave
birth to a child, Georgiana (see no. 36), who
is thought to have been fathered either by
Cholmondeley or, as her mother claimed,
by the Prince of Wales, who was said to
have been beguiled by her beauty. The prince
made no objection when, on July 30, 1782,
the little girl was registered as his daughter
at her baptism at St. Marylebone Church,
London. Georgiana remained with the
Cholmondeleys, while in 1786 Grace settled
more or less permanently in France, becoming
the sometime companion of the duc d’Orléans,
Philippe Égalité. She lived in Paris through the
Terror and described her experiences in

fanciful terms in a manuscript titled Journal
of My Life during the French Revolution,
published in 1819. She died in solitude at Ville
d’Avray on May 15, 1823.

An oval portrait by Gainsborough of
Grace Elliott (fig. 75), exhibited at the Royal
Academy in 1782, may have been commis-
sioned by the Prince of Wales. A very much
more seductive and private image, it descends
in the Cavendish-Bentinck family, was sold
to Duveen’s, and went thence in 1946 to the
Frick Collection.6

The present painting was not shown pub-
lcily between 1778 and 1920, when William
K. Vanderbilt bequeathed it to the Museum.
As far as we have been able to discover, it is
not recorded at Houghton until 1835 and was
known only through John Dean’s reproduc-
tive engraving (fig. 76), published on Janu-
ary 4, 1779. Gainsborough’s style did not
adapt well to mezzotint.7 He was not much
interested in the sort of publicity prints
afforded, and when he abandoned the Royal
Academy in 1784, he probably thought no
more about them as a vehicle for disseminating
his work.

Dean’s engraving is useful because it
records details of the surface that have since
been lost, including a flagstone pavement
and, notably, a burst of light over the trees in
the background that seems to have been a

Fig. 75. Thomas Gainsborough, Grace Dalrymple
Elliott, 1782. Oil on canvas, 30 1/4 × 25 in. (76.5 ×
63.5 cm). The Frick Collection, New York
(46.1.55)
wears little jewelry: gold earrings, bracelets of small pearls, and a black ribbon.

In 1777 Gainsborough had exhibited at the Royal Academy for the first time since moving to London. His star was on the rise, as he showed portraits of the Duke and Duchess of Cumberland that year, of the Duchesses of Cumberland and Gloucester in 1779, of the king and queen in 1781, and of the royal couple and all their children in 1783. He sent two landscapes and eleven portraits in 1778. Character as well as resemblance provoked the interest of both press and public, for three of the ladies he portrayed, those who attracted the most attention, "were not exactly of the first rank in society." Although Bate may have overstated the case when he remarked that Gainsborough’s sitters were mainly filles de joie, a reviewer for the Morning Chronicle made the point that Gainsborough was a favorite among them. The General Evening Post referred specifically to "a striking and beautiful portrait of an unfortunate lady (Miss Da——ple) of whom we may say with Pope: 'If to share some female errors fall / Look on her face and you’ll forget them all.' There was, in short, a prurient interest in those who in eighteenth-century terms had abandoned the path of virtue. A critic for the Public Advertiser put the case even more frankly when he found that the portrait of Grace Elliott exhibited in 1782 was "not a good moral likeness;—the Eyes are too characteristic of her Vocation." Little was left unsaid by her contemporaries.

4. Ibid., p. 209.
5. Ibid., p. 214.
6. The Frick Collection: An Illustrated Catalogue, vol. 1, Bernice Davidson and Edgar Munhall, Paintings: American, British, Dutch, Flemish and German (New York, 1968), pp. 54–57, esp. pp. 56, 57n4, according to which Oliver Millar identified the Frick picture with "a Head of Mrs. Elliott," priced at £510.0.0 in a list of works that Gainsborough painted for the Prince of Wales. For an anonymous portrait that may show Mrs. Elliott, see Alex Kidson, Earlier British Paintings in the Lady Lever Art Gallery (Liverpool, 1999), p. 77, ill.

T

The young Gainsborough first encountered seventeenth-century Dutch landscapes about 1740, when he moved to London. There he recorded his impressions of a painting of a pond and a wood by the Dutch artist Jacob van Ruisdael, which he may have come upon in the London auction rooms, in a finished drawing in black and white chalks (Whitworth Art Gallery, Manchester). He may also have looked at works by Meindert Hobbema. Having tried and failed to establish a practice as a landscape painter in London, Gainsborough had occasion to renew
Fig. 77. Thomas Gainsborough, *Hilly Landscape with Village among Trees*. Black chalk and stump and pale red wash, 11 × 15 in. (27.9 × 38.1 cm). The Corsham Court Collection, Wiltshire
his acquaintance with nature in 1749, when he returned to the Suffolk fields and lanes of his youth. In the 1760s, if not occupied with portrait commissions, he rode among the wooded hills around Bath and visited the great country houses to study the old masters, notably Claude Lorrain and Gaspard Dughet as well as Rubens and Van Dyck. Gainsborough’s landscapes reflect, on the one hand, direct experience of the land and the people who worked it, and, on the other, exposure to the grace and fluency of eighteenth-century French Rococo style and knowledge of seventeenth-century Flemish and Dutch practice.

In the summer of 1783, perhaps suffering from nostalgia for the countryside, Gainsborough wrote of his intention “to visit the Lakes in Cumberland & Westmorland” for the first time. He noted with renewed ambition, “I purpose to mount all the Lakes at the next Exhibition [of the Royal Academy], in the great stile”: that is, he would see the Lake District for himself and thereafter would compose images even more worthy of the example of Gaspard and Claude. In the event, the 1783 tour did enlarge the artist’s vision, enhancing his sense of the picturesque and inspiring his paintings of mountain scenery.

This view, together with a rapid sketch in black chalk and stump and pale red wash that preceded it (fig. 77), would have been made in Gainsborough’s London studio, probably shortly after his return. In the painting he elaborates on the ideas presented in the drawing. He employs traditional compositional devices, notably strong contrasts of light and shade to emphasize the zigzag of the cart track among the swelling hillocks, and introduces traditional staffage: cows, sheep, and donkeys; a dog and a horse-drawn cart; peasants walking and resting by the wayside. Although Gainsborough was not without social conscience, this idyllic landscape displays no awareness of the dire plight of the working poor. The view is imaginary, and the artist focuses on the spiraling diagonal of the cloud banks that follow the contours of the distant mountains, painting broadly in pastel colors so delicate and transparent that they suggest not oil but an aqueous medium.

1. See John Hayes, The Drawings of Thomas Gainsborough (New Haven, 1970), vol. 1, pp. 133-34, no. 80, vol. 2, pl. 248. It is not known whether Gainsborough saw the original or a copy of the Ruysdael painting, which is now in the Musée du Louvre.


47. Queen Charlotte

Oil on canvas, 37 3/4 x 17 1/2 in. (90.3 x 44.5 cm)
The Jules Bache Collection, 1949 (49-733)


Selected Exhibition: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, “The Bache Collection,” June 16-September 30, 1943, no. 56


Queen Charlotte was born on May 19, 1744, and was therefore thirty-eight in September 1782, when the first version of the present portrait (fig. 78) was painted. The daughter of Karl Ludwig Friedrich, Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, she had married, on September 8, 1761, George III of England. At the queen’s command, the couple and their children sat in September and October 1782 for oval bust-lengths by Gainsborough that are still in the Royal Collection at Windsor Castle, where they were painted. The installation of the set at the 1783 Royal Academy exhibition, which Gainsborough stipulated was to be in three rows of five, at eye level, was the cause of the artist’s withdrawal from that institution after the Hanging Committee failed to satisfy his requirements.

The queen seems often to have worn a collar of many strands of small pearls and a pearl brooch, as seen here and in the earlier version. She is rather informally dressed in a black shawl over a gauze fichu and wears a gauze cap loosely draped over her powdered hair. The image has a softness and intimacy that must have contributed to its popularity, and there are many copies, both in large and in miniature. In the first version the face is longer and the sitter looks a little older; in the second, the pigments appear thinner and less varied. The handling is delicate, and the state of preservation is very fine.

Fig. 78. Thomas Gainsborough, Queen Charlotte, 1782. Oil on canvas, oval (painted surface), 37 3/4 x 17 1/2 in. (99.7 x 44.1 cm). The Royal Collection, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II (RCIN 401007)
Eugene (or Eugen) Bolton, brother of the Berlin picture dealer Paul Bottenwieser, bought Gainsborough’s replica from the Waldeck family in 1926 and had it shipped to England, apparently with the intention of selling it there or in America. Bottenwieser acquired the companion portrait of George III two years later, for a much smaller sum. It has since disappeared. The archivist for the princely house could not confirm that the pictures had been a gift from a member of the English royal family, but the fact that they were at Schloss Friedrichstein by 1806, more than a decade before Queen Charlotte’s death in 1818, makes this likely.


3. Copies after one or the other are recorded in the following collections: (1) Victoria and Albert Museum, London; see Connoisseur 89 (May 1931), p. 345, colorpl. opp. p. 291, oval, 28 1/2 x 21 1/2 in.; (2) Sedelmeyer Gallery, Paris; see Illustrated Catalogue of the Seventh Series of Old Masters and Old Paintings by Old Masters of the Dutch, Flemish, Italian, French, and English Schools (Paris, 1910), p. 100, no. 84, pastel, oval, 26 1/2 x 21 1/4 in.; (3) David H. King Jr. (until 1905); his sale, American Art Association, New York, March 31, 1905, no. 20, pastel, oval, 28 1/2 x 23 1/2 in.; and (4) ?C. Bowring-Hanbury (until 1932); sale, Purrick & Simpson, London, May 31, 1932, no. 54, 29 x 24 in.). R. J. B. Walker. The Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century Miniatures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen (Cambridge, 1992), p. 84, lists miniature copies by Bowyer, Collins, Cross, Grimaldi, Hurter, and Anne Mee and an enamel by Bone.

4. Photocopies of relevant documents from the Waldeckisches Hausarchiv, housed at the Hessisches Staatsarchiv Marburg and dating from August 25, 1925, through March 17, 1928, have been provided through the good offices of Cecilia Fürst zu Waldeck. I am grateful to her and also to Drs. B. Woederlandink of the Stichting Historische Verzamelingen van het Huis Oranje-Nassau and Greetje C. Dullaart of the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie. The quality of the portrait of George III, which sold to Bottenwieser for RM5,000, was perhaps reflected in the price.

48. Mrs. William Tennant

Oil on canvas, 49 1/2 x 40 in. (126.1 x 101.6 cm) Fletcher Fund, 1945 (45.59.1)

Ex coll.: Major William Tennant, Little Aston Hall, Staffordshire (until 1802); William Tennant, Little Aston Hall (1803–1813); William Tennant, Little Aston Hall (1815–1848); Captain Charles Edmund Tennant, Needwood House, Staffordshire (1848–1862); Major Charles Richard Tennant, Needwood House and St. Anne’s Manor, Sutton, Loughborough, Nottinghamshire (from 1862); sold to Wertheimer; [Charles Wertheimer, London, until 1902; sold for £50,000 to Morgan]; J. Pierpont Morgan, London and New York (1902–1931); his estate, 1931–17; Mrs. William Pierson (Juliet Morgan) Hamilton (from 1917); [Scott & Fowles, New York, until 1928, sold for $60,000 to Bache]; Jules Bache, New York (1928–1944); his estate, 1944–45; cats., 1929, 1937, no. 56, 1943, no. 55; sold to MMA


M ary Wylde was the daughter of the Reverend John Wylde of Belbroughton, Worcestershire, who from 1766 until 1778 was rector of Aldridge in the West Midlands. In 1777 she married, as his first wife, William Tennant of Little Aston Hall and Shenstone, Staffordshire. Their only son, William, was born in 1783. The portrait of Mrs. Tennant and that of her husband (fig. 79) were painted in the mid-1780s, when Tennant was a major in the Staffordshire militia. Mrs. Tennant died in London in 1798 and is buried at Shenstone. The sitters are impassive. They face in the same direction, each has a black hat as an accessory, and each poses before a screen of foliage open to the sky at left. A sense of character is wanting in both.

The condition of our picture is compromised. The surface was flattened in the relining process. An extensive network of drying cracks over much of the surface is less evident in the landscape at the upper left, which is well preserved. The black hat and plume are difficult to read, and there are three old compound tears: through the top of the sitter’s wig; in her sleeve, near the right edge of the canvas; and in the lower right corner.

1. C. R. Tennant, born in 1831, succeeded at eleven, and it is likely that he owned the picture for years thereafter.


Fig. 79. Thomas Gainsborough, Major William Tennant. Oil on canvas, 52 x 42 in. (132.1 x 106.7 cm). The Forbes-Leith Collection, Fyvie Castle
Cottage Children (The Wood Gatherers)

Oil on canvas, 58/8 x 47/6 in. (147.6 x 120.3 cm)
Bequest of Mary Stillman Harkness, 1950 (50.145.17)

EX COLL.: Henry Herbert, Lord Porchester, later 1st Earl of Carnarvon, Highburgh, Hampshire (until d. 1811); by descent to Henry George Albert Herbert, 6th Earl of Carnarvon, Highburgh (from 1931); [Sulley, London, until 1924; sold to Knoedler; Knoedler, New York, 1924; sold to Harkness]; Edward S. Harkness, New York (1924–d. 1940); Mary Stillman (Mrs. Edward S.) Harkness, New York (1940–d. 1950)


In November 1787, after a visit to Gainsborough’s studio, Henry Bate described the present work, which had already been exhibited in Liverpool and sold to Lord Porchester, in the following terms:

A landscape of uncommon merit has been painted lately by Mr. Gainsborough. It is a picturesque scene, and although limited in extent of country is beautifully romantic. It contains a rustic history that cannot fail to impart delight to every beholder. Three peasant children are introduced; one of them, a young girl, has an infant brother in her arms; the other, a little boy of about six years, appears to have been engaged in the task of collecting the broken branches of trees for firewood. . . . A pastoral innocence and native sensibility give inexpressible beauty to these charming little objects. They cannot be viewed without the sensations of tenderness and pleasure, and an interest for their humble fate.

Bate thought of the canvas as a landscape, despite the fact that the artist had shown it under the title Cottage Children. Although the figures—as large as life, large enough to be sitters for a portrait—now seem to us to have been Gainsborough’s principal concern, for the critic they were so many rustic additions, however appealing. Bate also observed that the model for an earlier picture of the same kind, Cottage Girl with Dog and Pitcher (National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin), was a peasant whom Gainsborough had met in Richmond, where he also came upon the beggar boy Jack Hill, pictured here barefoot and seated on a knoll. Alluding to the children’s “humble fate,” the critic elicits sympathy, or empathy, but also delights in the presence of such “charming little objects.”

In the mid-nineteenth century, William Hazlitt reports that Gainsborough was chiefly famous for such works, which were known as fancy pieces. This is the way Hazlitt saw them:

These have often great truth, great sweetness, and the subjects are generally chosen with great felicity. We too often find, however, in his happiest efforts, a consciousness in the turn of the limbs, and a pensive languor in the expression, which is not taken from nature. I think the gloss of art is never so ill-bestowed as on such subjects, the essence of which is simplicity.

While Bate found the painting natural and Hazlitt sensed a strain of artificiality, F. G. Stephens, writing in the catalogue of the 1885 Grosvenor Gallery exhibition, suggested that the work was a disguised portrait, identifying the children as Charles Marsham, later Earl of Romney, and two of his sisters. The second Earl, born in 1777, did have two sisters, but the source for this highly improbable suggestion is not disclosed, and no other young notable has been proposed as a sitter for a fancy piece.

Ellis Waterhouse, the first modern critic to come to grips with Gainsborough’s new picture type, points out that he was inspired by Murillo and preceded in a single instance by Reynolds, who exhibited A Beggar Boy and His Sister (Faringdon Collection Trust, Buscot Park) at the Royal Academy in 1775. Gainsborough’s paintings in the new genre were consistent in style, and they were immediately judged praiseworthy by his clients and valued higher than any of his other work. Perhaps the artist devised the fancy pictures to make his landscapes more desirable by joining them with large-scale figures.

Having enjoyed high praise, and high value, when they were first painted, the fancy pictures gradually fell from favor with audiences who found them sentimental, lugubrious, and perhaps condescending. Lately there has been a shift in the scholarly literature, and they have been read as a commentary on the poverty and pious industry of the landless poor. While this must in a sense be so, earlier writings indicate that until recently such a response was largely subliminal.

Gainsborough made some fine drawings of peasants in the 1780s, one of which, while not a study for the present painting, relates closely to it (fig. 80). The directness and...
simplicity of this closely observed, unsentimental study did not translate into the finished work. An engraver’s version (fig. 81) of the painting, now thought to be by Gainsborough Dupont, may have been made in preparation for a contemporary print that was never executed; another replica (location unknown) was in Dupont’s estate.  

50. A Boy with a Cat—Morning

Oil on canvas, 59⅞ x 47⅜ in. (151.5 x 120.7 cm)  
Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889 (89.15.8)

Ex coll.: the artist (until d. 1788; his estate, 1788–at least 1799; his estate sale, Schomberg House, London, March 30–May 11, 1789, no. 51, as A Boy with a Cat—morning, for 50 gns., unsold); Richard Brinsley Sheridan, London (by 1817–at least 1824; [his] sale, Peter Cooke, London, October 6, 1823, no. 3, as The Girl and Cat, in a landscape, bought in); Alexander Copland (until 1816; his posthumous sale, Christie’s, London, March 12, 1836, no. 45, as A peasant girl with a cat, in a landscape, for £156.10.0 to Seguier); [William Seguier, London, from 1836]; Sir William W. Gonton, 2nd Baronet, Blendworth Lodge, Hampshire (by 1845–d. 1885; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, May 23, 1885, no. 460, as A Child with a Cat— evening, for £100.5.0 to Colnaghi); [Colnaghi, London, from 1885]; Sir Francis Bolton (until d. 1887; his estate, 1887–88; sold through Philip Scratchley for £2,000 to Marquand); Henry G. Marquand, New York (1888–89)


This work and its pendant, *A Boy at a Cottage Fire and a Girl Eating Milk*, were both in Gainsborough’s studio at his death in the summer of 1788 and remained together until after the Knighton sale of 1885, when the companion piece disappeared. It is not clear whether the artist thought of them as two morning scenes, or as a morning and an evening, as the titles are not parallel. According to William Whitley, Gainsborough was working on *A Boy at a Cottage Fire* in December 1785, and the principal figure in both pictures was “the Richmond child, Jack Hill, whom Gainsborough painted several times, and whom his daughter is said to have wished to adopt.” The picture that is presumed lost was the more popular of the two with Gainsborough’s audience but seems to have suffered an unhappy fate. In 1829, forty years after Gainsborough’s death, it was said to have been in very poor state, “cracked and split to pieces, but filled up, repaired, and daubed all over” by the artist’s contemporary and sometime follower William Bigg, R.A. Smaller replicas of both (locations unknown), probably by Gainsborough Dupont, were recorded by George Fulcher in 1856, but neither painting was engraved in the artist’s lifetime. We therefore reproduce Charles Turner’s 1809 mezzotints after both works, which he titled, respectively, *The Little Cottager* (fig. 82) and *Interior of a Cottage* (fig. 83).

The fancy pictures, although not commissioned, were offered for prices higher than portraits. At the end of his life, Gainsborough charged one hundred sixty guineas for a full-length portrait. He received two hundred guineas for *Cottage Girl with Dog and Pitcher* (National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin) in 1785. In the artist’s estate sale, the asking price for *A Boy at a Cottage Fire* was four hundred guineas, and for *A Boy with a Cat*, two hundred fifty guineas, though neither

---

1. The citations in the 1787 Liverpool catalogue do not include dimensions, and there seem to be at least two small replicas. Whitley 1915, p. 894, was the only authority to suggest that a reduction had been exhibited in 1787.
6. This statement may not take proper account of *Margaret Gainsborough Gleaning*, for which see Catherine Asley, Colin Harrison, and Jon Whiteley, eds., *The Ashmolean Museum: Complete Illustrated Catalogue of Paintings* (Oxford, 2004), p. 83, colorpl., and fig. 86 in this volume. For another possible exception, see Waterhouse 1958, p. 103, no. 801, a painting now titled without qualification *Elizabeth and Thomas Linley* by the museum to which it belongs, the Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, in Williamstown, Massachusetts. See www.clarkart.edu (accessed February 8, 2007).
9. For the replica, which was given to the National Gallery in 1847 and transferred to the Tate in 1951, see Martin Davies, *The British School, National Gallery Catalogues* (London, 1946), pp. 56–57, no. 311, who found it “unreasonable to reject the present example”; and Mary Chomot, *The Tate Gallery: British School, a Concise Catalogue* (London, 1953), p. 73, no. 311, where it is listed as by Gainsborough, M. H. Spielmann, “*A Note on Thomas Gainsborough and Gainsborough Dupont,*” *Waalskolle 9* (1915–16 and 1916–17), p. 99, catalogues a replica by Gainsborough Dupont sold at Sudbury, on May 29, 1784, as no. 116: *The Wood Gatherers* (after Gainsborough). Waterhouse, “Fancy Pictures,” “pp. 38–40, held that none of the engraver’s versions he had seen was by Gainsborough himself. In 1868 the painting was engraved in mezzotint by G. H. Every (*Engavings from the Works of Thomas Gainsborough, R.A.* [London, ca. 1880], no. 112, ill.). The Tate replica was engraved by G. B. Shaw.
sold. Ellis Waterhouse thought the discrepancy in the prices might be attributable to the fact that the latter was unfinished, and this does not seem to have been the case.

In Gainsborough’s time, a critic described A Boy with a Cat as “a natural representation, and a picture that will live for ever as a chaste and beautiful effort of the art.”5 Its reputation has suffered since, and with other fancy pictures it has been a source of confusion and disagreement among modern-day writers, who have called it sentimental, soulful, meek, and glum. Certainly its condition is at issue. Gainsborough’s dark pigments have darkened still further in this work, stepping up the contrast with the lighter passages, and there is also a disturbingly widespread network of drying cracks. It is difficult to read and, by 1913, was being treated rather dismissively by the Museum: titled Girl with a Cat, it was reattributed to Gainsborough Dupont.6 For Chauncey Tinker, writing in 1938, the painting showed Gainsborough insisting on the extreme poverty of barefoot children in rags. While benevolence and condescension must have gone hand in hand in late eighteenth-century London, it remains difficult to imagine that the artist himself or his audience thought of the fancy pictures as paintings of children of the poor, although in fact that is what they are.7

Here the child, bemused, scratches his thick mop of unwieldy hair. He has dark deep-set eyes, dark eyebrows, and elegantly shaped nostrils, lips, and chin. His head is large, his arms and legs slender and well formed. He wears a white shift and what seems to be a gauze sash, neither of which is tattered, though his right shoe is either worn, or torn for comfort’s sake, revealing his toes. He is clean, and other than the shoes nothing suggests that he is in need. In a different setting, it might not have been evident that he was (and was intended to be seen as) a peasant. Behind the figure there is a tumble-down fence; beside him to one side, some burdock leaves and a startled cat, and to the other, trees, distant mountains, and a sunrise. Gainsborough is known to have been sympathetic to both children and animals. His longing for country life imbued the landscapes and fancy pictures of his final years with a nostalgic Arcadian beauty and harmony.

1. Whiteley 1915, pp. 292–93. The provenance of the pendant is briefly as follows: the artist’s estate sale, 1789, no. 49, as A Boy at a Cottage Fire, and a Girl Eating Milk; Sheridan sale, 1833, no. 3, as An Interior with Children warming themselves; Copland sale, 1856, no. 44, as Robinetta; interior of a cottage, with two female peasant children before a fire, to Seguier; Knighton sale, 1885, no. 459, as Children by the fire: morning, to Colnaghi. The picture was exhibited in London: British Institution, “Pictures by the Late William Hogarth, Richard Wilson, Thomas Gainsborough, and J. Zoffany,” 1841, no. 52 (as Return from milking, lent by R. B. Sheridan); British Institution, “Pictures by Italian, Spanish, Flemish, Dutch, French, and English Masters,” June 1845, no. 216 (as Cottage Children at a Fire, lent by Sir W. W. Knighton); Royal Academy of Arts, “Works by the Old Masters,” 1883, no. 216 (as Children by the fire: morning, lent by Sir W. W. Knighton). See also “Editorial: Gainsborough’s Collection of Pictures,” Burlington Magazine 84 (May 1944), pp. 107–10.
2. Whiteley 1915, p. 293.
3. For the reduced replicas, see George Williams Fulcher, Life of Thomas Gainsborough, R.A., ed. E. S. Fulcher, 2nd ed. (London, 1856), p. 232. The present canvas was engraved by J. Scott after Charles Turner in 1877 as Autumn. Its pendant was engraved by Scott after Turner the same year and titled Winter (Engravings from the Works of Thomas Gainsborough, R.A. [London, ca. 1880], nos. 110, 125; and Alfred Whitman, Charles Turner, Nineteenth Century Mezzotinters [London, 1907], p. 245, nos. 745, 763).
5. Quoted in Whiteley 1915, p. 293.
6. P. M. Turner, “Pictures of the English School in New York,” Burlington Magazine 22 (February 1913), p. 269, ascribed it to Dupont, mentioning its “heavy and labouring handling and superficial cleverness.” The painting was reattributed to Gainsborough on the advice of W. G. Constable in 1931. See also Le Harivel in Le Harivel, Mulcahy, and Potterton, National Gallery of Ireland, p. 12. Those who did not know the original titles of the paintings and the circumstances of their creation had doubts about the intended sex of the children, and of the models who sat for them.
COPY AFTER THOMAS GAINSBOROUGH

ENGLISH, MID-19TH CENTURY

51. The Painter's Daughter Mary

Oil on canvas, 17 3/4 x 13 3/4 in. (44.8 x 35.2 cm)
Bequest of Maria DeWitt Jesup, from the collection of her husband, Morris K. Jesup, 1914 (55.30.14)

EX COLL.: Morris K. Jesup, New York (until d. 1908); Maria DeWitt (Mrs. Morris K.) Jesup, New York (1908–d. 1944)


Thomas and Margaret Gainsborough's two daughters were born in Sudbury. Mary was baptized on February 3, 1750, and Margaret eighteen months later, on August 22, 1751. Mary was briefly and unhappily married in 1780, soon returning to her parents' house. For the balance of their lives, the two women lived together, with their parents until their father's death in 1788 and their mother's in 1798. Both sisters, but particularly Mary, became increasingly odd, if not mad. The younger died in 1820, the older in 1826.
Gainsborough painted a number of portraits of the girls together when they were young. *The Painter’s Daughters Chasing a Butterfly* (National Gallery, London) may have been left incomplete about 1756, while *Portrait of the Artist’s Daughters* (Worcester Art Museum, Massachusetts), the latest and most formal, has been assigned to about 1763-64. Based on the children’s ages, the three other works, also unfinished, have been dated from about 1758 to the early 1760s and ordered as follows: *The Painter’s Two Daughters* (fig. 84); *The Painter’s Daughters with a Cat* (fig. 85); and a fragmentary picture, *Margaret Gainsborough Gleaning* (fig. 86). The portrait heads in *The Painter’s Two Daughters* were separated in or after 1833 and belonged to different private collectors. The two were then rejoined, probably between 1873 and 1875, by one of the owners, John Foster, and bequeathed by him to the Victoria and Albert Museum. *Margaret Gainsborough Gleaning* also seems to be the surviving half of a double portrait (the other part is known only by report), and, with the former work, is unusual in having formed a diptych, of which the two parts could be separated.

The present painting more or less replicates the portrait of Mary on the left side of the work in the Victoria and Albert. The canvas is slightly larger, but the images could be about the same size. This one differs markedly in that the hatching strokes used by Gainsborough for the preliminary modeling of the Victoria and Albert portrait (and for that in the National Gallery, London) are largely absent. Instead, the flesh and hair are smooth, and the hair less well defined. The skin tones are rosier, the top of the right ear is not as well formed, the right eyebrow is a less interesting and natural shape, and the hair ornament is paler in color. The background here is neutral and does not suggest the out of doors. The highlights that emphasize the profile are largely absent from this work, and the patches of yellow above and below the sitter’s left arm do not appear.

Since 1972, probably on the basis of Ellis Waterhouse’s opinion, the Museum has identified the painting as a copy, but it has been called autograph by Oliver Millar, Malcolm Cormack, and Robert Wark. John Hayes had been inclined to accept it as well, judging from a photograph, but Graham Reynolds identified it as a good copy made while the two halves of the London canvas were separated. This seems the most logical conclusion, as it is impossible to imagine why and for whom Gainsborough would have painted a replica of half of an unfinished family portrait in his own collection.


4. The left half of the painting in the Victoria and Albert measures 40.6 by 39.2 centimeters, assuming that it is half the total width of 80.4 centimeters, a difference in height of 3.2 centimeters.

5. These opinions were given verbally, in 1984, 1978, and 1980, respectively.

Robert Adam
Scottish, born Kirkcaldy, Fife, July 3, 1728; died London, March 3, 1792

James Adam
Scottish, born Edinburgh, July 21, 1732; died London, October 20, 1794

Robert Adam was the son of the architect and landscape designer William Adam. After attending Edinburgh University and training with his father and his elder brother, John, Robert departed in 1754 for Italy; upon his return in 1758 he established an independent architectural practice in London. In 1763 he took into partnership his younger brother, James, who had just returned from three years in Italy. With Robert as the principal designer, the brothers worked together for the rest of their careers, assisted by legions of draftsmen and artisans, including painters such as Antonio Zucchi and Giuseppe Manocchi, much of whose work remains unattributed. In 1760 Robert was elected joint Architect of the King’s Works, a post to which James succeeded in 1769.

Robert Adam is chiefly remembered for remodeling existing buildings and for completing unfinished ones, as well as for his interior decorations. The influence of the Adam Neoclassical style was widespread in England, on the Continent, and in the United States. From February 1755 until May 1757, while living in Rome, Robert Adam traveled, studied, and sketched works of ancient and contemporary art. During his stay, he was guided in his studies principally by Charles Louis Clerisseau, the French architectural draftsman, and by the Roman architect and engraver Giovanni Battista Piranesi. Later, Clerisseau also supervised James’s studies. Both brothers were therefore well versed in the arts of their own time and of the past, and knowledgeable about the evolution of classical style.

Selected References

ADAM PARTNERSHIP

52. Ornamental Painting in Chiaroscuro

Oil on canvas, 60 1/4 x 68 in. (153 x 172.7 cm)
Fletcher Fund, 1960 (60.504)

Ex coll.: George William Coventry, 6th Earl of Coventry, Croome Court, near Worcester (until d. 1809); George William Coventry, 7th Earl of Coventry, Croome Court (from 1809); by descent; Croome Estate Trust, Croome Court (until 1960; sold through Frank Partridge to MMA)


The fitting-up of the Long Gallery at Croome Court, commissioned from Robert Adam by George, sixth Earl of Coventry, was substantially completed in 1765, and the room for which this picture was designed thus became the first to be entirely decorated and furnished by the partnership.1 The layout of the walls shows, the chimneypiece, a square, friezelike composition in the antique taste with an altar at the center flanked on each side by two figures in classical draperies. The composition of the present work is roughly similar, but with six figures instead of four, two of which can be identified. Reclining in the foreground is Abundance, crowned with a leafy wreath and supporting a cornucopia containing fruit, flowers, and a sheaf of grain. The piper behind her, with horns, long, pointed ears, and a goatskin over his shoulder, is Pan. The four other figures offer a sacrifice at the altar. While the modeling of the torsos and arms is competent, the faces are all more or less the same, the composition is unfocused, and the columns in the background are ill proportioned.

The Museum owns but does not exhibit Sefferin Alken’s elegant original painted-pine frame (fig. 88), which is carved with a folded-leaf molding and with honeysuckle in arches separated by husks.2 Eileen Harris notes that Alken’s bill for the frame is dated August 1765. However, she rejects the identification of this canvas with one of two large ornamental paintings in chiaroscuro, described in a payment by the Earl of Coventry to Robert Adam in January 1766, because there was no place in the room for a second work of the kind.3 Perhaps the plurals were simply a clerk’s error, as the description would otherwise suit the present work, which comes from the room (fig. 89).

Fig. 87. Robert Adam, Laid-out Wall Elevations of the Long Gallery at Croome Court, 1765. From Eileen Harris, The Genius of Robert Adam: His Interiors (New Haven, 2001), p. 49. © Published with permission of The Croome Estate Trust
Fig. 88. Robert Adam, designer, and Sefferin Alken, maker, original frame for *Ornamental Painting in Chiaroscuro* (no. 51), 1765–66. Pine, 87 × 86½ in. (221 × 219.7 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fletcher Fund, 1960 (60.50b)

Fig. 89. Robert Adam, *Ornamental Painting in Chiaroscuro* (no. 51), in situ at Croome Court
Thirty years after the Museum acquired the dining room from Lansdowne House in Berkeley Square, this chiaroscuro was bought and installed there, in an original though slightly enlarged plaster surround over the chimneypiece. As the rooms at Croome Court and from Lansdowne House were both painted pale, monochromatic colors, a picture designed for one is quite suitable for the other. In James Parker's opinion, there was no indication that there had ever been a painting in the molding in the Lansdowne Room, though one had been intended.4 Adam reportedly commissioned similar paintings for Shardeloes in Buckinghamshire and Mersham-le-Hatch in Kent.3

Johan Joseph Zoffany

German, born Johannes Josephus Zaussaly, near Frankfurt, March 13, 1733; died London, November 11, 1810

Zoffany grew up in Regensburg, where his father was a court cabinetmaker. In 1750 he traveled to Rome, studying there with Agostino Musacci and Anton Raphael Mengs. In the late 1750s, after a second visit to Rome, he became court painter to the Elector of Trier, for whom he painted decorations illustrating various mythological subjects. Zoffany married and in 1760 moved to England, where he took up portraiture. He met the actor and theater manager David Garrick, who commissioned from him scenes of family life at Garrick's villa in Hampton. The first of Zoffany's canvases representing Garrick in a theatrical role, The Farmer's Return (private collection), was well received at the Society of Artists exhibition in 1762. Setting up a studio in Covent Garden, the artist painted groups and single figures of actors playing their favorite parts, works that brought him a much larger audience when reproduced as mezzotint engravings.

Zoffany was also taken up by George III's prime minister, John Stuart, third Earl of Bute, and was introduced by him to Scottish patrons, including John, third Duke of Atholl, who sat with his wife and seven children (private collection), and Mrs. Richard Oswald (National Gallery, London), wife of a wealthy Scottish merchant. In 1764 Queen Charlotte posed seated before her dressing table with her two oldest sons beside her (Royal Collection), one of the high points in the history of the conversation piece. George III nominated Zoffany to the Royal Academy shortly after it was established in 1768, but the restless artist decided to move to Florence, where, between 1772 and 1777, he completed The Tribuna of the Uffizi (Royal Collection) for Queen Charlotte and found favor with the grand ducal court. In 1778 he moved to Parma and in 1779 back to London. Unable to reestablish himself in the favorable position he had once occupied, he determined to restore his standing by traveling to India, where from 1783 until 1789 he worked principally and with great success in Calcutta. Zoffany returned to London, his powers failing, and in 1800 exhibited at the Royal Academy for the last time.

Selected References


53. The Reverend Philip Cocks

Oil on canvas, 35 1/2 x 27 1/4 in. (90.2 x 69.2 cm)
Gift of Mrs. Henry A. Grunwald, 2006 (2006.66)

Ex coll.: Rev. Philip Cocks (until d. 1797); his niece, Margaret Cocks, later Mrs. Joseph Smith, Shortgrove, Essex (1797–d. 1829); by descent to Joseph Heriz-Smith, Slade Park, Bideford, Devon (by 1920–ca. 1925); sale, Harcombe, Devon, September or December 10, 1929; [Leger, London and New York, 1925–at least 1930]; [Captain Harold Paikin, New York, until 1935]; his estate sale, Parke-Bernet, New York, January 22, 1951, no. 78, for $175; [Colnaghi, London, until 1955]; Ray Livingston Murphy, New York (d. 1955); his estate, 1955–85; his estate sale, Christie's, London, November 22, 1985, no. 81, to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1985–89; sold to Mrs. Grunwald]; Mrs. Henry A. (Louise) Grunwald, New York (1989–2006; sale, Sotheby's, London, July 14, 1999, no. 107, withdrawn); sale, Christie's, London, June 8, 2006, no. 53, withdrawn)


Selected Reference: Manners and Williamson 1920, p. 204
Philip Cocks was a younger child of John Cocks of Castleditch, who in 1724 had married his cousin, Mary Cocks, and who in 1765 inherited from a cousin extensive family estates at Eastnor in Herefordshire. The couple had thirteen children, ten sons, of whom Philip was the sixth, and three daughters. Philip was educated at Brasenose College, Oxford, and became rector of Acton in 1758 and later prebendary (honorary canon) of Lincoln Cathedral. Although the posthumous inscription on the reverse of the canvas records his birth date as 1736, he was apparently baptized on February 25, 1735, and died unmarried on September 17, 1797. The chair in Philip’s portrait, Zoffany’s sitters’ chair, appears in various works of the later 1760s. It would be reasonable to suppose that Philip was in his early thirties when he was painted. He wears a neatly dressed and powdered wig, a clerical collar, a silk gown, and shoes with brass buckles. He is rather lively-looking, with a soft, fair face and brown eyes under black brows. The setting is conventional. The bright fabrics of the gown and the damask-upholstered chair contrast with the matte surface of the carpet that serves as a table cover.

The present work is one of a group of four Cocks family portraits that were still together in 1920 in the collection of Joseph Heriz-Smith, a descendant. There were two upright single-figure portraits, small whole-lengths of the same size, and two horizontals with identical dimensions. The other single-figure portrait (location unknown) has been described as showing Joseph Cocks, the fourth son, in blue velvet, reading a book. The horizontals are double portraits, representing the Reverend John and James Cocks in an interior (fig. 90) and Thomas Somers and Richard Cocks in a landscape (fig. 91). Although exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1891 as the work of Zoffany, they are in fact by John Hamilton Mortimer. The sitters were six of the eight surviving sons of John of Castleditch, who died in 1771. Perhaps he commissioned all four paintings. After his death his heir, Charles, who is not among those represented, was created a baronet and first Lord Somers.

1. See Webster 1976, pp. 39, 43, 46, nos. 34, 44, 51, ill., for the chair, upholstered but without arms. The first two pictures are probably from the later 1760s, while the third is signed and dated 1769. Christine Lerche, Painted Politeness: Private und öffentliche Selbstdarstellung im Conversation Piece des Johann Zoffany (Weimar, 2006), pp. 358–60, no. 6, reproduced Zoffany’s Family of Lord Nugent, which was apparently painted in 1765 and has a similar setting (pilaster, curtain, carpet-covered table, chair).
3. The sons of John of Castleditch were: Charles (1735–1806); Thomas (1732–1799); Rev. John (1731–1793); Joseph (1732–1773); James (1734–1804); Rev. Philip; Thomas Somers (1737–1796); Richard (1740–1821); Robert (1741–1765); and Timothy (1748–1753).
George Romney

Born Becksde, Dalton-in-Furness, Lancashire, December 15, 1734; died Kendal, Cumbria, November 15, 1802

Romney’s early career in the north of England followed a typical course. He received little formal education, having left school at an early age to train with his father, a skilled cabinetmaker. In 1755 he was indentured for two years to an itinerant portraitist, Christopher Steele, and afterward established his own practice in Kendal, painting small full-lengths and groups. During a serious illness he was cared for by his landlord’s daughter, Mary Abbot, who was ten years older than he; Mary was three months pregnant when they married in October 1756. Romney moved to London in 1762, leaving his family behind. From 1765 he exhibited from time to time in London, though at venues other than the Royal Academy, which he was never invited to join. Despite his natural ability as a face painter, he had other ambitions and submitted a subject from modern British history, The Death of General Wolfe (location unknown), to the Society of Artists that year but won only a modest prize.

While Romney had a long-standing interest in the antique, it may have been his awareness of the inadequacy of his education that led him to abandon an established clientele in London to travel to Italy in 1773 with the miniaturist Ozius Humphry. There he became a highly accomplished draftsman, and his style as a painter was afterward marked by a new directness of attack and breadth of handling. Upon his return to London in 1775, he leased a house in Cavendish Square that had belonged to Francis Cotes and became one of the city’s busiest, most successful portraitists, a position that, despite his misanthropic disposition, he maintained for more than twenty years.

Romney, who is generally ranked third as a portrait painter, after Reynolds and Gainsborough, worked harder and was more productive than either. His sitter lists from 1776 through 1795, excluding that for the year 1785, have been preserved and reveal that in the 1780s he often had as many as six sittings a day and sometimes worked seven days a week. In view of this staggering pace, it is not surprising that the quality of Romney’s work is uneven. He never abandoned his ambition to succeed outside the realm of portraiture. After Emma Lyon, called Emma Hart, later the wife of Sir William Hamilton and the mistress of Lord Nelson, visited his studio in 1782, she became his muse and the model for many of his mythological and allegorical subjects. A recent revival of interest in Romney is evidenced by the resurgence in scholarship and by the fine traveling exhibition organized by Alex Kidson in 2002.

Selected References


54. Lady Elizabeth Stanley, Countess of Derby

Oil on canvas, 50 x 40 in. (127 x 101.6 cm)
The Jules Bache Collection, 1949 (49.7.57)

Ex coll.: the sitter (in 1779); Granville George Leveson Gower, 2nd Earl Granville,1 London (by 1885–87; sold for £5,130 to Tennant); Sir Charles Tennant, 1st Baronet, London (1887–d. 1906; cat., 1896); Sir Edward Praulex Tennant, 1st Baron Glenconner, London (1906–d. 1920); Sir Christopher Grey Tennant, and Baron Glenconner (1920–33; sold for £25,000 to Knoedler); [Knoedler, New York, 1923–27; sold for $125,000 to Bache]; Jules Bache, New York (1927–d. 1944; cat., 1929, 1937, no. 62, 1943, no. 62; Bache Foundation, 1943–49)


Lady Elizabeth Hamilton, born in 1753, was the only daughter of James, sixth Duke of Hamilton and Brandon, and his wife, née Elizabeth Gunning, one of the eighteenth century’s most famous beauties. In 1774 Lady Elizabeth married the wealthy and prominent Edward Smith Stanley, who in 1776 succeeded his grandfather as twelfth Earl of Derby, and the match was thought to be a most promising one. The countess soon had three children: Edward, born April 21, 1775, and later the thirteenth Earl; Charlotte, born October 17, 1776; and Elizabeth Henrietta. Twelve sittings for her portrait by Romney are recorded between November 27, 1776, and May 4, 1778.2 In the latter year Lady Derby left her husband for John Frederick Sackville, third Duke of Dorset, who is believed to have been the father of her younger daughter. Romney’s Huntington account book lists the payment, by the sitter herself, on January 28, 1779: “Receiv’d of Lady Derby for her Ladyship’s Picture half-length—37 16 / Frame for do Ansell—6 6 / 44 2.”3 The countess subsequently lived in exile or in the country and finally died after a long illness on March 14, 1797. Her own family paid her outstanding debts, which totaled five thousand pounds.

Angelika Kauffmann painted Lady Derby with her husband and their infant son
(no. 64), and the earl commissioned a full-length portrait of her from Reynolds that must have been begun about the same time as Romney’s but was finished more quickly, since it was exhibited, as number 284, at the Royal Academy in 1777. The Reynolds portrait, later destroyed by its angry owner after she left him, is known only from a mezzotint engraving prepared by William Dickinson in 1780. Shortly after her death, the earl married the actress Elizabeth Farren, who is the subject of one of Sir Thomas Lawrence’s finest works (no. 105).

Romney’s best portraits of women are pleasing to the eye: he preferred quiet contours and smooth, softly modeled curves. Most of his sitters wear white gowns, which must have been his preference as well as theirs, but they do not wear jewelry or attributes of rank. His highly generalized landscape settings often contribute more to the romantic mood of his portraits than to their iconography. Here the surface has a silky liquidity, smoothness, and slight transparency, while Lady Derby’s calm seated pose and expression suggest a tranquility of mind that she cannot have possessed, considering her personal circumstances. Her hair is dressed very high and lightly powdered. She wears a (beautifully figured) figured-damask underskirt. The portrait was engraved by John Dean in 1780.

55. Mrs. Frederick

Oil on canvas, 29 3/4 x 24 3/4 in. (75.6 x 62.9 cm)
Fletcher Fund, 1945 (45.59.5)

Ex coll.: Colonel Charles Frederick (until d. 1791); by descent to Sir Charles Edward Frederick, 7th Baronet (from 1873); [Salutef, London, until 1927; sold to Agnew]; [Agnew, London, 1927; sold for $75,153 to Bache]; Jules Bache, New York (1927–d. 1944; Bache Foundation, 1944–45); cat., 1939, 1937, no. 63; 1943, no. 63; sold to MMA


This portrait does not figure in the Romney literature. According to the 1929 Bache catalogue, Martha, “daughter of Benjamin Rigden, a tradesman, of Faversham, Kent, married clandestinely, on March 20, 1773, Charles Frederick, great-great-grandson of Sir John Frederick, a ‘merchant of great opulence,’ and Lord Mayor of London in 1662.”1 Charles Frederick, born October 9, 1748, resigned from the British army to join the East India Company and departed for India in 1777. After his death there in 1791, his wife and their many children returned to England. The Gentleman’s Magazine mentions her death in 1794.

No sittings for a Mrs. Frederick are recorded in the artist’s register. However, Sir Charles Frederick, her father-in-law, seems to have been painted by Romney early in 1776 (the location of his portrait is unknown).2 If the details about the sitter come from the Frederick family, and if she is indeed Martha Rigden Frederick—both of which seem reasonable assumptions—then she most likely sat for Romney between his return from Italy in 1775 and her departure for India in 1777, dates that accord with the style of the work.

This is a good example of a portrait of the small, standard size, in eighteenth-century terminology a “three-quarters.” The composition is traditional, the sitter’s head and folded arms forming a triangle. Her hair and right ear, as well as the costume and background, are loosely finished, without any pretense of detail. Romney favored classically inspired wrapping gowns of the sort illustrated, often with the sleeves tied around the upper arms, perhaps because this afforded him the opportunity to paint more interesting drapery patterns. The picture is rather similar in handling, pose, and costume to that of the Countess of Derby (no. 54). Romney’s more complex and highly finished small portraits generally required five sittings, so the present work may have taken no more than two or three.3

3. See Kidson 2002, p. 146, no. 82, color pl., for a "routine society portrait."

---

1. The portrait was bought in Paris by Lord Granville, the sitter’s great-grandson, according to Arthur B. Chamberlain, George Romney (London, 1910), pp. 297–98.
2. The additional sittings were on January 31, February 14, 21, and March 19, 1777, and on February 13, March 2, 9, 14, and 23, 1778. See Ward and Roberts 1904, vol. 1, pp. 82–86.
5. See Kidson 2002, pp. 98–99, no. 41, color pl., fig. 36, who believes that the composition was adapted from that of the Weeping David, an antique relief that Romney had drawn in Rome.
56. Portrait of a Man

Oil on canvas, 30 x 24 3/4 in. (76.2 x 62.9 cm)
Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Edwin C. Vogel, 1950 (50.189)

Ex coll.: [Scott & Fowles, New York, until 1929];
Mr. and Mrs. Edwin C. Vogel, New York (1929-50,
as Hon. Charles Francis Greville)

Selected References: Ian Jenkins and Kim Sloan,
Vases and Volcanoes: Sir William Hamilton
and His Collection, exh. cat., British Museum
(London, 1996), p. 174; Katharine Baejer,
"British Portraits in The Metropolitan Museum

According to information provided in 1931
by the New York art-dealing firm
of Scott & Fowles, William Roberts identiﬁed
the sitter for this portrait as the Honorable
Charles Francis Greville, second son of
the ﬁrst Earl of Warwick. Charles Greville
apparently sat for Romney in 1781-82 and
again in 1787, either of which would be possible
dates for the present work. However,
the sitter here is not he, and identities once
lost are rarely recovered.

Charles Greville, a sometime politician
and a collector of works of art, but as a
second son relatively ill provided for, was
Romney’s personal friend. He is widely
known as the lover of Emma, Romney’s
most famous model, who years later would
leave her husband and Greville’s uncle,
Sir William Hamilton, for Lord Nelson.
Greville is the subject of an 1810 mezzotint
by Henry Hoppner Meyer after Romney
(ﬁg. 92). As Kim Sloan noted in 1996, there
is little resemblance to the sitter in the
Museum’s portrait. Greville had deep-set
eyes under thick brows, a slightly hooked,
more pointed nose, and an intent expression.
Of several versions of the painting, Meyer’s
print is most likely based on a canvas that
descended collaterally in Greville’s family
until 1945, when it was sold at Christi’s on
October 26, as number 106.

The sitter here is probably younger, with a
broader, less angular face. He wears a wig (or
his hair is neatly dressed and powdered to
resemble one), a linen shirt and cravat, and a
waistcoat under a brown coat trimmed with
braid and closed with gilt buttons. Typically
for Romney, especially in paintings of men
in this rather standard format, the treatment
of the arms is perfunctory.

1. The records of Scott & Fowles are not available
for consultation.
2. The photo mount at the Frick Art Reference
Library, New York, is annotated accordingly.
4. Sloan in Ian Jenkins and Kim Sloan,
Vases and Volcanoes: Sir William
Hamilton and His Collection,

Fig. 92. Henry Hoppner Meyer,
after Romney, The Honorable
Charles Francis Greville, 1810.
Mezzotint, 14 x 9 7/8 in. (35.6 x
25.1 cm). The British Museum,
London (1902,1011,3458)
57. Portrait of a Woman, Said to Be Emily Bertie Pott

Oil on canvas, 49 1/4 x 32 1/4 in. (125.6 x 62.2 cm)
Gift of Jessie Woolworth Donahue, 1918 (38.102.2)


Selected Exhibitions: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen, "Aeldre Engelsk Kunst, 1908, no. 35 (as Sir Joshua Reynolds [?], Dameportret, lent by Hofjaegermester Hans Christian Theodor Wolff-Snedoff), Olympia, London, "Ideal Home Exhibition," April 1930 (as Emily Bertie, lent by Spink)


According to John Romney, in 1781 his father "painted a three-quarters portrait of the beautiful Emily Bertie for Mr. Pott, who took her with him to India, where they both died." He added that Romney "began a full-length of her in a recumbent posture, which was never finished," and later gave the study of the head to Isaac Pocock, one of his pupils. John Romney also noted that Emily had been the sitter for Reynolds's "Thais" (fig. 93), which was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1781, an identification that is now universally accepted.1 Ward and Roberts recorded Romney’s appointments for sittings with a Mrs. Pott on February 25, March 3, 10, and 17, April 20, and May 8, 1781, assuming, however, that the sitter was not Emily but Robert Pott’s mother. If so, her portrait is untraced. The artist also had two appointments with Mr. Pott (or Potts) himself that year, presumably for a portrait, which may be the work, illustrated in the diaries of William Hickey, that was in the collection of the Reverend Alfred Percival Pott in 1935.2 It shows a handsome young man, in a head-and-shoulders view, wearing a Van Dyck costume and a cloak. Finally, in September 1783 Romney received from Mr. Pott £21.0.0 for a portrait of Mrs. Pott.

Emily Bertie seems to have numbered among her protectors Messrs. Coventry and Warren (names by which she was also known), as well as Charles Greville (see discussion under no. 56) and William Hickey, formerly of the East India Company. According to Hickey, she was the beautiful daughter of a blind beggar and first came to his notice in 1776.3 His friend Robert, or Bob, Pott of the East India Company commissioned her portrait from Romney, then took her with him when he sailed for India, where she died at sea, off Calppee, in May 1782. Bob Pott died in India as well, in 1795, leaving the Romney portrait of Emily to his brother, the Reverend Joseph Holden Pott. Alfred Spencer, editor of Hickey’s memoirs, noted that in addition to Reynolds and Romney, Emily sat for "Dance and Sheriff," that is, Nathaniel Dance and the Scottish miniaturist Charles Shirreff. Neither of these works can be identified at present.

The Museum’s portrait was first identified as Romney’s "Emily Bertie" in a 1930 exhibition at Olympia, London. According to information that can only have come from Spink, the owner of the painting, by whose permission it was reproduced at the time in Apollo, "After [Pott’s] death the picture was bought in India by a Danish gentleman and it remained in his family, in Denmark, until now." The presumption must therefore be that Spink purchased the canvas from Hans Christian Theodor Wolff-Snedoff, who had owned it in 1908, and that he in turn had received it at the death in 1866 of his father, Benjamin Wolff, a merchant who traded in Calcutta between 1817 and 1828.4 However, Bob Pott is said to have bequeathed Emily’s portrait by Romney to his brother, Joseph, while Wolff-Snedoff did not know the identity of the sitter in his portrait and supposed it to be by Reynolds.5

On grounds of style, this “three-quarters” canvas might reasonably be dated to 1781. There is nothing conclusive about the fact that the beautiful, daintily dressed, and apparently rather demure sitter does resemble the Emily Bertie of Reynolds’s "Thais." In the absence of further information, however, there may be no more to the story than that Spink knew Wolff-Snedoff’s father had lived in India, where a portrait of Emily Bertie Pott by Romney once had been.

---


5. For Pott’s bequest, see Memoirs of William Hickey, vol. 4, p. 491 (errata and notes to p. 342). For Wolff-Snedoff, see Aeldre Engelsk Kunst, exh. cat., Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek (Copenhagen, 1908).

---

Fig. 93. Sir Joshua Reynolds, "Thais," before 1781. Oil on canvas, 90 1/4 x 52 1/4 in. (234.3 x 144.8 cm).
Waddesdon, The Rothschild Collection (The National Trust) (2556)
58. Admiral Sir Chaloner Ogle

Oil on canvas, 30 × 24 3/4 in. (76.2 × 62.5 cm)
Inscribed (on verso): Sir Chaloner Ogle. Bt. / Senior
Admiral of the Red. / Hr Royal Hr the Duke of
Clarence being made / Admiral of the fleet over his
head / died 1816
Gift of Lennen and Newell Inc., 1953 (53.220)

Ex coll.: the sitter (until d. 1816); by family descent
(1816–1928); [art market, 1928]; private collection (until
1953); Lennrn and Newell Inc., New York (1953)

Selected Reference: Ward and Roberts 1904,

Admiral Sir Chaloner Ogle, born in 1726,
was the third son of Nathaniel Ogle of
Kirkley Hall, Northumberland, sometime
physician to the forces under the Duke of
Marlborough.2 As a young man, Chaloner
Ogle was on service with his uncle in the
West Indies. Commissioned a lieutenant
in 1745 and a commander in 1756, he was
appointed captain of the Aquilon and in 1761
captured several French privateers. He was
nominated in 1768. During the war with Spain,
sailing under the command of Admiral Sir
George Rodney, he participated in the
relief of Gibraltar in January 1780 and the
capture of many ships of the Spanish fleet. Ogle
was promoted to the rank of Rear Admiral of the
Blue on September 26 of that year, and in
1803 reached the rank of Admiral of the Red.
He was created a baronet shortly before his
death in 1816 at eighty-nine. Ogle married,
on September 7, 1761, Hester Thomas,
dau-
ter and co-heir of the bishop of Winchester,
and the couple had many children. Through-
out the generations, the Ogles have been a
naval family.

Chaloner Ogle first sat for Romney in the
spring of 1781, shortly after he completed
active service. His portrait is recorded in the
artist’s rough lists as a “three-quarters,”3
while Ward and Roberts listed sittings for
Sir C. or Ch. Ogle, and once for Sir Cheverell
Ogle—on May 12, 14, 16, and 18, 1781, and
on June 13 and 19, 1782—but did not know the
whereabouts of the picture, which reportedly
descended in the family until 1928. For the
portrait, Ogle wore the uniform of a Rear
Admiral of the Blue.

It is generally held that while Romney
excelled at painting women and children,
he was less successful with men. There are only
a handful of military portraits, and this one
is a compelling image of a rugged individual.

Ogle’s jawline is hard, his eyes are sunk
under a wrinkled forehead, and his expres-
sion is commanding. The crisp, plain linen
is closely observed, and the sitter’s head rises
firmly above the back sweep of the lapel of
his coat. The left sleeve is an inept addition
to a good portrait of a successful naval offi-
cer. A replica or copy was sold at Newcastle-
on-Tyne by the auction house of Anderson
& Garland on November 30, 1982, as lot
number 424.4

1. The provenance was supplied by Lennrn and
Newell Inc.
2. This account is based in part on a 1928 brochure
by W. Roberts that came with the picture to
the Museum.
3. These lists, compiled by the artist’s son, the Rev.
John Romney, are in the archives of the British
Library, London. For this specific description, see
the brochure cited in note 2 above.
4. The sale was of Ogle family portraits, according
to E. H. H. Archibald of the National Maritime

59. Mrs. Bryan Cooke

Oil on canvas, 50 × 39 1/2 in. (127 × 100.3 cm)
Inscribed (on verso): Frances, Mrs Cooke / born 1765
Died 1818 / Sole child of Philip Puleston Esq* of
Havad-y-wern, / Chamberlain of North Wales, by
Mary Davies / Heiress of Gwysaney Flintshire and
wife of / Bryan Cooke Esq* of Owston Co. York for
sometime / a Lieut in the Royal Horse Guards (Blue) / an
M.P. for Malton and from 1803–1812 Colonel. / of
the 1st Regiment of Militia or 3rd West York / Light
Infantry. Mrs Cooke was a very clever woman / herself,
was one of the first promoters of the Education / of
the poor in the neighbourhood of Doncaster.
Fletcher Fund, 1945 (45.59.4)

Ex coll.: Bryan Cooke, Owston, Doncaster,
Yorkshire, and Gwysaney, Mold, Flintshire (until
d. 1812); by descent to Philip Tatton Davies-Cooke,
Owston and Gwysaney (until 1927; sold for £30,000
to Duveen); [Duveen, London and New York, 1927;
sold for $25,000 to Bache]; Jules Bache, New
York (1927–1944); cats., 1929, 1937, no. 61, 1943, no. 61;
Bache Foundation 1944–45; sold to MMA

Selected Exhibition: Royal Academy of Arts,
London, “Works by the Old Masters,” 1896, no. 35
(lent by Philip B. Davies-Cooke)

Selected References: Ward and Roberts 1904,
vol. 1, pp. 111, 119, vol. 2, p. 31; A Catalogue of Paintings
in the Collection of Jules S. Bache (New York, 1929), n.p.,
ill., 2nd ed. (1937), no. 61, ill., 3rd ed. (1943), no. 61, ill.;
Duveen Pictures in Public Collections of America (New
York, 1941), n.p., no. 293, ill.; John Steegman, A Survey
of Portraits in Welsh Houses, vol. i (Cardiff, 1957), p. 166

A Welsh lady of wealth and ancient lineage, Frances Puleston was the only
child of Philip Puleston and Mary Davies, daughter and co-heir of John Davies
of Gwysaney. Frances was born in 1753 and married, in 1786, Bryan Cooke of
Owston, near Doncaster. The couple’s life story is briefly recounted in an
inscription on the reverse of the portrait. She was a lady of good works, while
he was a lieutenant and colonel in the Royal Horse Guards from 1775
until 1785 and later a colonel in the Third West York Militia. From 1812
he sat as a member of Parliament for Malton. Frances Cooke died in 1818,
and Bryan Cooke married Charlotte Bulstrode in 1821. He died later
that year.

Romney painted two “three-quarters”
portraits of Lieutenant Cooke, who sat in
1780, 1782, and 1783. In what is apparently
the earlier of the two, he wears a dark coat
(fig. 94), while in the later one he is in unif orm
(fig. 95). His wig is neatly cut, curled,
and powdered in both. Mrs. Cooke first sat
for Romney on April 23, 1787, the year after
her marriage. Ward and Roberts recorded
Romney’s additional appointments, nine in
all, with Mrs. Cook or Cooke, on April 25
and 30, May 5, 9, and 12, 1787; May 12 and 16,
1789; and June 1 and 3, 1789. Apparently she
did not visit London in 1788, the year in
which the first of her children was born.
Mr. Cooke paid for his wife’s portrait in full,
fifty guineas, on April 26, 1791, and that
day it was dispatched to Owston by the
Doncaster wagon. Over the generations,
Gwysaney, the family formed a large collec-
tion of portraits.

Frances Cooke is represented as a pretty
young blonde with fair skin and dark eyes.
She wears the immaculate white dress and
fichu of the era, with a ribbon at the waist,
and a large plumed hat, tilted back so that it
does not cast a shadow. Her hands lie in her
lap, loosely clasped. Two penitents are vis-
able, where the artist drew in the outer con-
tour of the fichu to lessen its bulk and where
he moved the sitter’s hands a little to the
right. The figure is supported by a column

George Romney 131
wrapped in a drapery swag; there is also a railing, and behind it, shrubbery and a sky with scudding clouds. The whole is smooth and harmonious but lacking in particularity, and the artist failed to impart any sense of the motion of the sitter’s mind. Romney employed the same formula, in reverse, for his portrait of Mrs. Alexander Blair (fig. 96), a London society hostess, whose many sittings were also in 1789 and 1789 and whose husband paid the same price for her portrait. However, he observed Mrs. Blair’s dress with greater attention and provided her with sheet music, a book, and a rather more engaged expression. Another of the same sort, but with greater spirit, is his portrait of Mrs. Nathaniel Lee Acton (fig. 97), for which fourteen sittings are recorded between December 1786 and May 1787.

Jules Bache and Sir Joseph Duveen shared a taste for English faces. The latter sold Mrs. Lee Acton’s portrait to Henry Huntington and doubtless would have placed Mrs. Blair’s, but P. A. B. Widner was ahead of him. In November 1926, a representative of Duveen Brothers called on Mr. Davies-Cooke and noted of Mrs. Cooke’s portrait: “very pretty woman—background warm in colour—whole composition charming—condition very good—owner asking forty thousand pounds—worth twenty-five to thirty to buy.” This information was forwarded from London to New York the next day, and thereafter negotiations began. On July 27, 1927, the owner accepted an offer of thirty thousand pounds as well as the firm’s gift of a copy to replace the original. Sir Joseph reminded London that Mr. Davies-Cooke should also have the original frame because he had been “very pleasant and nice to us and I am anxious to oblige.” In September the original was at Holder’s in Paris for restora-

3. The quotations and the account of the transactions, copies of which are at the Metropolitan Museum, are from the archives of Duveen Brothers at the Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles.
60. Self-Portrait

Oil on canvas, 30 × 25 in. (76.2 × 63.5 cm)


Bequest of Maria DeWitt Jesup, from the collection of her husband, Morris K. Jesup, 1914 (55.30.37)

Ex coll.: the artist (until d. 1802); Reverend John Romney, Whitestock Hall, Ulverston, Cumbria (1802–d. 1812); Elizabeth Romney, Whitestock Hall (1812–d. 1831); her estate sale, Christie’s, London, May 24–25, 1894, no. 182, for £210.10.0 to Agnew; [Agnew, London, in 1894; sold to S. Philips]; S. Philips (from 1894); Mr. and Mrs. Morris K. Jesup, New York (by 1904–his d. 1908); Maria DeWitt (Mrs. Morris K.) Jesup, New York (1908–d. 1914)


Of the several Romney self-portraits that are recorded, the finest and by far the best known is an unfinished work (fig. 98) that he may have painted in 1782 while visiting his friend and biographer, William Hayley, at Hayley’s villa in Eastham, Sussex.1

Alex Kidson dates it to 1784 and maintains that Romney presented it to Hayley in 1787. A remarkably expressive self-image, it might be read simply as curmudgeonly, were Romney not known to have been mentally ill.2

Some ten years later in date, the present work, the artist’s last self-portrait, was described by his son, the Reverend John Romney, in the following terms:

In the winter of 1795 he painted a head of himself, which, though slight, and not entirely finished, being painted at once, showed uncommon power of expression; the likeness also is strong, but there is a certain expression of languor that indicates the approach of disease, which had in fact already begun to assail his constitution. It is remarkable that it is painted without spectacles, though he had been in the habit of using glasses for many years.

Neither of the two self-portraits was intended for public display, and both descended to John Romney and then to his daughter Elizabeth, who died in 1893.3

By the end of the 1780s Romney’s powers may have been waning, but he was, in accordance with his usual habit, furiously busy. Later his custom declined and he became increasingly dispirited. He retired to the north of England in 1799 and died there in 1802. This self-portrait, painted when he was sixty, seems to betray the depression and distress to which he had from time to time been subject throughout his life and which blighted his last years. His expression is alert, but furtive and suspicious. When John Romney described it as “painted at once,” he must have meant that the face was painted in a single session, leaving the balance to be worked up at a later date.

Fig. 98. George Romney, Self-Portrait, 1782. Oil on canvas, 49 1/2 × 39 in. (125.5 × 99.5 cm). National Portrait Gallery, London (999)

2. David A. Cross, “The ‘Admiral of the Blues’: Romney, Depression and Creativity,” in Those Delightful Regions of Imagination: Essays on George Romney, ed. Alex Kidson (New Haven, 2002), pp. 11–32. The artist suffered from cyclical episodes of hypomania and depression, which he kept from his clientele at large but not, as he grew older, from intimate friends.
3. According to Herbert Maxwell, George Romney (London, 1902), p. 186, the 1795 self-portrait was engraved by Caroline Watson. The print has not been traced, and it seems likely that Maxwell was referring to one of the three engravings Watson made after earlier Romney self-portraits for William Hayley’s Life of George Romney, Esq. (London, 1809), illus. opp. title page.
Joseph Wright (Wright of Derby)

Born Derby, September 3, 1734; died Derby, August 29, 1797

The son of a successful attorney in Derby, Joseph Wright spent most of his life there. In 1751, having apparently taught himself to draw by copying mezzotints, he began a two-year apprenticeship in London under a leading portraitist, Thomas Hudson, and he completed his training in 1756–57 with the same artist. Wright’s earliest known signed and dated portrait, of 1735, represents Anne Bateman (private collection), also a native of Derby. He emerges as an artist of individuality and distinction with six three-quarter-length portraits of members of the Markeaton Hunt (Stanford University Museum of Art and private collections), commissioned probably in 1762. Having evidently become interested in Caravagesque painting, Wright began to explore effects achieved by using a candle as an indirect light source. In 1765 he sent his first contribution to one of the Society of Artists’ London exhibitions, Three Persons Viewing the “Gladiator” by Candlelight (private collection); the next year he showed A Philosopher Giving That Lecture on the Orrery, in Which a Lamp Is Put in the Place of the Sun (Derby Art Gallery). These must have been works of which he was inordinately proud, as they are inventive and accomplished, suggesting both the spirit of inquiry and interest in technology that characterized intellectual life in the Midlands. From 1768 until 1771 Wright worked principally in Liverpool, and in the latter year painted two views of A Blacksmith’s Shop (Yale Center for British Art, New Haven, and Derby Art Gallery), the first of a series of night scenes with realistic working-class people as their subjects.

Wright was absent from Derby from October 1771 until September 1775, in Italy, and then, until the summer of 1777, in Bath. In Italy he made drawings after nature, and upon his return to Derbyshire he devoted as much time to landscape painting as possible, always allowing for the fact that portraits were his principal source of income. Beginning in 1778, he sent work in various genres to the Royal Academy, including, in 1781, the portrait of Sir Brooke Boothby (Tate, London) and a literary subject, Maria, from Sterne (Derby Art Gallery).

His smoother, classicizing late figure-and-draper style was influenced by his experience abroad. Wright quarreled with the academy, withdrew, and in 1785 held a one-man exhibition in London. Suffering from depression, he seems to have been incapacitated for lengthening periods. He died shortly before his sixty-third birthday.
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61. Portrait of a Woman

Oil on canvas, 49\(\frac{7}{8}\) x 40 in. (126.7 x 101.6 cm)
Gift of Heathcote Art Foundation, 1986 (1986.264.6)

Ex coll.: Josephine Mercy Heathcote Haskell, New York (until d. 1982); Heathcote Art Foundation (1982–96)


The portrait, the first and only painting by Joseph Wright of Derby in the collection, came to light in the course of a 1984 appraisal of property in the estate of Josephine Heathcote Haskell. Although no documentation concerning the works of art in her collection was found, Haskell, of English descent, was said to have bought English pictures and furnishings for her New York town house beginning in the 1930s. On grounds of style and costume, the canvas must date to about 1770, but the sitter’s identity is unknown, and unlikely to be discovered, even though there are a number of women in Wright’s account books who were painted in the correct time frame and whose portraits have never been identified. In view of the date, she could have been from Liverpool, Derby, or the environs.

When painting women, Wright, influenced by Hudson, showed a preference for satin fabric, pearl jewelry, gauze, and lace. The two artists also shared a fondness for the color rose, in Wright’s case, the precise shade illustrated here. Concerned as he was with effects of light, he often introduced as many reflective surfaces into his pictures as possible. Wright shows some of his sitters in their own, precisely described clothes, while others, such as this young woman, wear what were often referred to as draperies. A fine example of the former is the portrait of Mrs. Andrew Liddington (fig. 99) wearing what must be her own lavishly embellished costume. The coin dots woven into the blue material of her dress also figure in the design of the silk lace shawl. Only the pearls strike a slightly false note: Wright, fascinated by

Fig. 99. Joseph Wright, Mrs. Andrew Liddington, ca. 176–63. Oil on canvas, 30 x 24\(\frac{1}{4}\) in. (76.2 x 61.3 cm). Philadelphia Museum of Art, Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Henry W. Breyer Jr., 1968 (1968–73–1)
Angelika Kauffmann
Swiss, born Chur, Graubünden, October 30, 1741; died Rome, November 5, 1807

Angelika’s father, Johann Joseph Kauffmann, was an itinerant painter and decorator with whom, from an early age, she traveled as a pupil and assistant as he sought commissions in Switzerland and northern Italy. In June 1762 he took her to Florence, and in January 1763 to Rome. After their arrival in Naples in July 1763, Angelika copied works in the royal collection at Capodimonte, a practice that had long been part of her training, and painted portraits, including one of the visiting English actor David Garrick (Burghley House Collection, Lincolnshire) that was sent in 1765 to the Society of Artists in London, her first publicly exhibited work. Leaving Rome in the summer of 1765, the Kauffmanns traveled by way of Bologna and Parma to Venice. There the young painter first separated from her father, having received and accepted an invitation to travel with Lady Wentworth, wife of the English Resident in Venice, who was returning home. When Kauffmann arrived in London in 1766, she was, at twenty-four, not only a gifted artist but also an accomplished singer and fluent in English as well as German, Italian, and French. In pursuit of her desire to become a history painter, she had studied perspective and anatomy (working from antique sculptures, since, as a woman, she could not draw the nude male model from life, in accordance with standard academic practice).

Already honored with election to Rome’s prestigious Accademia di San Luca, Kauffmann became a founder member of the Royal Academy in 1768 and showed history paintings at the academy’s first exhibition the following year. Between 1778 and 1780 she painted allegories of Invention, Composition, Color, and Design for the academy’s new premises at Somerset House (now in the collection at Burlington House, London). Her wealth, however, came from portraits, in her case principally of women and family groups. The mild, elegant classicizing style she developed in London was well suited to the purpose. After the death in 1780 of her first husband, an adventurer, she married the Venetian artist Antonio Zucchi, who was...
fifteen years her senior and who became, in effect, her manager. Together they returned in 1781 to Italy. Having visited Venice, Rome, and Naples and having turned down the invitation of Ferdinand IV and Maria Carolina for Angelika to become their court painter, the Zucchi arrived in Rome in November 1782, settling in the capital for the balance of their lives.

Angelika continued to paint portraits and historical subjects, the latter in greater demand on the Continent. She exhibited in England and had English and Italian clients; she also received commissions from Austrian, French, German, Polish, Russian, and Swiss patrons of the highest rank. At the end of her life the reigning artist of the Roman School, she is among the most important of all women painters.
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62. Telemachus and the Nymphs of Calypso

Oil on canvas, 32½ x 44¼ in. (82.6 x 112.4 cm)
Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900 (5.110.188)

63. The Sorrow of Telemachus

Oil on canvas, 32¼ x 45 in. (81.3 x 114.3 cm)
Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900 (5.110.187)

Ex coll.: Monsignor Onorato Caetani, Naples and Rome (from 1782 [no. 62] and from 1783–84 [no. 61]); [Haskard, Florence, until 1845; sold to Agnew]; [Agnew, London, 1895–99; sold to Fischof]; [Eugène Fischof, Paris, from 1899]; Collis P. Huntington, New York (until d. 1900; life interest to his widow, Arabella D. Huntington, later [from 1913] Mrs. Henry E. Huntington, 1900–d. 1924; life interest to their son, Archer Milton Huntington, 1924–terminated in 1953)


According to Kauffmann, these scenes from the life of Telemachus, son of Odysseus, were based not on the Odyssey but on Fénélon’s Telémague (which was published in 1699 and remained popular throughout the eighteenth century). While searching for his father, Telemachus, guided by Athena in the guise of Mentor, was shipwrecked off Calypso’s island. Here her nymphs hover around Telemachus and offer him fruit, wine, and a garland of flowers (no. 62). At left the elderly, bearded Mentor is led away by Calypso herself. Kauffmann describes the picture in the Memoria delle piture, in which she recorded her commissions beginning in October 1781:

per Sua Eccellenza D. Honoratoto Caetani
Napoli 1782.

Un quadro di piedi inglesi 3.10 largo, su p. 2.9. Representa Telemaco nell’Isola di Calipso, quando la Dea tiene a parte

Mentore per dare campo alle sue ninfe di ralegrare Telemaco, una delle quali (Eucarit) è innamorata di Telemaco. pagato oncie napolitane 100.

She indicates that Monsignor Caetani offered her this first commission either during her brief stay in Rome in April 1782 or while she was in Naples preparing studies for her group portrait of the royal family (Museo e Gallerie Nazionali di Capodimonte, Naples), where our picture was evidently painted.

Angelika describes the second work (no. 63) in the following terms:

per sua Eccellenza il Sig." D. Honoratoto Gaettani
Roma [1783].

Un quadro di piedi inglesi 3.10 alto—Repertante Telemaco nella grotta di Calipso allorché la Dea fa sospendere il canto alle sue ninfe che loda- vano Ulisse accorgendosi dell’arrisca- mento di Telemaco che con la Dea e Mentore sedevano a tavola godendo del rinfresco che Calipso regalava li suoi ospiti—soggetto tirato dall’Romanzo dell’Telemaco di M’ Fenelon.

per oncie napolitane 100—circa zechini 120

She explains that Calypso silenced the nymphs who had been singing Odysseus’s praises when she saw the sorrow of his son. The compositions are friezes, with similarly constructed backgrounds, the prices and sizes given are identical, and the second picture was intended as a pendant to the first. Both follow Fénélon’s text closely.

Caetani—apostolic protonotary, savant, and writer—belonged to an ancient and noble Roman family and was a younger son. He commissioned portraits of himself from Anton Raphael Mengs in 1779, from Pompeo Batoni in 1782, and from Kauffmann in 1783. Later in 1783, according to the Memoria, she was also working on four large oval canvases representing allegorical figures; these were completed in January 1784, when she submitted her bill of 858 Neapolitan ducats for five
of the six pictures, including the two works catalogued here. Nine months later, in Naples, she accepted what proved to be a final commission from Caetani, for a portrait of the duchessa di Corigliano with her son and his nurse (location unknown).

In August 1787 Angelika was at work in Rome on a painting for her London friend Mrs. Brayer, or Bryer, Bacchus Teaching the Nymphs to Make Verses (fig. 102), a subject from Horace. The companion was a Sorrow of Telemachus, a canvas smaller than Caetani’s with a somewhat different background (fig. 103) which was on the Vienna art market in 1998. A larger, signed version of the Metropolitan Museum’s Sorrow of Telemachus is in the museum in Chur (fig. 104). It can be identified with a picture completed in October 1788 for a patron Kauffmann calls “il Duca di Curlandia” and had as a
Fig. 103. Angelika Kauffmann, *The Sorrow of Telemachus*. Oil on canvas, 31 × 37 in. (78.7 × 94 cm). Location unknown.

Fig. 104. Angelika Kauffmann, *The Grieving Telemachus with Mentor on the Island of Calypso*, 1788. Oil on canvas, 40 1/2 × 49 3/4 in. (103 × 126 cm). Bündner Kunstmuseum Chur.
64. Edward Smith Stanley, Twelfth Earl of Derby, with His First Wife and Their Son

Oil on canvas, 50 x 40 in. (127 x 101.5 cm)
Gift of Bernard M. Baruch, in memory of his wife, Annie Griffen Baruch, 1939 (59.189.2)

Ex coll.: Elizabeth, Baroness Hamilton and Duchess of Argyll (until d. 1790); George William Campbell, 6th Duke of Argyll and 3rd Baron Hamilton (1790–d. 1839); John Douglas Edward Henry Campbell, 7th Duke of Argyll, London (1839–d. 1847); his estate, 1847–55; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, March 17, 1855, no. 86, as The Earl of Derby, in a crimson silk dress, with his Countess, Lady Anne Hamilton, and the present Earl when a child, in an apartment, for £265.0 to Faver; Bernard M. Baruch, New York (until 1939)


On June 23, 1774, Lord Stanley, as he then was, married Lady Elizabeth Hamilton. She was the only daughter, and eventually the sole heir, of the sixth Duke of Hamilton and Brandon, while her husband succeeded on February 22, 1776, as twelfth Earl of Derby. Wealthy, generous, and well placed, the couple was the last cry. Their son, Edward, pictured here, was born on April 21, 1775; Charlotte followed in the autumn of 1776, and then Elizabeth Henrietta. In the summer of 1778, shortly after Lord Derby departed for Winchester to join the militia (France had taken up the cause of the American colonists and was threatening to invade England), his wife left him for John Frederick Sackville, third Duke of Dorset. The children remained with Lord Derby, who neither granted his estranged wife a divorce, nor allowed her to return. The unhappy countess became an invalid and died of tuberculosis in 1797, at which time the earl was free to marry the actress Elizabeth Farron (see no. 103).

The future Earl of Derby had commissioned Robert Adam to remodel his London residence in Grosvenor Square in 1773 and had also asked the architect to design a temporary pavilion for a lavish entertainment celebrating his engagement to be held on June 9, 1774, on the grounds of The Oaks, his property in Surrey. For his house in town, he

Fig. 105. Angelika Kauffmann, Lady Elizabeth Hamilton, Countess of Derby, with Her Son, and the Artist Playing the Harp. Oil on canvas, 50 x 40 in. (127 x 101.5 cm). Location unknown

Fig. 106. Angelika Kauffmann, Edward Smith Stanley, 12th Earl of Derby, with His First Wife, Elizabeth Hamilton, and Their Son, Edward Smith Stanley, ca. 1776. Oil on canvas, 49 x 39 in. (124.5 x 99.1 cm). Licentce granted courtesy of The Rt. Hon. The Earl of Derby 2007
ordered from Angelika Kauffmann a pair of overdoors with subjects after the antique (private collection), which were exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1775. Although Adam’s Derby House interiors do not survive, the appearance of several of the rooms is recorded, and they looked rather like the background of the present picture. The couple had worn Van Dyck costumes to the fête held at The Oaks. Here the earl is again dressed in Van Dyck style, in a red suit slashed with blue, emblazoned with rosettes, and with a wide collar edged with lace. The countess, who perhaps consulted the painter about her costume, wears a loose muslin gown with long sleeves under a robe trimmed lavishly with gold, which would have been described at the time as in the antique taste. Her hair is dressed high, with feathers, a veil, and a jewel, and she wears gold slippers.

Family portraits required the artist to keep each face and figure in view while arranging all the players in a reasonably natural manner and assigning them roles appropriate to an overall scheme in which dynastic considerations played a part. Although she specialized in painting groups, Angelika was not entirely successful in this case. Lady Derby is remote, while the earl’s gaze fails to encompass his handsome heir, a baby worthy of Raphael. The adults seem to be suspended above, rather than seated on, the improbable couches all’antica that Angelika must have invented, while the King Charles spaniels gaze out dolefully from their corner. The composition is outlandish but the portraiture honest, to judge by the young earl’s short stature and receding hairline. Nevertheless, the work suggests the degree to which the artist modified the tough-minded naturalism of her earlier style for her English patrons.

Elizabeth, Duchess of Argyll, was, by her first marriage, the mother of Elizabeth, Countess of Derby. The present work was number 86 in the seventh Duke of Argyll’s 1855 estate sale, where it was mistitled “The Earl of Derby . . . with his Countess, Lady Anne Hamilton, and the present Earl.” Number 87 in the sale was another painting by Kauffmann, “A lady, in a pink dress, playing the harp; and a lady, in a white dress, seated on a bank, with a child in her lap” (fig. 105). The sitters for the latter are the Countess of Derby with her son, and, apparently, Angelika Kauffmann herself. The last lot but one in the 1855 sale was the famous Reynolds of the countess as a girl (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.), which had been painted for her mother. The Museum’s picture is evidently a replica of a signed painting of the same group (fig. 106) belonging to the Earl of Derby, which differs only in that the earl’s costume is slashed with white. The two canvases must date to about 1776. George Romney’s portrait of the countess is the subject of catalogue number 54.


3. Emilie E. S. Gordon, Anthony van Dyck (1599–1641) and the Representation of Dress in Seventeenth-Century Portraiture (Turnhout, 2001), p. 78, points out that the seventeenth-century costume has been adapted to the 1770s: the waistline has been dropped and the britches narrowed.

4. The sitter had been misidentified in the sale catalogue as the Duchess of Argyll, with Lady Augusta and Lady Charlotte Campbell.


Richard Cosway
Baptized near Tiverton, Devon, November 5, 1742; died London, July 4, 1821

Cosway, primarily a portrait miniaturist, was also a painter, connoisseur, and dealer. He was sent to London to study in 1754 and, having displayed his precocious ability in drawing, was admitted to William Shipley’s academy in the Strand. The young Cosway showed at the Society of Artists in 1760 and from 1767 to 1769, and also at the Free Society of Artists, from 1761 to 1764 and in 1766. He entered the schools of the newly established Royal Academy in 1769, began to exhibit and was named an associate the following year, and in 1771 was elected an academician. Ten years later, he married the Anglo-Florentine artist Maria Hadfield, and they moved in 1784 to Schomberg House, Pall Mall, where they lived a fashionable life in the circle of the Prince of Wales, later George IV. Cosway became the prince’s principal miniature painter and from 1785 was entitled by him to use the phrase “primarius pictor” for the balance of his life.

In addition to miniatures, Cosway specialized in highly finished tinted drawings on a relatively small scale, many of which were engraved; also, mostly earlier in his career, he painted small whole-lengths and larger oils. The miniatures and drawings, with their luminosity and fine control of stipple and line, were extravagantly admired and are among the most elegant works of the art of the late Georgian and Regency periods. Cosway’s paintings have not enjoyed the same popularity, and relatively few have been published or exhibited.
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65. Marianne Dorothy Harland

Oil on canvas, 28 x 36½ in. (71.1 x 91.8 cm)
Inscribed (on two labels on stretcher): DASHWOOD HEIRLOOM / No. 49 [sic]; Marianne Dorothy Harland / [2nd Daughter to Admiral [Har] / land Bart by his second W[life] / . . . holds / . . . this Picture was painted by Cosw[a]y / . . . & when she was twenty- two years of [age] . . .
Gift of Mrs. William M. Haupt, from the collection of Mrs. James B. Haggin, 1969 (69.104)

Ex coll.: Admiral Sir Robert Harland, 1st Baronet, Sproughton Hall, Ipswich, Suffolk (until d. 1784); Sir Robert Harland, 2nd Baronet, Sproughton Hall and Wherstead Park, Ipswich, Suffolk (from 1784); by descent to Captain George Astley Charles Dashwood, Wherstead Park (until d. 1863); Charles Edmund Dashwood, Wherstead Park (1863–1914; Dashwood Heirlooms sale, Christie’s, London, June 26, 1914, no. 94 (as Miss Marianne Dorothy Harland [afterwards Mrs. Dalrymple], for £892.10.0 to Pollard); [Frederick Pollard, London 1914–d. 1916]; Mrs. W. S. Salt’s (until 1927; her posthumous sale, Christie’s, London, May 20, 1927, no. 44, for £55 to Tooth); [Tooth, London, from 1927]; [Daniel H. Farr, New York, in 1930]; Mrs. James B. (Margaret V.) Haggin, New York (until d. 1965); her sister, Mrs. William M. (Jean Amsden) Haupt, New York (1965–69)


Marianne Harland, born in 1759, was the second daughter of Admiral Sir Robert Harland, first Baronet, of Sproughton Hall, Suffolk, and his second wife, née Susanna Reynolds, whom he had married in 1749. Marianne married William Dalrymple on September 13, 1783, and died in October 28, 1785, leaving a son, John William Henry Dalrymple, born November 16, 1784, who
eventually succeeded as seventh Earl of Stair. William, later Sir William, Dalrymple was promoted to the rank of general and in 1798 became lieutenant governor of London’s Chelsea Hospital.

In accordance with convention, Cosway exhibited Miss Harland’s portrait at the Royal Academy in 1779 under the title A Lady Playing on the Harp. She is seated at her instrument, having completed her toilet; her morning dress is protected by a powdering mantle. The picture was described in the St. James Chronicle of May 1–4 as finished “with a painful and minute Attention to little Circumstances,” so that “a Bouquet of Flowers, or a Lady’s Ruffles, become the principal Object,” a sensibility not unexpected in a portrait miniaturist.1 Stephen Lloyd, who identified it with the work shown at the academy exhibition, noted that the style fit “the fashionable but competitive market for precisely painted conversation pieces, a genre which was dominated by Zoffany.”2 Cosway’s technique is fastidious, and he paints with equal attention to accuracy the portrait head, the costume, and the furnishings of the elegant modern interior. Although somewhat darkened over time, the picture is otherwise in good state.

The portrait and its pendant descended in the family at Wherstead Park. A portrait of Frances, Countess Dillon, that was number 93 of the Dashwood Heirlooms sale, by Cosway and with the same dimensions, must represent Marianne’s elder sister, who in 1777 reportedly married Count Édouard Dillon, gentleman-in-waiting to the comte d’Artois.3 In the catalogue entry, Countess Dillon is described as seated in an apartment, holding a letter, and wearing a blue lace-trimmed dress. The work (location unknown) must not have been as attractive as ours, because Agnew’s bought it for the much lower sum of £325.10.0.

John Russell

Born Guildford, Surrey, March 29, 1745; died Hull, Yorkshire, April 20, 1806

Pastel was generally called crayon painting in eighteenth-century England, and John Russell was the country’s most distinguished practitioner of this demanding art. Russell, who descended from a family that sold books and prints, was educated at Guildford grammar school. After an apprenticeship with Francis Cotes in London, he set up on his own in 1768. He married Hannah Faden in 1770 and, having entered the Royal Academy schools, won a medal for life drawing. From 1769 until the end of his life, he exhibited annually at the academy, of which he became an associate member in 1772 and a full member in 1788. The following year, as crayon painter to both George III and the Prince of Wales, he submitted as his principal exhibit a pastel portrait of Queen Charlotte (Royal Collection). Russell painted a few oils and hundreds of fancy pictures and portraits in pastels. In all, he exhibited 332 pastels at the Royal Academy. His book Elements of

2. Ibid.
3. The comte d’Artois later succeeded as Charles X of France.
Painting with Crayons (1772) is a standard guide to his techniques, to those of his teacher, and to the medium in general. Russell was also an astronomer, and he served as mayor of Guildford in 1779, 1789, 1791, and 1797.
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66. William Man Godsall
Pastel on paper, laid down on canvas, 23⅞ x 17¾ in. (60.3 x 45.1 cm)
Signed and dated (right center): J Russell RA. Pintx. / 1794
Inscribed (on large paper label in black ink, perhaps contemporary, removed from backing board):
William Man Godsall Aet. sue 71 / and 40 4th of his Marriage / with Sarah his now Wife / drawn by J. Russell / Anno 1794.
Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Wiesenberger, 1961 (61.182.1)

67. Mrs. William Man Godsall
Pastel on paper, laid down on canvas, 23⅞ x 17¾ in. (60.3 x 45.1 cm)
Inscribed (on large paper label in black ink, perhaps contemporary, removed from backing board):
Sarah Man Godsall Aet. sue 61 / and 40 4th of her Marriage / with William her present Husband / Drawn by J. Russell / Anno 1794.
Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Wiesenberger, 1961 (61.182.2)

Ex coll.: Mr. and Mrs. William Man Godsall, Weston House, Albury, Surrey (until his d. 1802); Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Man Godsall, Weston House (1802–her d. 1825; bequeathed to Palmerston); Henry John Temple, 3rd Viscount Palmerston, Broadlands, Romsey, Hampshire (1825–d. 1863); William Francis Cowper (Temple), later Baron Mount Temple, Broadlands (1863–d. 1888); Hon. Evelyn Melbourne Ashley, Broadlands (1888–d. 1906); Wilfred William Ashley, later Baron Mount Temple, Broadlands (1908–d. 1939; cat., 1939);
Edwina, Countess Mountbatten of Burma, Broadlands (1939–d. 1960; sale, Christie’s, London, March 15, 1960, no. 83; withdrawn, sold privately to Wiesenberger); Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Wiesenberger, New York (1960–61)

Selected Reference: Williamson 1894, pp. 15, 51, 135, ill. (Mrs. Godsall)

Mr. Man Godsall, LL.D., of Weston House, Albury—where these pastel portraits hung in the dining room—had taken the name Godsall when he married. He was a fellow of both the Royal Society and the Society of Antiquaries. Archival records describe him as a dairy farmer. According to the inscription transcribed above, the sitter was born in 1720; the burial register of the old church at Albury records his death in 1802. A like inscription on his wife’s pastel indicates that she was born in 1730. Mrs. Man Godsall was the daughter and heiress of Nicholas Godsall and the niece and heiress of Sir Robert Godsall, lord mayor of the City of London, who had lived at Weston House. The register records her death in 1793.

William and Sarah Man Godsall apparently sat to Russell on their fortieth anniversary. He wears a coat with a high collar and very large brass buttons. His portrait suggests that he was a gentle man. George Williamson lists another pastel thought to represent the same sitter, wearing a purple velvet coat and an embroidered waistcoat, that belonged in 1894 to W. G. Cole of North Street, Guildford. Mrs. Man Godsall
seems to have been a woman of presence and stature. Her abundant hair, beribboned cap, and ruffled shawl fill, and seem practically to overflow, the picture surface, their whiteness setting off her face and contrasting with her nosegay of garden flowers.

Man Godschall’s eldest son, William John, predeceased him, while his younger son, Samuel, died in 1821 and was survived by his widow, Lucy. The couple were ancestors of Lord Palmerston, the prime minister, through their daughter Jane, Lady Bernard, and her daughter, who married the son of the first Viscount Palmerston. The pastels passed into that family on the death of the Man Godschalls’ daughter-in-law.

1. Lord Brabourne supplied confirmation of the provenance and information about the earlier whereabouts of the pastels, drawn from a manuscript catalogue compiled at Broadlands by Agnew’s, probably subsequent to the death in 1939 of Lord Mount Temple. We gratefully acknowledge his assistance.

2. See the register of burials for the old Albury church in the Surrey History Centre, Woking (see also records available online at www.alburychurches.org; accessed July 5, 2009).

3. Historical Manuscripts Commission, National Register of Archives, National Archives, Kew, Surrey, GB/NNAF/CT/0107 (see also www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/default.htm; accessed February 10, 2009).

4. Williamson 1894, p. 139.

68. Robert Shurlock

Pastel on paper, laid down on canvas, 23 3/4 x 17 7/8 in. (60.3 x 44.1 cm)
Gift of Alan R. Shurlock, 1967 (67.132)

Ex coll.: Robert Shurlock, Chertsey, near Guildford, Surrey (until d. 1847); Manwaring Shurlock, Chertsey (1847–at least 1891); Emily Shurlock, Oxford; by descent to Alan R. Shurlock, Mill Valley, California (until 1967)

Selected Reference: Williamson 1894, p. 164
Robert Shurlock, his wife, née Henrietta Ann Jane Russell, and their daughter Ann were the son-in-law, daughter, and granddaughter of the pastelist John Russell. Henrietta was the fifth of the artist's family of twelve and the eldest to survive childhood. Robert Shurlock, born in 1779, was four years younger than his wife, and he would have been twenty-one in 1800, the likely date of their marriage. Ann must have been the first of the couple's fourteen children. Henrietta Shurlock died at Stoke, Surrey, on February 25, 1849. The pastels belonged in 1894 to their son Manwaring Shurlock, according to whom Ann Shurlock's portrait was added to that of her mother, which dates to 1801.

Mr. Shurlock's coat is double-breasted with brass buttons, while his wife wears a white dress with a lace collar, a gauze scarf or bonnet, and a black figured-lace shawl. Her abnormally long right arm had doubtless been adjusted when the baby was added. The frames on the two pastels and on that of Mr. Shurlock's mother (no. 70) match and are almost certainly the originals. The donors of the four Shurlock pastels (nos. 68–71) were two brothers and their sister.

1. Williamson 1894, pp. 115, 147, 165, 170, lists portraits by Russell of Henrietta as a child with a doll; as a child with a partridge; and at the age of fifteen, with a dog, as a hop picker. He notes that Ann Shurlock was the model for a pastel exhibited at the 1803 Royal Academy as number 397, Child with Strawberries. A patient search would probably disclose other disguised portraits of this kind.

2. Manwaring married John Russell's granddaughter, Jane Faden Russell, while his sister Letitia married his wife's brother, also called John Russell. The marriages were childless. Information about the ownership of the pastels is drawn from an 1898 codicil to the will of Manwaring Shurlock, of which a copy is in the Museum's archives.

69. **Mrs. Robert Shurlock and Her Daughter Ann**

Pastel on paper, laid down on canvas, 23¾ x 17¼ in. (60.6 x 43.1 cm)
Signed and dated (upper right, in red chalk): J. Russell R.A. 1801
Inscribed (on paper label in black ink, removed from backing): Mrs Shurlock / by J. Russell R.A. 1801 / The baby being inserted afterwards / Give to Miss Emily Shurlock / 1891 / M.S.
Gift of Geoffrey Shurlock, 1967 (67.132)

Ex coll.: Robert Shurlock, Chertsey, near Guildford, Surrey (until d. 1847); Manwaring Shurlock, Chertsey (1847–at least 1898); Emily Shurlock, Oxford; by descent to Geoffrey M. Shurlock, Los Angeles, California (until 1967)

Selected Reference: Williamson 1894, p. 164
70. *Mrs. Shurlock, Mother of Robert Shurlock*

Pastel on paper, laid down on canvas, 24 × 17 7/8 in. (61 × 45.4 cm)
Signed and dated (upper left, in red chalk): J Russell R.A. p. 1801
Gift of Olive Shurlock Sjölander, 1973 (1975.217.1)

Ex coll.: Robert Shurlock, Chertsey, near Guildford, Surrey (until d. 1847); Reverend William Shurlock, Shepperton, Middlesex (1847–d. 1870); Captain C. Shurlock (1870–at least 1898); by descent to Olive Shurlock Sjölander, Skara, Sweden (until 1975)

Selected reference: Williamson 1894, p. 165

The pastel was described by G. C. Williamson as a portrait of Mrs. Shurlock, Robert Shurlock’s mother, that was in 1894 in the possession of Manwaring Shurlock (who stated that it actually belonged to his brother Captain Shurlock). The sleeve of the sitter’s dress is blue, but the general impression is silvery, from the tone of the bonnet, shawl, and open snuffbox, from which she takes a pinch of snuff.
William Russell

Born London, November 26, 1784; died Highgate, Middlesex, September 14, 1870

William Russell, a younger son of John Russell, aspired to a career as an artist and exhibited at the Royal Academy annually from 1805 through 1809. In the latter year he was ordained a clergyman and determined never to paint or draw again. For more than forty years, he was the rector of a parish at Shepperton, Middlesex. In committing himself to the church, William may at least in part have been following the example of his father, who was obsessively religious. G. C. Williamson (1894, opp. p. 72) illustrates a pastel titled The Young Artists, a charming double portrait of William and his brother Thomas in Van Dyck costume. The two boys, one holding a drawing of an old man in a cap and the other a porte-crayon, look to be no more than six and four years old.

Selected Reference

Attributed to William Russell

71. Robert Shurlock

Pastel on paper, 23 7/8 x 17 5/8 in. (60.6 x 45.4 cm)
Gift of Olive Shurlock Sjölander, 1975 (1975.217.1)

Ex coll.: ?Reverend William Russell, Shepperton, Middlesex (until d. 1870); ?Captain C. Shurlock (1870—at least 1878); by descent to Olive Shurlock Sjölander, Skara, Sweden (until 1975)

In a codicil to his will dated April 2, 1898, a transcript of which is in the Museum’s archives, Manwaring Shurlock refers to “the portrait of my father in oils by Rev. Wm. Russell.” It seems possible that William accompanied his father to the Shurlock home in Chertsey in 1801, when he was in his late teens, and that this pastel is his work. It could even be the portrait referred to by Manwaring Shurlock, despite the difference in medium. William Russell was several years younger than his brother-in-law, Robert Shurlock, the sitter here. Compared with the other family portraits in the Museum’s collection (nos. 68–70), this one is of notably inferior quality, and although the sitter’s expression is lively, details of the background and costume are blurred and unresolved. The work is the only one of the group that has not been previously published.
Sir William Beechey

Born Burford, Oxfordshire, December 12, 1753; died Hampstead (London), January 28, 1839

Beechey’s uncle, by whom he was raised, sent him to London to become a lawyer, but the young man shortly gave up his studies and in 1772 entered the Royal Academy schools. He first exhibited at the academy in 1776, sending two small whole-length portraits, and continued to submit works of the kind from London addresses through 1782. That year he was invited to spend a month at Norwich, in Norfolk, where he settled. He exhibited nine works at the Royal Academy in 1785 and the same number in 1786; the catalogues list his residence as Norwich. In 1787 Beechey returned to a successful London career, painting only lifesize portraits from 1789 onward. His early style owes much to the influence of Zoffany, his later work to Reynolds. Having married young and lost his first wife, he married again, in 1793, Anne Phyllis Jessop of Norwich, a miniature painter who occasionally exhibited at the Royal Academy. The couple had many children. Beechey was appointed portrait painter to Queen Charlotte in 1793, elected to full membership in the Royal Academy in 1798, and knighted the same year by George III. Subsequently he was principal portrait painter to William IV. Beechey’s career was distinguished by its length: with few exceptions he showed annually from 1776 until 1838. The patronage of the Hanoverian monarchs, while usually a key to contemporary success, was not a guarantor of posthumous fame, and for a hundred years Beechey’s oeuvre has attracted little if any critical commentary.

Selected References

72. Edward Miles

Oil on canvas, 11 7/8 × 9 1/4 in. (30.2 × 23.1 cm)
Signed, dated, and inscribed: (lower right, on portfolio) 1784 / W Beechey / pinx; (lower left, on sketchbook) Edm. Miles / /Et 32; (on top stretcher bar, in black ink) Edward Miles Sr 1732–1828 / Sir William Beechey R.A. Pinx. Painted in 1784 / 1785–1789
Gift of Heathcote Art Foundation, 1986 (1986.264.1)
Ex coll.: Josephine Mercy Heathcote Haskell, New York (until d. 1982); Heathcote Art Foundation (1982–86)

Selected Exhibition: H.Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1786, no. 67 (as Portrait of an artist)


Born at Yarmouth, in Norfolk, on October 14, 1752, Miles was Beechey’s contemporary. Both entered the Royal Academy schools in 1772, while Miles first showed there in 1775 and Beechey the following year.1 In 1782 Beechey moved to Norwich, where he lived at 4 Market Place. Miles, a miniature painter, was living in the same city at 7 Market Place in 1782; he was there in 1779, and, apparently, until at least 1785.
Beechey’s portrait of Miles, which bears the artist’s name as well as the sitter’s name and age, must date between January 1 and October 13, 1785, the day before Miles celebrated his thirty-third birthday; it seems to have been sent for exhibition in 1786, but 1787 is also a possibility. Miles, who became miniature painter to Queen Charlotte in 1794, painted the queen that same year and probably also two of her daughters. There are portraits by Miles, apparently slightly earlier, of three of the princes as well. The artist moved in 1797 to St. Petersburg and served Czars Paul I and Alexander I in the same capacity. In 1807 he settled in Philadelphia, where he died in 1828.

This sympathetic, small-scale, highly finished work is a good example of Beechey’s early style and is in very good state. It implies the existence of a friendly relationship between artist and sitter that was already of some duration and that could have lasted through the years they were employed by the queen and until Miles went abroad, never to return. The miniaturist’s mild, open expression and hunched shoulders suggest a gentle character. He is elegantly dressed and grasps a porte-crayon for drawing in his right hand.

2. Wilson 1904 argues that it was among the small portraits framed as a group and sent to the Royal Academy in 1787. As the rules of the academy stipulated that each work must be framed separately, Beechey’s submission was rejected.

73. Portrait of a Woman

Oil on canvas, 50 × 40 1/4 in. (127 × 102.2 cm)
Gift of George A. Hearn, 1905 (05.31.1)

Ex coll.: David H. King Jr., New York (until 1896; his sale, Chickering Hall, New York, February 17–19, 1896, no. 55, as Portrait of a Lady, 50 × 40 in., for $3,000 to Blakeslee); [T. J. Blakeslee, New York, from 1896]; George A. Hearn, New York (until 1905)


According to a handwritten description in the Museum’s copy of the 1896 sale catalogue of the King collection, the sitter in lot number 55 wears a red wrap and carries a parasol, the attributes illustrated here. Percy Moore Turner called the portrait “most attractive,” pointing out that while Beechey was “one of the most unequal painters of the British school,” he was quite good “when seen in a congenial mood.” The costume and the arrangement of the hair suggest a date of about 1805. The painting is generally in good state but was flattened in the lining process.
SIR WILLIAM BEECHEY AND WORKSHOP

74. George IV When Prince of Wales

Oil on canvas, 56¼ × 44⅜ in. (142.9 × 113 cm)
Gift of Heathcote Art Foundation, 1986 (1986.164.3)

Ex coll.: Lord Newton (until 1946; his sale, Sotheby’s, London, July 17, 1946, no. 65, as George IV, wearing the Star of the Garter, the right hand resting on his sword, turned left, 55 × 43 in., for £18 to Koetser); Josephine Mercy Heathcote Haskell, New York (until d. 1982); Heathcote Art Foundation (1982–86)

The Prince of Wales may have been the only member of George III’s family who did not particularly admire Beechey; he preferred Hoppner. Nevertheless, in 1798, Beechey presented to the Royal Academy as his diploma work a standing three-quarter-length portrait of the prince in the uniform of the Tenth Light Dragoons, wearing the star of the Order of the Garter and holding a saber in his right hand (fig. 107). A later variant in the Royal Collection was painted for Edward, Duke of Kent, at the sitter’s command: Beechey asked eighty-four pounds for it on September 5, 1806, and his receipt for the same sum, plus ten guineas for the frame, is dated January 26, 1807. He states that he painted it in 1803 and describes it as a “Bishop’s Half length,” that is, fifty and one-half by forty inches. He also mentions that the prince proposed to sit for him briefly for alterations to the hair, which does in fact differ from that in the first version.

The Museum’s painting is a replica, differing in many small details, of the earlier, Royal Academy picture. The face is paler, with the hair lightly powdered, while the jaw is slack, and there is less shadow on the sitter’s right cheek. The modeling is delicate, but the expression lacks tension. The costume is painted broadly, without the bright highlights on the silver threads. The background is less varied in tone. The question is whether the canvas is at least in part by Beechey, an artist whose work is extremely uneven in quality. This seems possible, while the schematic, rather lifeless painting of the uniform indicates a studio assistant. The canvas was flattened in lining, and there is an old tear that is partly visible below the tassels on the left side.

2. See Roberts 1967, p. 224; and Oliver Millas, The Later Georgian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen (London, 1969), vol. 2, p. 8, no. 664, vol. 2, pl. 162, for the painting in the Royal Collection and for mention of a copy that had belonged to Lord Newton and was sold at Sotheby’s in 1946.

Fig. 107. Sir William Beechey, The Prince of Wales (Later George IV), ca. 1798.
Oil on canvas, 55¼ × 46¾ in. (142.4 × 117.6 cm). Royal Academy of Arts, London (03/1380)
Gainsborough Dupont was the son of Thomas Gainsborough’s elder sister, Sarah, and her husband, Philip Dupont, a carpenter in Sudbury. Apprenticed to his uncle in Bath on January 14, 1772, he moved with the Gainsborough family to London in 1774 and entered the Royal Academy schools the following year. He is reported to have assisted with the painting of Queen Charlotte’s dress in Gainsborough’s 1781 full-length portrait (Royal Collection), with its remarkably beautiful drapery. In the 1780s he also made reduced copies of Gainsborough’s late works as well as mezzotints after the reductions, remaining in his uncle’s studio until the latter’s death in 1788. As an independent painter in London, Gainsborough Dupont exhibited at the Royal Academy (between 1790 and 1792), was employed by George III, and painted theatrical portraits, several of which belong to the Garrick Club. Dupont was perhaps most successful with landscapes, one of which is in the collection of the Brooklyn Museum, New York.

Selected References

Anne Elizabeth Cholmley was the daughter of Nathaniel Cholmley, member of Parliament for Howsham and Whitby. She was born in 1769 and married, on June 20, 1787, Constantine John Phipps, second Baron Mulgrave, of the Royal Navy, who was twenty-five years her senior. On May 22, 1788, she died in childbirth, leaving a daughter, Anne Elizabeth Cholmley Phipps. This is a small studio replica by Dupont of Gainsborough’s portrait of Miss Cholmley, which was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1785 as number 47.1

Walter Armstrong was the first to record this panel, as a Gainsborough in the Gould collection. Duveen’s bought it for stock, affording Sir Joseph the opportunity to give it to investment banker Jules Bache, a loyal client. In his checklist, Ellis Waterhouse noted that the sitter is Anne Elizabeth Cholmley and that the work was “certainly not by Gainsborough” but a copy of his portrait then (in 1953) in the Jean Grout collection. John Hayes, enlarging on Waterhouse’s opinion, observed that Gainsborough Dupont painted portraits of the kind while in his uncle’s studio and that this picture “betrays throughout that fussiness of handling, often masking form, that is one of the trademarks of [Dupont’s] painting.”2 Both this work and the following, attributed to Richard Gainsborough Dupont (no. 76), present modest object lessons and shed light on the byways of Gainsborough scholarship in the twentieth century.

75. Anne Elizabeth Cholmley, Later Lady Mulgrave

Oil on wood, overall, 7 3/8 x 5 3/4 in. (18.1 x 14.6 cm); painted surface, 6 x 4 3/4 in. (15.2 x 12.1 cm)
The Jules Bache Collection, 1949 (49.7.56)

Ex coll.: George Jay Gould, New York (by 1890; as by Gainsborough); [Duveen, New York, until 1931; given to Bache]; Jules Bache, New York (1931–d. 1944; his estate, 1944–49; cat., 1929, 1937, no. 58; 1943, no. 57)


1. The provenance of Gainsborough’s portrait: by descent to George Augustus Constantine Phipps, 2nd Marquess of Normanby, Mulgrave Castle, near Whitby, Yorkshire (until 1880; sold to Price); James Price, Barcombe, Paignton, South Devon (1880–95; his posthumous sale, Christie’s, London, June 15, 1895, no. 70, as Gainsborough, Lady Mulgrave, Anne Elizabeth Cholmley, for £750 to Campbell); Camille Groult, Paris (until d. 1908); by descent in the Groult family (until at least 1953). Miss Cholmley’s future husband sat for Gainsborough at about the same time, and Gainsborough Dupont made one or more replicas of the portrait. See Ellis K. Waterhouse, comp., “Preliminary Check List of Portraits by Thomas Gainsborough,” Walpole Society 33 (1948–50; pub. 1953), pp. 82–83, and also a reduced replica in the Cincinnati Art Museum, Gift of Emilie L. Heine (1940–55).

Richard Gainsborough Dupont was the nephew of Gainsborough Dupont. A painter and illustrator, he made small pencil drawings that were reproduced as engravings in the *Ladies’ Pocket Memorandum Book*, published from 1822.

**Selected Reference**

---

**Attributed to Richard Gainsborough Dupont**

76. *Mrs. John Puget*

Oil on copper, 6 x 4 3/4 in. (15.2 x 12.1 cm)  
Bequest of Mary Stillman Harkness, 1950 (50.145.18)

**Ex coll.:** Mrs. Thomas Browne; her daughter, Emily Sarah Browne (given before her d. in 1906 to Hadland); E. Hadland, St. Leonards-on-Sea, East Sussex;* [Knedler, Paris]; Mrs. William Salomon (until 1928; her posthumous sale, American Art Association, New York, January 4–7, 1928, no. 761, as Gainsborough, Mrs. Puget, to Knedler); [Knedler, New York, 1928; sold to Harkness]; Mr. and Mrs. Edward S. Harkness, New York (1928–his d. 1940); Mary Stillman (Mrs. Edward S.) Harkness, New York (1940–d. 1950)

**Selected Reference:** Carroll Carstairs, *Postscript to Criticism* (London, 1934), pl. 6, as by Gainsborough

---

Mrs. Puget, born Catherine Hawkins, was the daughter of an Irish bishop. She married, on April 17, 1786, John Puget, of Dublin and Totteridge, a banker and a governor of the Bank of England. She survived her husband, who died suddenly in 1805. According to William T. Whitley, Gainsborough’s portrait of Mrs. Puget was in the artist’s studio at the end of December 1787. This is a small replica.

In 1932 Ellis Waterhouse described it as “by an assistant, who would almost certainly have been Dupont.” John Hayes, in 1964, supposed both the painting and the soft-ground etching on the reverse (fig. 108) to be by Gainsborough Dupont. In 1991 Graham Reynolds was inclined to agree. Hugh Belsey has instead proposed an attribution to Richard Gainsborough Dupont, pointing out that the design in the copper “seems to correspond with (though it is not identical to) the plate of the soft-ground etching by W. F. Wells” after a lost drawing by Thomas Gainsborough from the Hibbert collection that was not published until 1802. As the present work and number 75 above are apparently by different hands, it seems reasonable to accept the suggestion of Belsey, who has extensive knowledge of Thomas Gainsborough, Gainsborough Dupont, and their descendants. It is, however, difficult to imagine how R. G. Dupont came to see Gainsborough’s painting.

---

1. A presumed chain of descent from Gainsborough Dupont and his sister Sarah Dupont Stowe, through her granddaughter and great-granddaughter to Miss Hadland, must have been based on details provided by Miss Hadland to Knedler or an intermediary (see the catalogue of the posthumous sale of Mrs. Salomon). See also Belsey 1988, pp. 34, 43, for two authentic Gainsboroughs with that provenance. If by Gainsborough or his nephew, the present painting theoretically could have belonged to Mrs. Stowe. If by neither, the information was based on an incorrect assumption.

2. William T. Whitley, *Thomas Gainsborough* (New York, 1915), p. 294, who called her “a beautiful Irishwoman.” Gainsborough’s painting has the following provenance: by descent to Colonel John Puget (until 1897; his sale, Christie’s, London, May 8, 1897, no. 86, for £5,040 to Wertheimer; [C. J. Wertheimer, Paris, in 1897]; Baron Alphonse de Rothschild, Paris; by descent in the Rothschild family (until at least 1946).


Sir Henry Raeburn

Scottish, born Stockbridge, near Edinburgh, March 4, 1756; died Edinburgh, July 8, 1823

Raeburn was a prolific and almost entirely self-taught painter about whose work too little is at present known. He was born just outside Edinburgh, where he spent nearly all his life, and he is the only Scottish portraitist represented in the Museum's collection. Raeburn's parents died when he was a boy. He was looked after by his older brother and sent to school in Edinburgh from 1765 until 1772, when he was indentured to a jeweler and goldsmith in whose workshop he remained until 1778. He married, probably in 1780, Ann Leslie, a wealthy widow with children who was twelve years his senior, and the couple had two sons: Peter, born May 18, 1781, and Henry Jr., born October 24, 1783. During this period he participated with other young artists in a private drawing class, studying casts and receiving some instruction from the Scottish artist Alexander Runciman.

By the summer of 1784, Raeburn was preparing to leave his family and set off for Rome, where he seems to have remained until the spring of 1786. We know almost nothing of his life there. He must have visited London on his way to Rome and back to Edinburgh, where in 1788 he received payment for a pair of portraits of the lord president of Scotland's highest court, Sir William Forbes of Craigevar, and Lady Forbes (Craigievar Castle, National Trust for Scotland). Working first in his George Street studio and from about 1798 in York Place, where his painting rooms are still preserved, he assumed the mantle of the leading portraitist of the Scottish Enlightenment. In 1801, his business interests having left him in severe financial difficulties, Raeburn stayed for some months in London and considered moving there but ultimately returned to his native city. He was elected to England's Royal Academy in 1815 and knighted by George IV in 1822. In the spring of 1823, shortly before his death, he was honored with the title King's Painter and Limner in Scotland.

---

Lucy Johnston, the daughter of Wynne Johnston of Hilltown, seems to have been christened Louisa. She married, in 1793, Richard Alexander Oswald of Auchincruive, St. Quivox, Ayr. The couple had two children, Richard, who died without issue, and Mary, who married, in 1818, Thomas Spencer Lindsay of Hollymount, County Mayo, Ireland. In May 1799, the Scottish poet Robert Burns addressed a song to her that he titled

“O, Wat Ye Wha's in Yon Town,” calling her “that incomparable woman.” Lucy composed an air to which Burns set his poem “Thou Lingerling Star.” Forced to seek a warmer climate because of ill health, she traveled to Lisbon, where in 1797 or 1798 she died of pulmonary consumption. The present portrait must have belonged to the sitter’s husband, because it descended until 1921 in the Oswald family. It has been dated about 1795 and was engraved in stipple by H. T. Ryall for the 1843–44 edition of The Works of Robert Burns. Mrs. Oswald, her expression solemn and her eyes downcast, is seated on a hillock and faces to the right, with an open book on her lap. The crisp ruffled collar of her dress frames her head. The setting sun brilliantly illuminates the sky through a screen of tree trunks and foliage in the background, a device Raeburn favored in the mid-1790s. Typically for the artist, there are extensive drying cracks, principally in the dark passages in the background.

Raeburn painted another half-length portrait of about the same date that has been identified since 1876 as Mrs. Oswald, née Lucy Johnston. That portrait was included in the 1876 Raeburn exhibition as number 28, from the collection of James T. Gibson-Craig of Edinburgh. It seems to me to represent a different sitter.
confusion about her biography. For the most part, we have followed Burke's Landed Gentry of Great Britain, vol. 1, The Kingdom in Scotland, 19th ed. (London, 2001), pp. 1188–119.


7. See note 5 above; and Freeman O'Donoghue, Catalogue of Engraved British Portraits Preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum, vol. 3 (London, 1921), p. 384, who instead asserts that she sat for Raeburn before her marriage in 1793.


78. Janet Law

Oil on canvas, 35 1/4 x 27 1/4 in. (89.5 x 69.2 cm)
Inscribed (on two labels, removed from stretcher):
Sir H. Raeburn R.A. / Miss Janet Law— / afterwards / Mrs Berry / of Tayfield / Fife; Raeburn / Mrs. Janet Law
Bequest of Helen Swift Neilson, 1945 (46.135)

EX COLL.: [French Gallery, Edinburgh]; John A. Holmes (by 1908–12); sale, Christie’s, London, July 12, 1912, no. 85, as Miss Janet Law, afterwards Mrs. Berry, of Tayfield, Fife, for £5,040 to A. Wertheimer; [Asher Wertheimer, London, from 1912]; Adolph Hirsch; Mr. Wild; E. H. Cuthbertson (until 1926; his sale, Christie’s, London, May 14, 1926, no. 105, to Palmer); [Scott & Fowles, New York, 1927; sold to Neilson]; Helen Swift (Mrs. Francis) Neilson, Chicago (1927–d. 1945)


Janet Law was the third daughter and one of seven children of Janet Pilmor Law and Munro Law of Pittillock, Fife, major in the Royal Scots Greys. She must have been painted in the 1790s. Janet first married, in 1775, Walter Wemyss of Lathockar, Fife, and then Colin Lauder, M.D., and died without issue. In 1770 her sister Isabella married, as his second wife, John Berry of Tayfield, Fife. (The two women are confused in labels from the reverse.) Her sister Agnes married their cousin, Captain George Makgill of Kemback and Fingask, Fife. Makgill had joined the army of Prince Charles and, after the battle of Culloden, had fled to France. Eventually he was pardoned, returned to Scotland, and attained the rank of captain in the Twelfth Regiment of Foot. Raeburn painted him in uniform, apparently shortly before his death in 1797.2 Raeburn’s portraits of Mr. and Mrs. Makgill (as well as that of Janet Law) were in the 1912 Holms sale, as numbers 76 and 75.3

Janet Law, in white, is seated in a chair with green upholstery. Her face is round, her lips slightly pursed, and her hair gray or lightly powdered. Logic would suggest that her portrait may have descended in the family of Captain and Mrs. Makgill, though no evidence to that effect has been found. The picture is first recorded in 1908.

1. Holms and all the subsequent owners, together with several exhibitions and references, are listed on a third label removed from the stretcher. It is captioned “Miss Janet Law . . . afterwards Mrs. Berry of Tayfield.”

2. A photograph of the painting of Captain Makgill is at the Frick Art Reference Library, New York. An elderly man with powdered hair, he wears a red coat with buff collar and revers, and a buff waistcoat and trousers. According to the description on the back of the photograph, he is seated in a chair upholstered in green.

3. The portrait of Captain Makgill sold for £787½ to Wallis, whereas that of Mrs. Makgill sold for £4,095 to Asher Wertheimer.
William Forsyth, born in 1749, was a wine merchant from Aberdeen who lived in Nova Scotia from 1784 until 1800, when he returned to Scotland and settled at Greenock, near Glasgow. In 1777 he married Mary Rannie, born in 1756. Their children were Margaret, born in 1779 and later Mrs. William Smith; James, born in 1781; William, born in 1783, and Thomas, born in 1789, while the family was abroad. Both parents sat for Raeburn in or shortly after their return in 1800 (fig. 109), and there are two versions of each portrait. One pair of portraits descended in the family of the couple’s eventual heir, Thomas Forsyth, while the other pair, including the present work, could have belonged to Mrs. Smith. William Forsyth died at sixty-five on October 11, 1814. In 1867 Harry D. Forsyth, a descendant, provided a copy of William’s unpublished memoir, excerpts from which are published below.1

This portrait, of a standard type, is in good state with a somewhat yellow varnish. It has not been treated since it was acquired.

1. Apparently, the history of ownership of the companion to this portrait (fig. 109) is as follows:
   - Evelyn Forsyth Gordon, London (until 1935; sold to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1935–36; sold to Lee]; H. Morton Lee (from 1954); P. E. Rank (his estate, until 1965; sold to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1955; sold to Hardie]; Lieutenant Colonel S. J. L. Hardie of Ballathie (1955–60); his posthumous sale, Sotheby’s, London, November 13, 1969, no. 126, for £3,000 to Agnew]; [Agnew, London, 1969–70; sold to Keith]; Sir Kenneth Keith (from 1970). It was exhibited in Edinburgh in 1956, no. 27. One of the portraits of Mrs. Forsyth, perhaps the companion to ours, was with Newhouse, New York, in 1982. The provenance of the other version of the Museum’s picture seems to be: Thomas Forsyth, Liverpool (until d. 1853); William Forsyth, London (1853–d. 1890); Mrs. William Henniker Forsyth, London (in 1911); Mrs. Maurice (Jean Forsyth) Todhunter (in 1953); Mrs. Ivan (Griselda Todhunter) Hills, Polesden Lacy, near Dorking, Surrey (in 1967). The companion portrait of Mrs. Forsyth has the same history of ownership until 1953, subsequently it descended to Ursula Todhunter.

Copy of a memorandum written by my grandfather William Forsyth born 28th Sep. 1749, died 1814.

When a person remove himself & his family from his native country to a distant part of the world, & time has taken off the stage of life the scenes & circumstances he has left behind, it may at some future period be a subject of enquiry amongst those that survive him in his own family What is the name of the City or County he came from, or the Parish that gave him birth. To satisfy the curiosity if ever it shall become one is my intention in narrating the following.

I was born in Crimmond (the name of a farm in the Parish of Crimmond & County of Aberdeen in Scotland) on the 28th of Sep’ 1749. My father’s name was James Forsyth & my mother’s Christina Boys. I was their second & last child.

My brother whose name was James was two years older than myself. He went to London at the commencement of the American wars, entered himself as a Volunteer & was killed in the Jerseys soon after he landed in America.

My mother died the 31st of March 1756. She was remarkable for her piety. Her education was superior to that of the generality of her sex in her rank of life. She was a regular attendant upon divine service, & a worthy member of the Established Church.

My father afterwards married Elisabeth Murray widow of James Forrest, farmer in Corticram in the parish of Longmay to which place my father removed his family.

And soon I was able to walk any distance I was sent along with my brother to the school of Longside.

In a few years my father gave up the farm of Corticram & went to Newry (Newark) in the same parish, & there being no Public School in that place, I was sent to a private school kept by William Smith of [crossed out] at Blair . . . mount, with whom I first learnt to read & cipher. At the age of 14 I was sent to Aberdeen where I was bound apprentice to William & Thomas Cruden, Wholesale Haberdashers. My father’s circumstances did not entitle me to a liberal education: it was confined to but an imperfect knowledge of the English language as taught at a country school, the common rules of Arithmetic & Writing. [T]he two latter I had an opportunity of improving myself in during my apprenticeship but I have had much cause to regret that I had no opportunity of being made perfect in English nor of acquiring some knowledge of Latin or any other language, & I have always felt a difference in speaking on any subject in public.

M’ Thomas Cruden died in 1769 & I continued my apprentice ship with William Cruden. One year after it expired, I was admitted co partner under the firm of William Cruden & C. & I continued Mr. Cruden’s partner for 11 years.

In Nov. 1777 I was married to Mary Rannie my affectionate & loving wife. She is daughter of Mr. Murray Rannie Manufacturer in Cullen Banffshire.

It was an early attachment, & we had every prospect of happiness before us. We had
an agreeable & respectable circle of friends & circumstances, & my commercial affairs succeeded tolerably well, but finding my family increase & with it my expenses, I was desirous to increase my business, but Mr. Cruden possessing a fortune independent of his business was not anxious about extending his trade, & I became concerned with a Mr. George Thomson in the grain trade. This gentleman who was likewise a large importer of wines in which I had no concern, unfortunately attempted to smuggle some cargoes of wine from France. He was detected, & he elapsed to Dunkirk leaving me his security & government for a large amount besides being deeply indebted to me in private account.

Finding myself unable to discharge this sum & anxious to do justice to all my creditors resolved before any demand was made upon me to stop payment. My creditors met: I laid my situation before them, when some proposed to take a dividend of what property, I was possessed of, & to grant a discharge. Others, less generous proposed to accept of their share of the whole property I had in the meantime, & to grant a letter of licence for seven years to pay the balance. This last resolution did not however prevent others from giving a voluntary discharge.

At the time of Mr. Thomson’s elopement I was a Member of the Council of Aberdeen & by Virtue of my office held a considerable sum of public money which to me was no small matter of concern. I have since had it in my power & with much satisfaction to myself) to discharge all these debts, as well as those who had discharged me, as those who had not—although it was for some time a drain upon my industry after I arrived in Nova Scotia.

On the 26th of August 1779 my eldest daughter Margaret (now Mrs. Smith) was born. My eldest son James was born the 24th day of June 1781 & my second son William was born the 1st day of July 1783. It was in this year that I was obliged to stop payment. I then began to cast my thoughts toward America & having for several years done business with the house of Morrison & Co. of Greenock, I communicated my wishes to them & they readily agreed to go into business with me in America. This happening soon after the peace British merchants had not the same confidence in the American government which they have since had. & Messrs. Morrison & Co. having done business at Halifax, we fixed upon Nova Scotia as the most eligible situation. On the 4th of June 1784 I embarked at Greenock on board the ship Lucy with my wife & daughter Margaret & arrived at Halifax the 13th of July after Where I now find myself this 8th day of January 1799.


80. James Johnston of Straiton

Oil on canvas, 35 1/4 x 27 1/4 in. (89.5 x 69.2 cm)
Bequest of Adele L. Lehman, in memory of Arthur Lehman, 1965 (65.181.11)

Ex coll.: by descent to Mrs. Johnston’s nephew, Sir William Baillie, 2nd Baronet, of Polkemmet (by 1876–d. 1900); Lady Baillie of Polkemmet (by 1901–d. 1910); her estate sale, Christie’s, London, June 16, 1911, no. 117, for £1,152.10.0 to Knoedler; [Knoedler, New York, 1911; sold to Lehman]; Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Lehman, New York (1911–his d. 1956); Adele L. (Mrs. Arthur) Lehman, New York (1956–d. 1965)


The sitter is James Johnston of Straiton, Midlothian, who died in 1841. He married Mary Baillie, second daughter of William Baillie, Lord Polkemmet, a judge of the Court of Session from 1793 until 1811. The present work and Raeburn’s portrait of Mrs. Johnston (fig. 110) descended in the Baillie family despite the fact that the couple had a son, also called James. Her portrait, acquired by Knoedler at the same time as that of her husband, was sold in 1912 to George Eastman and belongs now to the Eastman collection at the Memorial Art Gallery, University of Rochester, New York. Mrs. Johnston’s father and her stepmother, born Janet Sinclair, also sat for Raeburn. James Johnston is seated in an armchair upholstered in crimson damask and holds an open book in his lap. The portrait may perhaps date to about 1800.

1. The Rochester Memorial Art Gallery of the University of Rochester, Handbook (Rochester, 1961), p. 85. Her portrait, no. 116 in the 1911 sale, fetched $5,775, over four times as much as that of her husband. A portrait of the younger James Johnston of Straiton by G. Watson, no. 119 in the same sale, went to Knoedler for $70.80.

Fig. 110. Sir Henry Raeburn, Mrs. Johnston of Straiton, ca. 1800. Oil on canvas, 35 x 27 in. (88.9 x 68.6 cm). Memorial Art Gallery of the University of Rochester: George Eastman Collection of the University of Rochester (78.6)
John Gray of Newholm

Oil on canvas, 49/8 x 40 in. (125.4 x 101.6 cm)
Bequest of Lillian S. Timken, 1959 (60.71.13)

Ex coll.: Alexander Cunningham, Edinburgh (in 1876); Major-General Sir Alexander Cunningham (in 1907); R. Hall McCormick, Chicago; Frank Bulkeley Smith, Worcester, Mass. (by 1913–20; his posthumous sale, American Art Association, New York, April 23, 1920, no. 110, for $2,100 to Seaman); Lillian S. (Mrs. William R.) Timken, New York (until d. 1959)


Selected references: Andrew 1894, p. 124, no. 134; Armstrong 1901, p. 103, ill. p. 52; Pinnington 1904, p. 232; Greig 1911, p. 47, ill. p. 20

John Gray, the eldest son of William Gray of Newholm, was born in 1731 and died on February 15, 1811. An attorney, he was a writer to the signet and, from 1786 until his death in 1811, town clerk of Edinburgh. He married Marion Brown, daughter of the Reverend James Brown, a minister of Edinburgh. A fine mezzotint engraving by George Dawe after Raeburn’s portrait of John Gray was published by D. Hatton, Edinburgh, in 1806 and dedicated to the Royal Company of Golfers. Perhaps Gray was one of their number.

The sitter’s heavyset face is intelligent and quizzical. His pose is severely frontal, and he holds a snuffbox in his left hand. The generally well preserved portrait was cleaned at the Metropolitan Museum in 1992 by Hubert von Sonnenburg. At that time, old black overpaint was removed from the sitter’s stockings, returning their color to the original white. The view through the window at the left had been retouched to read as a landscape with trees and an ominous sky rather than a volcano with a plume and a cloud of black smoke. These changes also were reversed. Rather little is known about John Gray, and the significance of the volcano has yet to be discovered.

David Mackie, writing in 1888, knew of, but had not seen, another portrait of Gray and having looked at this one, identified it as a copy. However, assuming the provenance to be correct, the present work was accepted as a Raeburn while on long-term loan from Major-General Cunningham to the Scottish National Portrait Gallery, Edinburgh, and was also lent, as the work of Raeburn, by Frank Bulkeley Smith to the Worcester Art Museum, Massachusetts. Technically, it seems to be quite typical for the artist, who in any event painted many replicas. The sitter’s apparent age and costume suggest a date between 1795 and 1805, the year before Dawe’s print was published.

1. Information from the brochure of the unidentified dealer who sold the painting to Mrs. Timken.
2. Scottish writers to the signet correspond to English barristers. They have certain exclusive privileges and by custom are considered a corporation. See “Writers to the Signet,” in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed., vol. 28 (Cambridge, 1911), p. 931.
82. William Robertson, Lord Robertson

Oil on canvas, 49 1/2 × 39 1/4 in. (125.7 × 99.7 cm)
Inscribed: on verso, covered by lining canvas
Taken H[1] Length July (1?0; on stretcher) Lord Robertson, by Raeburn
Bequest of Mary Stillman Harkness, 1950 (50.145.32)

Ex coll.: by descent to Dr. S. D. Robertson Macdonald MacVicar, Invermoundart, Argyll (until 1910; sale, Christie’s, London, July 23, 1920, no. 4, for £1,155 to Knoedler; [Knoedler, London and New York, 1920–25; sold to Field]; Marshall Field, Chicago (1925–26; sold to Knoedler); [Knoedler, New York, 1926–27; sold to Harkness], Mr. and Mrs. Edward S. Harkness, New York (1927–his d. 1940); Mary Stillman (Mrs. Edward S.) Harkness, New York (1940–d. 1950)


Lord Robertson was born December 15, 1733. He was the eldest son of Dr. William Robertson, clergyman, distinguished historian, and chancellor of Edinburgh University (who sat for Raeburn in 1793), and of his wife, née Mary Nisbet. The younger Robertson studied law and was admitted to the bar as an advocate in 1775, shortly after his twenty-first birthday. In 1779 he was chosen procurator, or chief counsel, to the Church of Scotland. On November 14, 1805, just before his fifty-second birthday, he was seated on the Scottish bench with the title Lord Robertson. He was a judge of the Court of Session, Scotland’s supreme civil court, until 1826 and died on November 20, 1835.

The inscription indicates that Robertson was painted during the summer of 1805. His deep-set eyes and strong jawline suggest a forthright, determined character. He wears a wig and white bands with the gray-and-crimson gown of a Lord of Session. While some passages may once have been more legible, Raeburn probably would not have described the sitter’s collar, britches, and hose, or the fall of the skirt of his robe, any more precisely. He has also left the ill-proportioned chair largely to the viewer’s imagination. By contrast, Raeburn sheds sharp light on the bony structure of Robertson’s face and attacks the drapery and ribbons of his costume with a flurry of red, salmon, white, and black strokes, suggesting the dense textures, pliability, and brilliance of the materials. In the abstractions of the patterns and in the sensuous quality of the pigments he used here, the artist was ahead of his time. This portrait was neither published nor illustrated until 1920 and does not figure in the Raeburn literature.

1. According to Knoedler’s invoice to Edward S. Harkness, December 21, 1926.
2. David Robertson, the younger of Lord Robertson’s two brothers, married Margaret Macdonald of Kinloch-Moidart in 1799 and assumed her name, indicating that the picture passed by descent until 1920.
3. See Thomson 1997, pp. 96–97, no. 22, colorpl. The painting was commissioned for and still belongs to the University of Edinburgh.

Sir Henry Raeburn 169
83. George Harley Drummond

Oil on canvas, 94⅛ × 58 in. (239.4 × 147.3 cm)
Gift of Mrs. Guy Fairfax Cary, in memory of her mother, Mrs. Burke Roche, 1949 (49.142)

EX COLL.: Thomas Macknight Crawford of Carlsburn, Renfrew (by 1879); Mrs. L. Macknight Crawford, Cheltenham (until 1913); sale, Christie's, London, February 28, 1913, no. 94, for £3,813.10.0 to A. Wertheimer; [Asher Wertheimer, London, from 1913]; [Knoedler, New York, until 1916; sold for $16,000 to Roche]; Mrs. Frances Burke Roche, New York (1916–d. 1947); Mrs. Guy Fairfax Cary, New York (1947–49)

SELECTED EXHIBITION: Royal Scottish Academy, Edinburgh, “Sir Henry Raeburn, R.A.,” October–November 1876, no. 298 (as Harley Drummond, Esq., lent by T. Macknight Crawford, Esq. of Carlsburn)

SELECTED REFERENCES: Andrew 1894, p. 114, no. 78; Armstrong 1901, p. 100; Pinnington 1904, p. 227; Greig 1911, p. 43

The sitter is George Harley Drummond of Stanmore, Middlesex, and Drumtochtly, Kincardine. He was born on November 23, 1783, and married on February 7, 1801, when he was seventeen, Margaret, daughter of Alexander Munro, merchant of Glasgow. Their elder son, George (see no. 84), was born in 1802. George Harley, who was of Scottish descent, was the great-grandson of the founder of the Drummond family banking house, Drummonds of Charing Cross, London. His mother, Martha, died in 1788, and his father, George, a banker with extravagant habits, followed her in 1789, leaving three small children. The unruly George Harley Drummond, the oldest son and heir also to his paternal grandmother’s fortune, was excluded from the bank, “ruined his life by gambling and dissipation, and would have squandered all [his] inheritance . . . but for the precautions imposed on him by . . . members of [his] family.” By 1821 he had abandoned Margaret Drummond and was living with Sarah Drury, the wife of a naval officer. Eventually he fled to Dublin to escape his creditors and died there, penniless, on March 21, 1855. Sarah, who called herself Mrs. Drummond, erected a monument to him in Dublin’s Mount Jerome cemetery and is buried beside him.

George Harley Drummond stands easily at full length, in riding clothes and top boots, a fob with seals at his waist. He holds a whip in his right hand and rests his left arm and hat on the rump of his saddled bay hunting horse. Reynolds had mastered the genre of the dismounted equestrian portrait, and Raeburn was perhaps familiar with similar compositions that Reynolds had employed for his lifesize full-lengths of both George, Prince of Wales (Collection of Lord Lloyd Webber), exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1784 and engraved in 1793, and John Manners, Marquess of Granby (versions in the John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, Sarasota, Florida, and the Royal Collection), which was also engraved. In 1788–89 Raeburn had painted a three-quarter-length of Captain Patrick Miller of Dumfries (fig. 111) in a similar pose, with his horse. All the others are military portraits. What sets them apart from the present work is that in each, the head of the horse is behind or beside the head of the man. Here the horse crops grass, one leg hidden, and the head, in shadow, hardly visible. The pose of the tall figure is straightforward by comparison with the complex, foreshortened view of the large grazing animal, its hindquarters so prominently displayed. The low horizon line also contributes to the rather startling effect. A similar portrait of the same size and with a low horizon, but with the composition reversed, is that of David Macdowall-Grant (location unknown). Our portrait is usually dated shortly before 1810.


Fig. 111. Sir Henry Raeburn, Captain Patrick Miller, 1788–89. Oil on canvas, 65⅞ × 52¼ in. (167.2 × 132.8 cm). National Gallery of Art, Washington, Gift of Pauline Sabin Davis (1948.29.1)
84. The Drummond Children

Oil on canvas, 94 1/4 x 60 1/2 in. (239.4 x 153 cm)
Bequest of Mary Stillman Harkness, 1950 (50.145.31)

Ex coll.: by descent to George James Drummond (by 1876–d. 1917); George Henry Drummond, Pittsford Hall, Northampton (from 1917; sold to Knoedler); [Knoedler, New York, until 1925; sold to Harkness]; Mr. and Mrs. Edward S. Harkness, New York (1925–his d. 1940); Mary Stillman (Mrs. Edward S.) Harkness, New York (1940–d. 1950)


The principal sitter is George Drummond, elder son of George Harley Drummond (see no. 83) and his wife, née Margaret Munro. George, born in 1802, became a partner in the family’s London bank, Drummonds of Charing Cross, at the age of twenty-five. He married, in 1831, Marianne, daughter of Edward Berkeley Portman, and the couple had four daughters and a son, George James Drummond. George Drummond died young of heart disease in 1851. When George James Drummond lent the picture in 1876, it was identified as “Master Drummond, attended by his foster-brother and sister,” while in 1895 it was called George Drummond with his “Sister Margaret, and his Foster-Brother.” This was probably a casual error, but it is impossible to know which description was correct, as there does not appear to be any additional published evidence for the existence of either of the other two children. The portrait is usually dated about 1808 or 1809, on the presumption that George was six or seven years old at the time it was painted. The couple’s second son, Henry, was born in 1812 and cannot be represented here.

George Drummond is seated astride a saddled and bridled pony, holding the reins in his left hand and a whip in his right. His face betrays a coy self-consciousness. His head would be more or less level with his father’s, were the two portraits to hang side by side, and his elevated station with respect to the other children, combined with their more or less servile upward glances, makes his dynastic role clear enough, even without the aureole of blond light around his head. Curiously, much of his face is shadowed beneath the brim of a furry hat. The older boy, largely hidden behind the pony, either leads it or holds it in check. The child at the right hitches up her skirt and dangles by its ribbons a sunbonnet with a blue lining. Trees and vines, rocks, creepers, and autumnal foliage play a supporting role in a carefully calibrated but not particularly natural-looking design.

While this portrait descended to the sitter’s grandson, that of the boy’s father, George Harley, must have been sold off by the sitter himself or by some other family member. It was the Museum’s good fortune to receive the two companion portraits with their entirely separate histories from two different donors within a year.

85. **William Scott-Elliot of Arkleton**

Oil on canvas, 47¼ x 36¼ in. (120.3 x 93 cm)
Inscribed (on stretcher): Painted by my Grandfather Sir Henry Raeburn, vouched for by L. W. Raeburn, 1876
Fletcher Fund, 1945 (45.59.2)

Ex coll.: the artist (until d. 1823); by descent in the Raeburn family, Edinburgh (1823–77; Raeburn sale, Christie’s, London, May 7, 1877, no. 31, as Study of a Child, for 240 gns., on behalf of the sitter); William Scott-Elliot of Arkleton, Langholm (1877–d. 1901); Walter Travers Scott-Elliot of Arkleton (1901–27; his sale, Sotheby’s, London, May 12, 1927, no. 87, for £12,000 to Gooden & Fox); [Gooden & Fox, London, 1927]; [Duveneck, London, 1927; sold for $150,000 to Bache]; Jules Bache, New York (1927–d. 1944; cats., 1929, 1937, no. 59, 1943, no. 58; Bache Foundation, 1944–45, sold to MMA)


William Scott-Elliot’s mother was born Margaret Elliot of Arkleton. She married, in 1807, Adam Scott, who assumed the Elliot surname. They were the painter’s neighbors in Edinburgh, and their only son remembered that he sat for Raeburn at the artist’s request. The boy, born on March 22, 1811, is likely to have been four or five years old. He holds flowers in both hands and leans against a rather unconvincing hummock of earth and grass, before a vaguely defined landscape open toward a light source at the left. The pose is a somewhat improbable one for a child. In the 1920s, his costume was described as a pink or rose smock over short trousers of the same color, and some evidence of the color remains, particularly in the shadows. Such a change, to a muddy neutral tone that Raeburn cannot have intended, may be accounted for by further fading of what must have been red lake glazing. This engaging portrait, twice exhibited by Raeburn, remained with the artist’s family until the 1877 sale, when it was bought for the sitter.

86. Alexander Maconochie of Meadowbank

Oil on canvas, 30 1/4 × 25 in. (76.8 × 63.5 cm)
Inscribed (on verso): Alex' Maconochie Welwood / of Meadowbank / & Garrock / t/s Lord Meadowbank / Raeburn pinxt
Gift of William P. Clyde, 1960 (60.94.1)

Ex coll.: Alexander Maconochie-Welwood, 2nd Lord Meadowbank, of Meadowbank, Midlothian, and Garrock, Fife (until d. 1861); Allan Alexander Maconochie-Welwood of Meadowbank and Garrock (1861–d. 1883); John Allan Maconochie-Welwood of Kirknewton, Midlothian, and Garrock (1883–at least 1912); [Knoedler, London and New York, until 1923; sold for £800 to Clyde]; William P. Clyde, Washington, D.C. (1923–60)


Selected references: Andrew 1894, p. 140; Armstrong 1901, p. 114; Pinnington 1904, p. 240; Greig 1911, p. 53

Alexander Maconochie, born on March 2, 1777, was the eldest son of an eminent Scottish judge, Allan Maconochie, first Lord Meadowbank, of Meadowbank, Midlothian, and his wife, Elizabeth, daughter of Robert Welwood of Garrock and Pitliver, Fife. On April 29, 1805, he married Anne, eldest daughter of Robert Blair of Avontoun, West Lothian, who was also a judge. The couple had ten children. The sitter was admitted an advocate in 1799 and succeeded as lord advocate in 1816; in 1819 he took his seat on the bench as a Lord of Session. He was a politician and a member of Parliament for two constituencies, Yarmouth in the Isle of Wight (1817–18) and the Anstruther district, a burgh in Fife (1818–19). In 1834 he succeeded to the entailed estate of Garrock and Pitliver and assumed the additional name of Welwood. He died on November 30, 1861. Reportedly, he sat for this portrait in 1816 at the age of thirty-nine; it was engraved in mezzotint by T. Dick in 1839.1 His father and mother also sat for Raeburn.2

Maconochie wears white linen and a double-breasted dark brown coat, the third button of which is unbuttoned. The edges of five of the six buttons catch the light. The sitter’s soft, receding hair, long nose, forthright gaze, and erect posture are engaging. The portrait, in good state but somewhat discolored, is painted with economy of means. The eyes were scratched at some time in the past, and the pupils were repainted.

2. The portraits are in the Scottish National Portrait Gallery (no. 2188) and a private collection, respectively.
The sitter was born Catherine Connor, second daughter of Daniel Connor of Ballybricken, County Cork, and Orme Square, London. She married, in April 1804, Frederick Lewis Maitland, grandson of the sixth Earl of Lauderdale. The couple's only child died in infancy. Maitland held various naval commands with distinction. He was captain of HMS *Bellerophon* during the surrender of Napoleon on board the ship, July 15, 1815; from 1832 to 1837 he was admiral superintendent of the Portsmouth dockyard; in 1837 he was appointed commander in chief in the East Indies and China; and he died at sea off Bombay in 1839. In 1816 the admiral bought from his mother the estate of Lin- dores, Fife, which had been in her family for centuries; he spent several years improving the property and building a manor house with prize money from the Napoleonic Wars. He was deeply attached to Lady Maitland, who presumably lived principally at Lindo- dores, where she died in 1865. She is said to have sat for this portrait about 1817. It was engraved in mezzotint by Norman Hirst.

Lady Maitland, her hands clasped, is shown seated and at three-quarter length. Her expression is mild. She wears a gold necklace, a gold ring set with a colored stone, and a slate gray shawl. The figure and the costume, with the exception of the shawl, are very well preserved, but the darks in the background are severely abraded.


A poet and a printmaker, William Blake also worked in pen and ink and in watercolor. Painting occupied him only sporadically. His pictures, on canvas or copper, are generally small, in tempera mixed and layered with glue size, a medium that he devised and that has proven to be defective and unstable. Insofar as their state of preservation is concerned, his paintings have fared badly over time, and, although much reproduced, they are not well known in the original despite the interest that the artist's work in all media generally commands.

Blake's father, a Soho hosier, sent his son to drawing school when he was ten and in 1772 apprenticed him to the engraver James Basire Sr. When William emerged from Basire's shop and, probably in 1779, entered the Royal Academy schools, he was an artisan trained in traditional techniques of etching and engraving, qualified to make a living in the book trades. He had also become a political radical whose writings had prophetic and apocalyptic overtones and a highly imaginative artist who rejected compromise and disdained the established system of patronage. Even so, he developed a following and was reasonably successful by 1785, when he exhibited four works at the Royal Academy. He perfected a method of combining words and images that he called illuminated printing, and using this technique, in 1789 he published Songs of Innocence, and in 1794, Songs of Experience. He often hand-colored his books in watercolor.

Blake worked throughout his career on illustrations for his own texts and those of Thomas Gray, Edward Young, Milton, and Dante, among others. In the late 1790s he met Thomas Butts, who commissioned fifty biblical paintings and offered to buy any new watercolors devoted to biblical subjects. In 1800 Blake moved for three years to Felpham, Sussex, where in addition to his work for Butts, he was employed—and supported by—the writer William Hayley. Returning to the city, he had difficulty finding work and was increasingly impoverished. In 1809–10 Blake held an exhibition in London. He met the artist John Linnell in 1818 and later received from Linnell commissions to engrave his own earlier illustrations for the book of Job, completed in 1825, and to prepare illustrations for Dante’s Divine Comedy, a project left unfinished at his death.

88. The Angel Appearing to Zacharias

Pen and black ink, tempera, and glue size on canvas, 10 1/5 x 15 in. (26.7 x 38.1 cm). Signed (lower left): WB
Bequest of William Church Osborn, 1931 (31.30.1)

Ex coll.: Thomas Butts, London (until 1843); Thomas Butts Jr., London (1845–d. 1861; his estate, 1862–63); Captain Frederick John Butts (1863–1903; his sale, Sotheby’s, London, June 24, 1903, no. 10, for £42 to Carfax); Carfax, London, from 1903; Mary Hoadley Dodge, London and Wick Hall, Hove, Sussex (by 1906–after 1927); by descent to Mr. and Mrs. William Church (Alice Dodge) Osborn (by 1929–her d. 1937); William Church Osborn (1937–d. 1951)


Blake's Angel Appearing to Zacharias is one of the fifty Old and New Testament subjects ordered from the artist by his principal patron Thomas Butts, who was a clerk in the office of the Master Master General (later the War Office). When Blake described the commission to his friend the amateur artist George Cumberland in a letter of August 26, 1799, work had begun:

As to myself, about whom you are so kindly interested, I live by a Miracle. I am Painting small Pictures from the Bible. For as to Engraving, in which art I cannot reproach myself with any neglect, yet I am laid by in a corner as if I did not exist. . . . My Work pleases my employer, & I have an order for Fifty small Pictures at One Guinea each, which is something better than mere copying

William Blake

Born London, November 28, 1757; died London, August 12, 1827
after another artist. But above all, I feel myself happy & contented.  

As a result of Butts’s commission, the artist had a small but regular income and a project that suited his taste. It seems likely that the series of paintings was more or less complete when he moved to Felpham in September 1800, after which he began preparing watercolors of biblical subjects, also for Butts. Some thirty of the fifty paintings survive, including variants and replicas, and about two-thirds of these are devoted to New Testament subjects. More than twenty others can be identified in W. M. Rossetti’s list, published in 1865, and elsewhere.  

This scene, the earliest of the New Testament narrative cycle, illustrates verses from Luke (1:11–13), in which Gabriel appears to the righteous Zacharias, a high priest of the synagogue, to announce that Zacharias’s elderly and barren wife will give birth to a son, Saint John the Baptist: “And there appeared unto him an angel of the Lord standing on the right side of the altar of incense. And when Zacharias saw him, he was troubled, and fear fell upon him. But the angel said unto him, Fear not, Zacharias: for thy prayer is heard; and thy wife Elizabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John.”  

A careful, poetic description of the picture in the catalogue of the 1906 exhibition at the Carfax Gallery draws attention to the particulars of the iconography. The description gives evidence of expert knowledge, not only on the part of the author of the entry but also on the part of Blake himself. This is interesting in view of the fact that Blake, who was a Swedenborgian, generally depended on his own interpretation of biblical theology rather than on outside sources to guide him. The entry reads:  

Blake represents in minute detail the furniture and vestments ordained by the Law. The Altar of Incense and the Table of Showbread are furnished with their golden horns, rings, and crown, and the Table with its plates and covered bowls. The Seven-branched golden Candlestick is ornamented with its knops and almond-flowers. The vestments of the Priest are represented with equal accuracy: the Mitre with its Phylactery, the Ephod of blue, bordered with its golden bells, and blue, purple, and scarlet pomegranates; the curious woven girdle and the shoulder pieces, and, attached to both with its rings and chains of gold, the Breast-plate set with the Twelve Stones.
Pale blue, red (used sparingly), and gold are typical colors for Blake. The elegant, precise, quite naturalistic detailing of the face, garments, breastplate, and appurtenances of the priest is unusual. A bubbling-like trail of incense rises from the censer to join the cloud and fumes emitted by the many gold burners on the altar. The picture, although fragile, is in very good state for a work by Blake, despite extensive minute craquelure with cupping along the edges of the cracks and some tiny losses, which may be attributed to the artist’s flawed technique. The medium, which is aqueous, has not been tested. Blake evidently used the terms “fresco” and “portable fresco” when referring to his own works in tempera. He was to some degree aware of the importance of the technique of Italian Renaissance paintings and of their reported brilliance and permanence, which he wished to imitate. That he had little knowledge of the materials with which the frescoes and panel paintings had been made is evidenced by the fact that his pictures suffer from the very difficulties he had hoped to avoid.


2. According to Butlin 1981, vol. 1, p. 316, ten paintings are dated 1799 and two are dated 1800; one other was shown in each of those years. This would suggest 1799 for the greater part of the series, but see also Martin Myron, “Biblical Subjects, 1799–1802,” in Robin Hamlyn and Michael Phillips, William Blake, exh. cat., Tate Britain, London, and The Metropolitan Museum of Art (New York, 2000), p. 60.


5. W. M. Rossetti, in 1861, found the surface “considerably decayed.”

John Hoppner
Born London, April 25, 1758; died London, January 23, 1810

Hoppner, whose parents were Bavarians settled in London, was a chorister in the Chapel Royal and thus would have received a good classical education. When it was discovered that he had normal ability as a draftsman, he was provided with a stipend by George III and sent to live with the keeper of the royal collection of drawings. He entered the Royal Academy schools in 1775 and soon won a silver medal for life drawing and a gold medal for history painting, the latter with a scene from King Lear (location unknown). He exhibited regularly at the academy from 1780. Hoppner married Phoebe Wright, daughter of the American wax modeller Patience Wright, in 1781 and set out to make his living painting portraits. His career progressed not without difficulty but became profitable; traditionally trained, he emulated Reynolds, whom he succeeded at the latter’s death in 1792 as London’s best-known and most popular portraitist.

Although Hoppner never visited Italy, he admired the painters of the Venetian Renaissance and favored their restrained palette, warm tones, and breadth of handling. His contemporaries described him as a good colorist and remarked upon his ability to capture a likeness. By the time he was elected to full membership in the Royal Academy in 1795, he was already principal painter to the Prince of Wales, later George IV. Hoppner traveled widely in Britain and visited Paris on one occasion. He was devoted to teaching, and although he could be harshly critical, his professional advice was sought by his contemporaries as well as by students at the Royal Academy. The year 1801 found him in declining health; he died at fifty-one.

Richard Humphreys,
the Boxer

Oil on canvas, 55 3/4 x 44 1/4 in. (141.6 x 112.4 cm)
Inscribed (on frame): J. HOPPNER R. A. RICH
HUMPHREYS, AGED 25, WHO BEAT WILL SMITH,
JAMES BENTLEY, SAM: MARTIN SUNDAN:
MENDOZA.
The Alfred N. Punnnett Endowment Fund, 1953
(53.113)

Ex coll.: Wilson Bradly; Conishead Priory, Epping Forest (from 1787); Sir Wroth Acland Lethbridge, 4th Baronet, Sandhill Park, Taunton, Somerset (in 1788); sale, Christie’s, London, April 6, 1889, no. 103, for £335.5.0 to Reynolds; Sir John Digdale Astley, Everley, Marlborough (in 1890); Captain J. C. Dun-Waters, Palais, South Staffordshire, and Canada (in 1903); Mrs. J. C. Dun-Waters, Vancouver and Okangan Mission, British Columbia, Canada (by 1953–55; sold to MMA)


The sport of prizefighting, or boxing, which has its origins in antiquity, was revived in England in the eighteenth century and afforded entertainment to all classes of society. A boxing amphitheater opened in London in the Oxford Road in 1743, while the Fives Court in James Street, Haymarket, was patronized in the early nineteenth century by elegant society. George IV himself took up the gloves and was a patron of the sport.

Wilson Bradly, a member of Parliament and a groom of the bedchamber to George IV
for ease of transfer to a reproductive print, the sale of which doubtless produced significant revenues. The picture reads well but has suffered somewhat: the flesh tones show evidence of having been strongly cleaned, and there is quite a lot of wear and retouching in the background.

A bout that Humphreys had won at Newmarket in the mid-1780s against Samuel Martin, known as the Bath Butcher, was reportedly witnessed by the Prince of Wales, his brother, the Duke of York, and "most of the French nobility then in England." Mendoza had also defeated Martin, claiming to have done so "in less time, and with greater ease," and it was hoped that the two victors would meet. When the contest was held, Humphreys won what by Mendoza’s account was a difficult engagement. Mendoza described the end of the bout as follows:

When in endeavouring to throw my opponent, he seized the rails surrounding the stage and maintained his hold with such firmness, that I could not effect my purpose; and being off my balance, he was easily enabled to pitch me on my head, which nearly decided the battle against me. I fought, however, two more rounds but in the last received a fall that completely terminated the contest, for the excruciating pain I now felt in my loins rendered me unable to stand; consequently Mr. Humphreys was declared the winner, after a severe contest.*

A grudge existed between the two men, as Humphreys had sponsored Mendoza at the outset of the younger boxer’s career, and there were to be two more challenges and matches: on May 6, 1789, and on September 29, 1790. Mendoza, the public favorite, triumphed in both. It is said that after Humphreys’s retirement from the ring, he lived for some years as a coal merchant in London.

Sarah Franklin Bache

Oil on canvas, 30 1/8 x 24 1/16 in. (76.5 x 61.2 cm)

Catharine Lorillard Wolfe Collection, Wolfe Fund, 1901 (01.20)

Ex coll.: Mrs. and Mrs. Richard Bache, Settle Farm, near Bristol, Pennsylvania (until his death in 1871); Richard Bache, Jr., Philadelphia (1871–d. 1888); Alexander Dallas Bache (1848–d. 1867); Mrs. Robert J. (Mary Bache) Walker, Washington, D.C. (1867–at least 1898); her family, represented by Isabella K. Walker (until 1901)


Sarah, Benjamin Franklin’s only daughter, was born in Philadelphia on September 11, 1743, and married, on October 29, 1767, Richard Bache, a merchant of Philadelphia who had emigrated from the village of Settle in Yorkshire. Richard succeeded his father-in-law as postmaster general of the United States in 1776, a position he held until 1782, and Sarah was active in support of the American cause during the Revolutionary War. The couple lived in the Franklin house with their family, and after Franklin returned permanently to Philadelphia in 1785, Sarah acted as his hostess and cared for him until his death in 1790. She had two brothers—one died in childhood, the other’s two marriages were childless—while she and her husband had eight children, several of them notably successful, and she was the progenitor of all the innumerable Franklin descendants.

When Franklin completed his diplomatic mission to France, Louis XVI presented him with a miniature portrait of himself surrounded by 408 diamonds. In his turn, Franklin left this object to Sarah, but stipulated that she...
should not make the diamonds into ornaments and thereby encourage the “expensive, vain, and useless fashion of wearing jewels.”

Instead, the diamonds were sold, and with a portion of the proceeds Mr. and Mrs. Bache and their eldest daughter, Eliza, set off for England in the late spring or early summer of 1792. In August of that year they were with Richard’s family in Lancashire, and by December Mr. Bache had made a tour of Scotland. Thereafter they rented rooms in Duke Street, Grosvenor Square, and they were still in London but preparing to depart on July 30, 1793. It was probably during this stay in the city that they were painted by Hoppner. Sarah’s portrait has a companion piece representing Richard Bache (fig. 113) that has been on loan to the Museum for many years.

When she sat for this half-length, Sarah Bache was approaching her fiftieth birthday. Well forward in the picture space, she is sober and upright, with a plump, rosy, unlined face and wearing a gray dress with a pattern of large dots, a starched muslin fichu, and an embroidered kerchief of the same material. The conservative costume is what one might expect of an American woman of her age and station. In his most fluent technique, Hoppner suggests his sitter’s forthright, generous character. Her husband faces three-quarters to our right, gazes outward, his eyebrow cocked quizzically. The couple brought the canvases back to Philadelphia, where they were well received.

On January 1, 1795, Hoppner’s wife, Phoebe, wrote to Sarah from London to thank Richard for help with family matters: “the attachment I feel to you, & M’ Bache, & the pleasure I had in your friendship and acquaintance, has made your interests mine.”

Sharing her husband’s news, she continues, “We have lately been very much gratified by several circumstances relative to M’ Hoppner in his profession, one of which is M’ H being Chosen a member of the Royal Academy.” She concludes, “M’ Hoppner presents his thanks for the many pleasing things you say of the Portraits, I assure you he is highly gratified that your Children approve them, his wish was that they would find them like.” Phoebe Hoppner was of American descent, and it is perhaps not surprising that she and the Baches became personal friends.

In 1814 Rembrandt Peale copied the portraits of Richard (location unknown) and Sarah (fig. 114), the latter painted over his own self-portrait holding a mammoth’s tooth. Thomas Sully made two copies of Sarah’s portrait: one in 1814, for his own collection (fig. 115), and another in 1865, for a grandson of the sitter (Diplomatic Reception Rooms, Department of State, Washington, D.C.). Sully’s son, Thomas Wilcocks Sully, copied it in 1838 (Mead Art Museum, Amherst College, Massachusetts). In view of the sitter’s historical importance, this fine portrait must have been among the most influential English paintings in Philadelphia, if not in America, in the first half of the nineteenth century.

1. The name of the seller on the Museum’s accession file slip.
3. Sarah Franklin Bache Papers, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia. The date on the letter actually reads “Jan’ 1st 1794,” which is old style and should be understood to refer to January 1, 1795.
91. Mrs. Whaley

Oil on canvas, 39 1/2 x 38 in. (100.3 x 96.8 cm)
Gift of Henry S. Morgan, 1947 (47.438)

Ex coll.: Thomas Whaley, Fort Anne, Douglas, Isle of Man (until d. 1800); his daughter, Sophia Isabella, later Mrs. Taylor (from 1800); by descent (until 1902; sold to Colnaghi); [Colnaghi, London, 1902; sold to Morgan]; J. Pierpont Morgan, London and New York (from 1902); J. P. Morgan, New York (by 1909—d. 1943); his estate, 1943–47; sale, Parke-Bernet, New York, December 13, 1947, no. 373, withdrawn; Henry S. Morgan, New York (1947)

Selected Exhibition: Colnaghi, London, May 1902, no. 5 (as The whole length portrait of Mrs. Whaley, the wife of “Buck Whaley”)


The sitter, born a Miss Courtney, was known for a number of years as Mrs. Whaley. According to the writer of Thomas Whaley’s obituary in the December 1800 issue of Gentleman’s Magazine, this “young woman of amiable disposition” had been “connected with” Whaley, by whom she had four children, three of whom survived him, and with whom she had lived “till the time of her death.” Their sons, Thomas and Richard, died unmarried, while their daughter, Sophia Isabella, married a Mr. Taylor. Whaley had met Miss Courtney in Dublin between 1789 and 1791. In his 1797 memoirs, he described her as “a lady of exquisite taste and sensibility from whom I have never since separated. She has been a consolation to me in all my troubles—her persuasive mildness has been a constant check on the impetuosity of my temper, and at this moment, constitutes, in my retirement, the principal source of all my felicity.” After she died, Whaley married, in January 1800, the Honorable Mary Catherine Lawless, daughter of the first Baron Cloncurry; on November 2 of the same year Whaley himself succumbed, at thirty-three. His wife lived on in his house, Fort Anne, near Douglas Head on the coast of the Isle of Man, where she raised his illegitimate children as her own.
Whaley’s career had been brief and colorful. He was an Irish Protestant landowner, born to great wealth in Dublin on December 15, 1766. He was sent to Paris with a tutor when he was sixteen, but had to return several years later when he was unable to pay his gaming debts. In 1789 he won thousands of pounds sterling after traveling from Liverpool to Jerusalem and back within a year, in response to a wager. Whaley, whose exploits were legendary, was among the most dissolute members of Dublin’s Hellfire Club. He lived in London for a time and traveled to Paris, Switzerland, and Brussels. From 1785 to 1790 he represented Newcastle, County Dublin, and from 1798 until 1800, Enniscorthy, County Wexford, in the Irish Parliament. He is known to have taken bribes.

The present portrait is said to have hung with one of Whaley in the dining room at Fort Anne, an expensive establishment that he built during his retirement, presumably with ill-gotten gains, in the late 1790s. Reportedly, Whaley was painted “in the character of a sportsman,” while Mrs. Whaley was shown “as a lady, in the Mrs. Siddons’ style of beauty.” This could be a reference to the portrait of Siddons (fig. 116) by William Beechey that had been exhibited at the Royal Academy to rather poor reviews in 1794. Leaving aside the emblems of Tragedy that Mrs. Siddons holds, Beechey’s is a rather discreet image in which the famous actress, in black satin, stands in a shadowy setting before a screen of trees with a garden sculpture to one side and a lurid burst of sunset in the distance. Hopper’s Mrs. Whaley partakes of the same essential sobriety. His sitter’s expression discloses nothing, but the head is well conceived, and the black fabric figured with leaves is elegant and modern.

Hopper, who cared less about composition than about characterization, was not always at his best when working at full length. Mrs. Whaley’s overlong, gloved forearms and the shapeless extended oval of her left leg betray his casual disinterest in anatomy. The portrait, which is in good state, has not been treated since it came to the Museum. It was perhaps painted about 1795, when, in the competition between Hopper and Beechey, Hopper held the upper hand.

1. See Gentleman’s Magazine 70 (December 1800), p. 1210, for Whaley’s obituary; his death notice had appeared in November 1800, p. 1114, in the same publication.


3. Green, Knutsford, p. 140. Sullivan in Back Whaley’s Memoirs, p. xxi, suggested that Whaley’s portrait might have been by James Northcote. On the other hand, Walter G. Strickland, A Dictionary of Irish Artists (Dublin, 1913), vol. 1, pp. 171–72, mentioned a portrait of him by George Chinnery that was exhibited in Dublin in 1800. Strickland (p. 177) called it “Thomas Whaley and his Servant, with Sporting Dogs,” and described the companion piece as “Hon. Mrs. Whaley, full length in a Landscape.” According to Patrick Conner, George Chinnery, 1774–1852: Artist of India and the China Coast (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1993), p. 35, Chinnery showed Whaley “life-size in a cornfield, with dogs and a servant ‘giving the sportsman’s whistle.’” He called the sitter for the companion piece the Hon. Anne Whaley, stating, “she was shown in a grove, with a rose and lily in her bosom, and ... basking tints of the crimson and orange poppy which appear to bend their proud heads before her in homage to her beauty.” This does not seem to be a description of our picture. While her given name is wrong, the descriptions suggest that Whaley and his legitimate wife both sat to Chinnery, though the two need not have been painted at the same time.


92. Portrait of a Woman

Verso (covered by lining canvas): A Child’s Head
Oil on canvas, 30 x 24 7/8 in. (76.2 x 63.2 cm)
Gift of William T. and Eleanor Blodgett, 1906 (66.1242)

Ex coll.: Honorable P. S. Pierrepont (in 1858, as Mrs. Fitzherbert by Romney); William T. Blodgett, New York (by 1874–d. 1875); Mrs. William T. (Abby Blake) Blodgett, New York (1875–d. 1904); William T. and Eleanor Blodgett, New York (1904–6)


Shortly after this painting came into the collection in 1906, curator Roger Fry noted that it was not by Romney but by Hoppner. Colleagues have agreed: in 1913, Percy Moore Turner; in 1931, Thomas Agnew, W. G. Constable, and Colin Agnew; and in 1985, John Wilson. It seems to be a quite characteristic, unfinished work of the 1790s (as does the oil sketch of a child’s head on the back of the original canvas, fig. 117). The composition of the portrait is not unlike that employed for Sarah Franklin Bache (no. 90), although reversed, and in both, typically, Hoppner paid little attention to the arrangement of the sitter’s arms and
omitted the hands altogether. He evidently laid in the purplish brown tone to the right of the sitter’s head with the intention of making a correction in the contour of her hair, a change he never completed. The child’s face and bright expression are rather similar to Charles Brinsley Sheridan’s in another portrait by the artist (no. 95). In the lower left corner of the sketch there is a faint drawing of a draped figure from behind (fig. 117), apparently a woman, with a child by her side.

The sitter had been identified as Mrs. Fitzherbert, the morganatic wife of the Prince of Wales, later George IV, and McKay and Roberts noted that a portrait of her is listed among the unfinished paintings and sketches in the 1823 Hoppner estate sale. She also sat for Gainsborough (fig. 118) in 1784, for Cosway in about 1784–85, and for Reynolds (fig. 119) about 1788, after her marriage to the prince, on December 15, 1785. (She parted from him irrevocably in 1811.) These three

Fig. 117. John Hoppner, A Child’s Head (no. 92, verso)

Fig. 118. Thomas Gainsborough, Mrs. Maria Anne Fitzherbert, 1784. Oil on canvas, 29 7/8 × 25 in. (75.9 × 63.5 cm). Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, Mildred Anna Williams Collection (1941.10)

Fig. 119. Sir Joshua Reynolds, Mrs. Maria Anne Fitzherbert, ca. 1788. Oil on canvas, 36 × 28 in. (91.4 × 71.1 cm). Private collection, by consent of the owners
The children are Lady Mary Sackville, born July 30, 1792; George John Frederick Sackville, Lord Middlesex, born November 15, 1793; and Lady Elizabeth Sackville, born August 11, 1795. Their father, John, third Duke of Dorset, commissioned the picture, which was painted in July 1796 at Knole, the family seat in Kent; according to the duke’s accounts at Drummonds, his London bank, he paid Hoppner 105 pounds for it on the twenty-fifth of August that year. McKay and Roberts noted that the duchess had sat to Hoppner the year before (fig. 121), while the artist would paint George, by then the fourth duke, again several years later (see fig. 123).1)

The diarist Joseph Farington, who called on Hoppner on Sunday morning, July 31, gave the following account of the artist’s stay in Kent:

Hoppner has been 9 or 10 days at the Duke of Dorset at Knole, painting the 3 children.—The duke is become very unpleasant in his temper, anxious and saving. At Cassino he lost 5 shillings to Hoppner and during the play was fretted when the cards He wished for were taken up. . . . The Duchess is a woman of most excellent temper, and is unmoveyd by the Dukes peevishness; never seeming to be discompos’d.2

Farington then made the point that the duke placed importance on family, which, by 1796, seems to have been the case. Finally married at forty-five, he had three children and died when his son was just five. Beforehand he had enjoyed considerable notoriety and the company of many mistresses, the Countess of Derby (see no. 64) and Nancy Parsons (see no. 31) among them. He had been a famously successful cricketer and an extravagant, indolent ambassador to the court of Louis XVI

---

1. Thomas Agnew, verbally, in 1931; Constable, verbally, in 1931; Colin Agnew, verbally, in 1931; and Wilson, verbally, in 1983.

---

on the eve of the French Revolution. Primogeniture would be his, and the Sackvilles', undoing. His widow married, in 1801, Charles Whitworth, Earl Whitworth. During an 1815 visit to the Whitworths in Ireland, the fourth Duke (figs. 122, 123) went hunting at Lord Powerscourt's and was killed in a fall from his horse at twenty-one. The picture passed from his elder to his younger sister (fig. 124).

Vita Sackville-West, in her history of Knole and her ancestors, recounted a story told her by her grandfather:

[He] used to show me the baby girl, telling me that while Hoppner was seeking for a pose for his picture a grievance arose between the two little girls because one had shoes and the other had not, and that on Lord Middlesex taking his sister into his arms for consolation, Hoppner rushed at them exclaiming that he could not improve upon the charm of this accidental pose. I think this story has a convincing ring about it. Certainly it was the only anecdote which my grandfather had to tell of any picture in the house; usually he did not know a Hoppner from a Vandyck, a Kneller from a Gainsborough. He said that he had the story straight from his mother, Lady Elizabeth, the sulky baby of Hoppner's picture.

Hoppner, father of five, loved children and would probably have responded with interest to such behavior on the part of the very young.

In the girls' shy demeanor and the boy's commanding stance, childlike and natural-looking as they are, the painter maps the familial and social hierarchy. The boy's forthright stare and the comma-shaped strokes defining his hair suggest a lively, inquisitive nature. The arrangement of the elements of the landscape draws the eye in his direction. His costume is colorful, while his sisters, whose roles are literally as well as figuratively parenthetical, wear matching dresses of tucked muslin white work. The one who seems to have touched Hoppner is Elizabeth, standing like a crane on one bare foot, her petticoat drooping.

When the present portrait was shown at the 1797 Royal Academy exhibition, the writer for the Monthly Mirror remarked that it was "well composed" and that the children were "much after Sir Joshua's manner, but rather flat, from the light being too generally diffused." The boy's pose illustrates the way
in which the work of Reynolds functioned as a lens through which Hoppner perceived the old masters. About twenty years before, Reynolds showed his portrait of John Crewe, titled Portrait of a Boy in the Character of Harry the Eighth, at the annual exhibition of the Royal Academy and John Raphael Smith published a reproductive mezzotint.5 Hopner, a student in the academy schools, probably would have seen both. Given his childhood association with the court, he may also have remembered Reynolds’s source, Remigius van Leemput’s copy of Holbein’s Whitehall mural of 1537, which had been destroyed in a fire in 1698. Leemput’s copy, in the Royal Collection, had been engraved.6 The Sackvilles were of ancient lineage and connected by marriage to Anne Boleyn, the second wife of Henry VIII and the mother of Elizabeth I. The connection, if understood, would presumably have been appreciated.

94. Mrs. John Garden and Her Children

Oil on canvas, 50½ x 39½ in. (127.3 x 101.3 cm)
Inscribed (on three separate stickers, on reverse of frame): HOPPNR / MRS. GARDNER [crossed out]
garden; Portrait of Mrs. Gardner and children / from the Gardner Collection, Redesham Hall / Surrey, England; Cooper’s / as others Manufactory for / plate glass / Carvings and Gilding / . . . / Piccadilly / Opposite St James’s Church
Bequest of Maria DeWitt Jesup, from the collection of her husband, Morris K. Jesup, 1914 (55.30.41)

Ex coll.: John Garden, London and Redesham Hall, Suffolk (until d. 1820); John Garden, London and Redesham Hall (1820–d. 1844); John Lewis Garden, Redesham Hall (1844–d. 1891; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, May 6, 1893, no. 122, as Portraits of Mrs. Garden and her children, the late J. L. Garden, Esq., and his sister, for £409.10.0 to Wallis); [Wallis, London, from 1893]; Mr. and Mrs. Morris K. Jesup, New York (until his d. 1908); Maria DeWitt (Mrs. Morris K.) Jesup, New York (1908–d. 1914)

Selected Reference: McKay and Roberts 1909, p. 94

The 1893 sale catalogue entry listed by McKay and Roberts is the only record of the picture in the Hoppner literature. The connection to the Gardens of Redesham is established by labels that were on the reverse of the gilded frame in which the picture came into the Museum and which had been made in a shop in Piccadilly. The canvas can be dated to the late 1790s on the basis of the sitters’ costumes. The family is that of John Garden, of the city of Westminster, who was born in 1739 and died in 1820.1 His wife, Annie, who was ten years younger, is pictured here with the couple’s two children, Ann Margaret, baptized at St. James’s Church, Westminster, on August 24, 1793, and John, born in 1796. Given John’s date of birth, the unfinished canvas must have been painted that year, or perhaps the next.

This is straightforward portraiture of considerable warmth and charm that reflects Hopner’s sympathetic response to young children. All three sitter’s wear white. Their hands are beautifully painted. The little girl is an ash blond, and her brother has the fair skin of a redhead. The skirt of his dress has tucking around the bottom and three rows of tiny brass buttons on the bodice. A red curtain is sketched in the background to the left, and there are indications of foliage through an open window at the right. Evidently Mr. Garden was pleased with the likenesses, and unconcerned about the absence of finish, as he must have paid for the portrait and taken it away in the state in which we see it. The canvas had been exceedingly dirty and, when cleaned in recent years, proved to be in very good condition.

In 1808 John Garden bought the Redesham Hall estate, an agricultural property near Beccles, in the north of Suffolk. Having demolished the Elizabethan house on the site, he built a new residence, which was completed in 1823, after his death. His daughter married Charles Burne-Carne and lived in London. The younger John Garden and his wife, Amelia, settled at Redesham Hall. The couple had four daughters and three sons, the eldest being John Lewis Garden, from whose estate sale the picture came.2

1. The biographical information, from the transcribed and indexed parish registers and the monumental inscriptions at Ringsfield church, the parish church of Redesham Hall, and from the Garden family papers, which are held at the Lowestoft Record Office, Suffolk, was provided in 2004 by Gudrun Reinke, searchroom assistant. The elder John Garden’s will is in the National Archives, Kew, Surrey, as is that of his son (www.archivesonline.pro.gov.uk; accessed May 20, 2004).
2. J. L. Garden had married, in 1872, Princess Caroline Murat, who died at Redesham in 1902.

1. McKay and Roberts 1909, pp. 68, 226, ill. opp. p. 68.
6. For the Leemput copy, see www.royalcollection.org.uk/gallery (B81045750) and for the engraving, by George Vertue, see www.npg.org.uk (OB184545; accessed November 20, 2008).
95. Mrs. Richard Brinsley Sheridan and Her Son

Oil on canvas, 93 1/4 × 59 in. (238.1 × 149.9 cm)
Inscribed (on verso): This picture belongs to / Henry Bertram Ogle / lent to the Hon. E. Bouvier / 1818 / Gift of Mrs. Carll Tucker, 1965 (65.202)

Ex coll.: Henry Bertram Ogle, Kirkley Hall, Northumberland (by 1818 – d. 1899), by descent to Newton Charles Ogle, Kirkley Hall (1892 – at least 1910); [Davis Brothers, London, until 1911; sold for £160,000 to Duveen]; [Duveen, London, 1912 – 17; sold for $105,000 to Tucker]; Mr. and Mrs. Carll Tucker, New York (1917 – his d. 1956); Mrs. Carll Tucker, New York (1956 – 65)

Selected Exhibitions: Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1797, no. 190 (as Portrait of a lady); Royal Academy of Arts, London, “Works by the Old Masters,” 1910, no. 115 (as Portraits of Mrs. Sheridan and Son, lent by Newton C. Ogle)


Hester (or Esther) Jane Ogle was the youngest of five daughters of the Very Reverend Newton Ogle of Kirkley, dean of the cathedral at Winchester and prebendary (honorary canon) of Durham. She married, as his second wife,7 on April 27, 1795, the Right Honorable Richard Brinsley Sheridan, who was more than twice her age, and their only son, Charles, was born in 1796. Sheridan, the dramatist, had been the manager of London’s Drury Lane Theatre since 1776 and is perhaps best known as the author of The School for Scandal, which was first performed there in 1777. Elected to Parliament in 1780, he was a well-known Whig politician and orator. Hester Sheridan died at forty-one on October 27, 1817. Her portrait belonged in 1818 to the youngest of her brothers.

Although most sitters for Royal Academy portraits were not named in the catalogues, they tended to be people of note whose appearance was familiar to the critics. In his guide to the 1797 exhibition, Anthony Pasquin took Hoppner to task for the present portrait of Mrs. Sheridan.8 As Pasquin did not know the lady, he could not “be positive as to the likeness,” but he nevertheless declared that the work “conveys altogether an idea so vulgar, if not meretricious, that we can scarcely be led to believe it is a faithful delineation of those features, and those habits which could ensnare the heart of so enlightened a gentleman as her husband; the neck is too thick and too short, and seems more approximating to the Farnese Hercules than feminine loveliness.” The critic observed that the attitude of the figures was borrowed from the Faun Bearing a Kid (fig. 125), a famous restored antique marble thought to be a Roman copy of a Greek original, of which the Royal Academy had acquired a cast in 1781.9 Bowing to contemporary taste for antiquity, Hoppner opted for a quotation, deploying the pose of the faun’s body and right arm, while adjusting the balance of the composition in accordance with the requirements of his subject. Pasquin described the child as “a theft” from Sir Joshua Reynolds, and the motif does relate to that used by Reynolds for his half-length of Mrs. Payne-Gallwey with her son (fig. 126), which had been exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1779 and engraved by John Raphael Smith in 1780.10 If Hoppner devised his composition with Reynolds in mind, as seems likely, he would have regarded his design not as a theft, but as a compliment to an artist whom he greatly admired.

The writer for the St. James’s Chronicle remarked in an even tone that the canvas was

Fig. 125. Faun Bearing a Kid, Roman copy of Greek original, 2nd century A.D. Marble, h. 53 1/2 in. (136 cm). Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid (229)

Fig. 126. Sir Joshua Reynolds, Mrs. Stephen Payne-Gallwey and Her Son Charles, 1779. Oil on canvas, 30 × 25 in. (76.2 × 63.5 cm). Taft Museum of Art, Cincinnati, Ohio, Bequest of Louise Taft Semple (1962.2)

Fig. 127. John Hoppner, Lady Anne Fitzroy and Her Daughters. Oil on canvas, 50 × 40 in. (127 × 101.6 cm). With permission and copyright of Stratfield Saye Preservation Trust
an excellent subject independent of its being a portrait," and in general the painting received an interested rather than enthusiastic response. As Skipton notes, Mrs. Sheridan is "homely, effectually refuting the charge so commonly brought against Hoppner of making all his women beautiful, whether they were actually so or not," and certainly she is plain, particularly by contrast with her smiling son. As a portrait in the semidisguise of a genre scene, the picture was singular: a prominent person, in rustic, natural colors, carrying her child on her back and holding a pitcher that was evidently to be filled from a stream. A cottage behind a hummock in the middle distance reinforces the connection with country life. The donkeys have harnesses and are not wild beasts, but this was nevertheless a curious way to show the young wife of one of London's most cosmopolitan public figures. Although the boy wears a torn hat, there is no implied connection with the hollow-eyed cottagers Gainsborough painted in the several years before his death in 1788.

Hoppner's portrait was engraved in 1800. At about the same time, he painted a beautiful three-quarter-length disguised portrait of Lady Anne Fitzroy wearing a rather tattered dress and a kerchief, with one of her two daughters clinging to her shoulder (fig. 127).

1. See www.oglefamilyofmarylandandalliedfamilies.com/ogle_castle.htm for the date of his death, recorded on his memorial (accessed September 19, 2006).
2. Sheridan's first wife, born Elizabeth Linley, had died on June 28, 1792.
3. Anthony Pasquin [John Williams], A Critical Guide to the Present Exhibition at the Royal Academy, for 1797 (London, 1797), p. 15. McKay and Roberts 1909, p. 230, confused Mrs. Sheridan and Mrs. Siddons, for whose appearance at the time, see her portrait by Beechey (fig. 116).

7. T. Nugent made the engraving; later impressions were titled Fetching Water. A small copy of the painting (square format) belonged to W. Clarkson Wallis, Brighton (until 1998; sale, Phillips, London, April 7, 1998, no. 155, ill.).
8. The portrait must have been painted before her second marriage in 1799. She wears what McKay and Roberts 1909, p. 238, describe as a "gipsy dress."

96. Mrs. Thomas Pechell

Oil on canvas, 30 x 25 in. (76.2 x 63.5 cm)
Bequest of Helen Swift Neilson, 1945 (46.13.4)
Thomas Pechell, born in 1753, was the son of Lieutenant Colonel Sir Paul Pechell, first Baronet, whose portrait by Gainsborough (no. 43) also belongs to the Museum. In 1799, when the present work was painted, Thomas was a major in the army. According to the inscription, he was for thirty-four years, presumably from 1784 until her death in 1818, in the service of Queen Charlotte. He succeeded his father in 1809 and in 1801, in compliance with his mother’s will, assumed the additional surname of Brooke. In 1814 he was promoted to major general. His uniform, which is that of a staff officer or aide-de-camp, is probably the one he wore as a gentleman usher of the privy chamber. ¹

His wife, Charlotte, whom he married on April 28, 1783, was the younger daughter of Lieutenant General Sir James John Clavering, commander in chief in India, and his wife, born Lady Diana West. The couple had two sons and a daughter, and Charlotte Brooke Pechell died on October 23, 1841.

The pictures, thickly painted, are among the few pairs from Hoppner’s late years. Both sitters look out, engaging with the viewer. Mrs. Pechell’s portrait is lit strongly from the left, and her husband’s from the right, while the elegant, restricted tonality of the one contrasts with the more varied palette of the other. Her portrait is in fairly good state, despite the presence of some drying cracks and an old repair in the background at the upper right center. His cannot be cleaned owing to the defective medium, which may be bituminous. At some time in the past, an attempt was made to retouch the disfiguringly wide drying cracks, and the retouching has in its turn discolored.

A portrait of a “Capt. Pechell,” listed in the 1823 Hoppner estate sale as number 14 and noted by McKay and Roberts, is presumed to have been either a study or a replica.


97. Major Thomas Pechell

Oil on canvas, 30 × 24 3/8 in. (76.2 × 63.2 cm)
Inscribed (on reverse of lining canvas): Painted by Hoppner of London / 1799 / Major General / Sir Thomas Brooke Pechell Bart / Gen’l Usher Privy Chamber. / 34 Years to her Majesty Queen Charlotte / He Died June 1816
Bequest of Helen Swift Neilson, 1945 (46.133)

Ex coll.: Major General Sir Thomas Brooke Pechell, 2nd Baronet, Paglesham, Essex (until d. 1826); by descent to Sir Alfred Plantagenet Frederick Charles

Somerset, Enfield Court, Middlesex (in 1909); [Sulley, London, until 1929; sold to Scott & Fowles]; [Scott & Fowles, New York, 1929–30; sold to Neilson]; Helen Swift (Mrs. Francis) Neilson, Chicago (1930–d. 1945)

98. **Lady Hester King**

Oil on canvas, 30 × 25 in. (76.2 × 63.5 cm)
Inscribed (on sticker, on reverse of stretcher, recorded when picture was acquired): Lady Hester King, wife of Peter, 7th Baron / daughter of the First Earl Fortescue / married 1804; died 1833. . . . Note: In 1807 Lord King was painted / by John Hoppner, and Exhibited in / the Royal Academy—No. 38. . . .
Gift of Bernard M. Baruch, in memory of his wife, Annie Griffen Baruch, 1939 (39.189.3)

**Ex coll.:** the artist (until d. 1810; his estate, 1810–23; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, May 31, 1823, no. 11); Bernard M. Baruch, New York (until 1939, as Portrait of a Lady)

**Selected Reference:** McKay and Roberts 1909, pp. 146, 374

The sitter is Hester Fortescue, the eldest daughter of Hugh Fortescue, later first Earl Fortescue, who in 1782 had married Hester Grenville. On May 26, 1804, their daughter married Peter King, seventh Baron King; she died in 1873, very likely at eighty-nine or ninety years old. Her husband sat for Hoppner in 1805 for a head-and-shoulders portrait (location unknown), of the same size as this one, that the artist exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1807 as number 38, *Portrait of Lord King*. The present, unfinished canvas probably dates also to 1805, the year after the couple’s marriage. McKay and Roberts note that a sketch or study of “Lady King” was number 11 in the May 31, 1823, catalogue of the Hoppner estate sale at Christie’s,

1. By 1976 neither the sticker nor the notes made as standard practice when a work enters the Museum could be found. The information on the sticker pertaining to the sitter’s death date and the date her husband was painted by Hoppner could have been mistranscribed or misread; otherwise, it is simply in error.

2. McKay and Roberts 1909, pp. 145–46, who also quote a letter of January 24, 1899, from the Earl of Lovelace, stating that he had seen a portrait of Lord King at Holland House fifteen or twenty years previously.
99. A Girl with a Basket of Birds

Oil on canvas, 29 7/8 × 24 7/8 in. (75.9 × 63.2 cm)
Bequest of Mary Clark Thompson, 1923 (24.80.488)

This could be a portrait, a disguised portrait, or a subject picture. Small girls still dressed in more or less adult clothes in the late eighteenth century, but not, except in paintings, in the draperies shown here. Large, soft ruffled muslin caps with ribbons were worn, more often indoors than out, by both women and girls. The basket lined with straw provides little enough room for three fledglings. Several children with birds figure among Reynolds's subject pictures, while Hoppner, in his portraits of children, had made a specialty of this sort of bright-eyed, engaged expression. The picture, broadly painted, is very well preserved.

1. For Reynolds's subject pictures, see David Mannings, Sir Joshua Reynolds: A Complete Catalogue of His Paintings; the Subject Pictures Catalogued by Martin Postle (New Haven, 2000), vol. 1, p. 195, no. 631 (entry by David Mannings), vol. 2, fig. 1242, and vol. 1, pp. 520–21, 534–35, nos. 2048, 2083–85 (entries by Martin Postle), vol. 2, figs. 1604, 1611–19. Reynolds's portrait of Lady Gertrude Fitzpatrick (ibid., vol. 2, fig. 1242) was engraved by John Raphael Smith in 1780. Her pose is unusual, and that of the figure here is similar.

2. The painting had been attributed to John Opie before 1933, when, in the course of a visit to the Museum, C. H. Collins Baker pointed out that it was in the style of Hoppner.
Reportedly, J. W. Chandler was the natural son of Francis Greville, first Earl of Warwick. Chandler probably entered the Royal Academy schools in 1784, and showed ten portraits at the academy between 1787 and 1791 (in the latter year he exhibited from Warwick Castle). In or after 1809, he left London for Aberdeen and Edinburgh, where several years later, apparently after an unsuccessful suicide attempt, he died. His portrait style was based on that of Romney and Hoppner. In Scotland he is said to have painted landscapes.

Selected References

Since 1887, when this portrait came to light in an exhibition at the Royal Academy, it had been attributed to Romney and the sitter identified as Mrs. George Horsley, who was born Charlotte Mary Talbot, the third daughter of Charles Henry Talbot (from 1800, Sir Charles Talbot, first Baronet), of Mickleham, near Dorking, Surrey, and Belfast, County Antrim.7 Miss Talbot married, in 1786, George Horsley of Epsom, Surrey, commissary of the British army in Bombay. Her husband, born in 1745, may have retired by the time of their marriage and died at forty-seven on December 3, 1792. Charlotte Horsley died in 1828.

A Mrs. Horsley is recorded as having sat for Romney on October 9, 10, 15, 16, and 18, 1787, and on August 13 and 17, September 30, and October 22, 1793.8 He also painted two of the couple’s children, Charlotte and George, in 1793.9 Charlotte Horsley’s sister-in-law, Mary, had married, in 1766, William Palmer, whose grandson, Edward, lent the portrait in 1887 to the Royal Academy. It had therefore been assumed that the portrait, by Romney, represents Mrs. Horsley and dates to 1787.

Forty years ago, however, Ellis Waterhouse pointed out that the present work was “wrongly attributed to Romney [and] should be Chandler.”9 His attribution may have been based on its resemblance to a half-length portrait of the Honorable Jane Montagu Douglas (fig. 128), which K. E. Maison called the finest work by Chandler that he had seen.6 Given Jane Douglas’s birth date, 1779, her portrait must be from the mid- or later 1790s. She also wears a bonnet with a shallow brim held in place by a scarf tied with a bow under her chin, and Maison described the palette of that work as gray, black, and yellow, which would be similar. The arms are not well drawn and the backgrounds are negligible in both pictures. They are quite close in style, as far as can be judged from a photograph.

1. Information from Scott & Fowles, 1931. is recorded on the photograph mount at the Frick Art Reference Library, New York.
2. Henry Curtis, in a letter, 1939, provided additional details drawn in part from the unpublished will of Commissary George Horsley.
3. T. Humphry Ward and W. Roberts, Romney: A Biographical and Critical Essay, with a Catalogue Raisonné of His Works (New York, 1904), vol. 1, pp. 112, 128, vol. 2, pp. 80–81, state that in 1787 Romney seems also to have painted a copy of a portrait of Mrs. Horsley’s mother-in-law. They assume that the 1793 sittings recorded for Mrs. Horsley were in fact with her son and daughter.
George Morland

Born London, June 26, 1763; died London, October 29, 1804

Born at the Haymarket, George Morland was one of six children of Henry Robert Morland, a minor genre painter, engraver, and dealer who had been declared bankrupt in 1762. The boy’s precocious talent for drawing was recognized by his needy parent, and his sketches were exhibited at the Royal Academy as early as 1773. He was trained under his father’s supervision and encouraged to copy seventeenth-century Dutch landscapes and works by Gainsborough and Claude Joseph Vernet, among others. The young painter exhibited regularly at the Royal Academy, the Society of Artists, and the Free Society of Artists. In the 1780s, influenced principally by Hogarth and Francis Wheatley, he began to specialize in modern moral genre subjects, many of which were engraved. Morland left the restrictive environment in which he had been brought up in 1784 and the following year went to France with a Mrs. Hill, from Margate, for whom he had painted some portraits. Returning to London, he began to work with John Raphael Smith and William Ward, engravers and print dealers. In 1786 he married Ward’s sister, Anne, and thereafter Ward married Morland’s sister, Maria.

Morland was a disciplined, prolific draftsman and painter who led an undisciplined, extravagant, alcoholic life, constantly moving with his wife to escape his creditors. About 1790 he settled in the village of Paddington, near London, in a house opposite the White Lion Inn, where he did some of his best work, including larger canvases devoted to scenes of country life that reflect the times but are for the most part without specific narrative content. Morland also painted coastal views that were inspired by occasional visits to the Isle of Wight. Imprisoned for debt in 1799, he was released in 1802, then rearrested in 1804, and died in a bailiff’s lodging house. The study of Morland has been complicated by innumerable replicas, copies, and pastiches. No oeuvre catalogue exists, and modern critical writing is limited.
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101. The Bell Inn

Oil on canvas, 20 1/2 x 26 1/4 in. (52.1 x 66.7 cm)
Signed (lower right): G. Morland, pinx.
Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900 (55.130.20)
Ex coll.: George Salting, London (in 1897); Collis P. Huntington, New York (until d. 1900; life interest to his widow, Arabella D. Huntington, later [from 1923] Mrs. Henry E. Huntington, 1900–d. 1924; life interest to their son, Archer Milton Huntington, 1924–terminated 1945)

Selected References: Ralph Richardson, George Morland’s Paintings: Their Present Possessors, with Details of the Collections (London, 1897), p. 74; Perkins 2004

In 1897 George Salting owned a set of four paintings by Morland, one of which, titled The Bell Inn, was a canvas measuring twenty by twenty-six inches and signed but undated. From Richardson’s description, the subject of the Salting picture matches that of the present work: “Hay-wain and group of hay-makers regaling themselves in front of the inn. Landlady and little girl appear at inn-door.” The others, approximately the same size and all signed, are Gipsy Encampment, dated 1789; Roadside Inn, dated 1790 (fig. 129); and Cowherd and Milkmaid, dated 1792 (fig. 130). The last was engraved in 1798 by John Raphael Smith.1 The first in the series is apparently this picture, the second has disappeared, and the third and fourth, lent by Salting to the Victoria and Albert Museum in 1904, now belong to the Tate.2

It is safe to assume that while living in Paddington, Morland patronized the local alehouses, the White Lion, and to the north-west, in Kilburn, the Bell Inn. A smaller canvas by Morland, titled The Bell Inn (fig. 131), shows a village tavern with an oak or chestnut tree circled by a bench and a freestanding signpost in front.3 A drawing by the artist (fig. 132) depicts a slightly different building but a similar tree and bench; the sign with the bell hangs from a timber support affixed to the tree trunk. The subject of a reproductive engraving by John Raphael Smith after Morland that is called Return from Market is also identified as the Bell Inn: the sign is above the door.4

The alehouse of the Museum’s picture is yet another structure, apparently with two rooms, each with a chimney and one with a dormer window, and a heavily thatched roof.

Fig. 129. George Morland, Roadside Inn, 1790. Oil on canvas, 20 1/8 x 26 1/4 in. (51.1 x 66.4 cm). Tate, London (no2641)
Fig. 130. George Morland, *Cowherd and Milkmaid*, 1792. Oil on canvas, 20 × 26 in. (50.8 × 66 cm). Tate, London (no2640)

Fig. 131. George Morland, *The “Bell” Inn*. Oil on canvas, 10 1/4 × 12 1/2 in. (26 × 31.6 cm). Location unknown
The freestanding sign with the bell is braced out from a post. The landscape is dense and encroaching, and the place remote. Peasants, several with hayforks, gather before the inn door near a loaded wagon and a water trough: dour and uncommunicative, they look past, rather than at, each other. A typical Morland pig (a similar animal is in Cowherd and Milkmaid) scrabbles about in the rutted earth. The fluid impasto is somewhat flattened by relining, while the colors are autumnal.

ATRIBUTED TO GEORGE MORLAND

102. Dancing Dogs

Oil on canvas, 30 x 23 1/4 in. (76.2 x 63.8 cm)
Gift of Evander B. Schley, 1931 (31.216)

EX COLL. Frederick Davis (1889); Lord Tweedmouth, London and Guissachan, Beauly (until 1905); sale, Christie’s, London, June 3, 1905, no. 29, 28 1/2 x 24 in., for £4,200 to C. Davis; [Charles Davis, London, from 1905]; Walter Burns (until 1929); sale, Christie’s, London, May 3, 1929, no. 19, for £9,240 to Vicars; [Vicars, London, from 1929]; private collection, England; [Scott & Fowles, New York]; Evander B. Schley, New York (until 1931)

SELECTED EXHIBITION: Royal Academy of Arts, London, “Works by the Old Masters,” 1885, no. 30 (lent by Frederick Davis)


The entertainers in Dancing Dogs are a musician and an animal trainer with a stick who causes two small dogs in skirts to dance on their hind legs. The family group comprises a pretty mother wearing a bonnet, seated under a tree at a cottage door with a baby in her lap and accompanied by her sons, well-dressed boys with clean stockings and buckled shoes. One of them holds his dog’s paws in his hands, encouraging the unwilling animal to dance as well. A puppy wrapped in a cloth tied with a pink bow looks on.

Engravings by Thomas Gaugin after Morland’s Guinea Pigs (fig. 133) and Dancing Dogs (fig. 134) were published in September.
1789 and February 1790, respectively. Paintings of the same subjects (locations unknown) were lent in 1904 by Captain F. W. Lowther, R.N., to the Morland exhibition at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Although the catalogue numbers assigned to Captain Lowther's canvases were not consecutive, each work measured twenty-nine and one-half by twenty-five inches, and the existence of the prints confirms that they had been conceived as companion pieces, which was typical for Morland. The Lowther pair was sold in 1977, and according to the catalogue, both are signed and Dancing Dogs is dated 1790, which would tend to give it primacy over the present work. Gaugin's stipple engravings are in reverse to the paintings of Dancing Dogs but in the same sense as the ex-Lowther Guinea Pigs.

The catalogue here is of replica quality, and no pendant to it is known or recorded. Morland was capable of sharp observation and rather tough social commentary, but this work exhibits neither. The primary versions are either the other two works described above, or they have gone missing. In any event subjects of the kind were a form of hackwork for the print trade.

John Crome

Born Norwich, December 22, 1768; died Norwich, April 22, 1821

Crome, the son of a journeyman weaver, was apprenticed to a coach and sign painter from 1785 until 1790. After marrying two years later, he worked as a restorer, a picture dealer, and a drawing master. During the 1790s he also studied paintings in private collections in the Norwich area, notably that of his friend and patron Thomas Harvey of Catton, a master weaver who owned a significant number of eighteenth-century English and seventeenth-century Dutch landscapes, including works by or attributed to Gainsborough, Richard Wilson, and Meindert Hobbema. In 1802 and 1806 Crome visited the Lake District, in 1804 he went to Wales, and in 1814 he traveled abroad to see the works of art that Napoleon had brought to Paris. Nevertheless, the majority of his subjects that can be identified are Norfolk views, taken in Norwich itself or the immediate environs, along the Yare River, on Mousehold Heath, and a few miles farther afield on the North Sea coast at Great Yarmouth.

Crome was a founder of the Norwich Society of Artists in 1803 and a regular contributor to the society's annual exhibitions until the end of his life. A leading figure in the Norwich School of landscape painting, he was also a gifted etcher, but his prints were not published until 1814, long after his death. In general, Crome neither signed nor dated his work. His paintings were much sought after in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, and the study of his oeuvre is complicated by the existence of variants and copies, some of which may be by his pupils. Much of his best work is in the Norwich Castle Museum and Art Gallery.
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103. Hautbois Common, Norfolk

Oil on canvas, transferred from wood, 22 x 35 in. (55.9 x 88.9 cm)

Inscribed (on verso of original panel): (on label) Crome, John—Hautbois Common; (on label) Hautbois Common / painted / by John Crome, called / Old Crome, from / the Sherrington Coll; (on printed label) International Exhibition, 1862 / Proprietor’s name & address: M. Ellisson / Sudbrooke Holme. / Title or description of the Work: Clump of Trees. / Artist’s name: Crome / No. 743. / Case No. 6; (red wax seal) Collection Sedelmeyer Paris Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1880 (89.15.14)

Ex coll.: Francis Stone, The Shrubbery, Norwich (by 1821–35; his posthumous sale, The Shrubbery, Norwich, October 23, 1835, no. 106, as A splendid Landscape, [Hautbois Common]; [John Wigger, Bethel Street, Norwich, until 1837; sold for £40 to Sherrington]; J. N. Sherrington, Yarmouth (from 1837); [Mrs. J. N. Sherrington, later Mrs. Caleb Rose (until 1838); sale, Sherrington Collection, Christie’s, London, May 1, 1838, no. 29, as A Small Landscape: Entrance to a village, panel, for £15 10s.); Mr. and Mrs. Richard Ellisson, Sudbrooke Holme, Lincolnshire (by 1862–74; his posthumous sale, Christie’s, London, May 16, 1874, no. 70, as Hautbois Common: a landscape, with clump of trees, from the Sherrington Collection, for £40 to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1874, to Levy; Albert Levy (1874–84; his sale, Christie’s, London, April 6, 1876, no. 288, as Hautbois Common: a landscape with a clump of trees and donkeys in the foreground, 25 x 35 in., from the Sherrington Collection and from the Collection of Richard Ellisson, Esq., for £404 5s. 0, bought in; posthumous sale, Christie’s, London, May 3, 1884, no. 15, as Hautbois Common: known as the Clump of Trees, bought in; posthumous sale, Christie’s, London, May 3, 1884, no. 15, as Hautbois Common: known as the Clump of Trees, bought in; posthumous sale, Christie’s, London, from 1884; Baron Hirsch, Paris; [Sedelmeyer, Paris, until 1888; sold for Fr 16,000 to Marquand]; Henry G. Marquand, New York (1888–89)

Selected Exhibitions: ?Norwich Society of Artists, 1810, no. 27 (as Scene on Hautbois Common, near Coltishall, Norfolk); Norwich Society of Artists, “The Principal Pictures Painted by the Late Mr. Crome,” 1821, no. 37 (as Hautbois Common, Norwich, 1810, lent by F. Stone); South Kensington Museum, London, International Exhibition, 1862, British Division, Class xxxviii, A, “Paintings in Oil,” no. 125 (as A Clump of Trees, lent by Mrs. Ellisson)

Selected References: John Wodderspoon, John Crome and His Works, 2nd ed. (Norwich, 1876), pp. 14.
Fig. 135. John Crome, *The Beaters*.
Oil on wood, 21 3/8 × 33 3/4 in.
(54,6 × 85,4 cm). National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh (NG 2309)
Hautbois Common lies by the villages of Great Hautbois and Coltishall, some seven or eight miles northeast of Crome’s native Norwich. The artist typically preferred the limited range of tones that he used here. Although the motif, a path through a stand of oaks and other trees beside a common, was one that he must have seen, the composition also strongly suggests the influence of Hobbema and in a more general sense perhaps of Jacob van Ruisdael. A similar painting by Crome with a more expansive background is The Beaters (fig. 135) in the National Gallery of Scotland.

If this work was exhibited at the Norwich Society of Artists in 1820 as Scene on Hautbois Common, near Coltishall, Norfolk, which cannot be proven but seems likely, then that year would be its approximate date. In support of such a presumption is the fact that neither Goldberg nor the Cliffords list any other autograph view of the common or of either of the two villages. According to a photocopy of a document that came with the picture to the Museum, “Hautboys Common,” had been “Warranted by the Late John Crome” and sold in 1877 for forty pounds by Wigger to Sherrington. Labels that had been on the reverse further testified to the ownership of Sherrington and Mrs. Ellison, from whose husband’s estate sale it was bought by Agnew’s. Judging by the title of the picture that Francis Stone lent in 1821 to the artist’s memorial exhibition, he must have been the first owner.

Miklos Rajnai offered various opinions on the picture. In 1981 Andrew Festing quoted Rajnai’s then recent view that “it is a very good example of the artist’s work.” Goldberg thought it authentic, but Timothy Clifford called it a copy, and Derek Clifford dated it later than 1810. According to our conservation records, the original support was “a very thin linen mounted on a panel,” and the work was transferred to canvas when, in 1914, the panel was found to be separating and the linen blistering. Horizontal cracks were already visible in a late nineteenth-century record photograph, and the surface offers evidence of old damages. Condition is therefore a mitigating circumstance, and the work appears to be an authentic if damaged original.

Paintings of the Norwich School were widely collected in the United States from the late nineteenth through the first quarter of the twentieth century, but there are few good examples in America, and none other than the present work in this Museum.3

1. There are two variants, neither by Crome: a painting formerly belonging to the Yale Center for British Art, New Haven (sale, Sotheby’s, London, November 18, 1981, no. 57, ill., as by David Hodgson), and a pencil-and-wash drawing in the Norwich museum that is now attributed to Richard Girtling (reproduced in Henri Focillon, La Peinture au XIXe siècle: Le Retour à l’antique—le romantisme [Paris, 1927], p. 131).

2. Festing himself, in a letter of November 23, 1981, regarded the picture as “absolutely genuine,” judging from a photograph. Rajnai had on two previous occasions been less certain: when he saw the work in the course of a 1971 visit to the Museum, and when he wrote in 1965 to give his opinion based on a photograph.

3. I would like to thank Norma Watt of the Norwich Castle Museum and Art Gallery, who kindly reviewed the draft of this entry in 2006.

In 1908 this large canvas was attributed to the Norwich School painter John Crome. Only W. G. Constable, in 1931, hesitantly concurred, while the attribution to Crome was rejected by Miklos Rajnai, who proposed the young James Stark. Other artists whose names have been put forward are Benjamin Barker and George Vincent, but none of these suggestions was made with any degree of conviction, nor seems convincing, and the picture remains unattributed. The artist was evidently familiar with seventeenth-century Dutch landscapes, which he could have seen in sale rooms or private collections.


2. Barker was proposed by Turner, in a letter, 1931; Vincent by C. H. Collins Baker, verbally, 1937.
Sir Thomas Lawrence

Born Bristol, April 13, 1769; died London, January 7, 1830

Lawrence was the son of an innkeeper at Devizes, not far from Bath, and visitors to the inn reported that when he was ten the boy was already a skilled draftsman. His father was declared bankrupt in 1779, and the boy soon became the chief financial support of his family. Essentially self-taught as an artist, with very little opportunity for formal education, Lawrence applied his extraordinary natural gifts almost exclusively to portraiture from that time on. In 1785 he was painting pastel portraits in Bath. He first came to public notice in London in 1784, when he received a prize from the Royal Society of Arts for a crayon drawing (sold at Sotheby’s, London, March 12, 1887, no. 29) after a print of Raphael’s altarpiece of The Transfiguration (Pinacoteca Vaticana). In 1787 he settled in the capital and, having studied briefly at the Royal Academy schools, showed there for the first time. Three years later, at the age of twenty-one, he earned acclaim for exhibiting at the academy his full-length portraits of Queen Charlotte (National Gallery, London), consort of George III, and of the celebrated actress Elizabeth Farren (no. 105).

Lawrence was elected an associate of the Royal Academy in 1791 and a full academician in 1794, having already succeeded to the position of painter-in-ordinary to George III upon the death in 1792 of Sir Joshua Reynolds. During the Regency he was presented to the future George IV, who became his most important patron, commissioning for the Waterloo Chamber at Windsor Castle the famous series of full-length portraits of Britain’s allies in the 1815 victory over Napoleon at the battle of Waterloo (Royal Collection). Lawrence was knighted in 1815 and elected president of the Royal Academy in 1820. He died ten years later.
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Elizabeth Farren made her first London appearance on June 2, 1777, playing Kate Hardcastle in Oliver Goldsmith’s She Stoops to Conquer at the little Theatre in the Haymarket.1 Her last was as Lady Teazle in Richard Brinsley Sheridan’s School for Scandal, which she performed in farewell to a full house at Drury Lane on April 8, 1797. She was at the height of her fame as a comic actress when she sat for Lawrence for this portrait, which was probably completed if not painted entirely in the late winter and early spring of 1790 and was to be shown at

Elizabeth Farren

Oil on canvas, 94 x 57½ in. (238.8 x 146.1 cm)
Bequest of Edward S. Harkness, 1940 (50.155)


Selected Exhibitions:
the Royal Academy. “The old servant showed me straight into the painting-room, as no one was then sitting, where certainly Miss Farren’s look met you as you entered,” the diarist Mrs. Papendiek observed, reporting that Lawrence’s likeness of the popular actress “riveted me to the spot.”

Miss Farren was an exception to the then generally held assumption that actresses were lowborn and without repute. Her grandfather was an Irish wine merchant of Huguenot descent, who must have suffered grave disappointment when her father, George Farran, who had trained as a surgeon-apothecary, left for England and a career in the theater. He married Margaret Wright, daughter of a Liverpool brewer, and when he died in 1770 left her with three young daughters. Elizabeth made a name for herself at the Theatre Royal in Liverpool and in 1777 was recommended by the manager there to his counterpart at the Little Theatre, where from the first she was billed as Elizabeth Farran, rather than Farren, and was referred to as Eliza. Under the watchful eye of her mother, she lodged in nearby Suffolk Street and later in Green Street, Mayfair, and despite the interest she attracted, her reputation remained blameless.

It cannot have been long before she met Edward Smith Stanley, twelfth Earl of Derby, whose wife had left him for the Duke of Dorset and was soon abandoned by them both, although not divorced (see nos. 54, 64). Miss Farren became the earl’s companion and joined polite society. By 1787 her position was established. Doubtless at Lord Derby’s suggestion, she was invited by Charles Lennox, third Duke of Richmond, to manage the amateur theatricals at Richmond House, which were performed by the aristocracy before members of the royal family. The earl’s wife died on March 14, 1797, and on May 1 he remarried. Thirty-four, or perhaps older, at the time of her marriage,1 the new countess gave birth to four children in the next four years. Three of them died young; the fourth, Mary Margaret, married the second Earl of Wilton. At Derby House in London and at Knowsley Hall, near Liverpool, Lady Derby managed an extended family, a very large household, and many guests and was greatly admired. She died at Knowsley on April 23, 1829.

An account of the public reception accorded her portrait by Lawrence is provided by the painter’s father in excerpts from three letters to the Reverend Dr. Henry Kent, who had advanced the sum of money that had allowed the Lawrence family to move to London several years before:

[April 1790] I wish to inform you that next Wednesday [April 28] will be a very flattering day to my young son, from the opening of the Royal Exhibition, to which their Majesties mean to go to-morrow, and will see of his—portraits of the Queen, of the Princess Amelia, [there follows a complete list] and Miss Farren, for which last he is to receive one hundred guineas; and he has now, with the most general approbation, raised his prices to twenty, forty, and fourscore guineas, with plenty of business to go on at those prices; being the highest ever known in this or any other kingdom, at his age, who will be one and twenty the 6th of May.

[April 26, 1790] Their Majesties and the Princesses were there on Friday, and expressed the highest degree of satisfaction.

[April 30, 1790] The Diary says: “Mr. Lawrence, young as he is, treads close already on the Roke of the most eminent of the profession. . . .” “We have seen a great variety of pictures of Miss Farren, but we never saw before her mind. . . . upon canvas.” “It is completely Elizabeth Farren, arch, careless, spirited, elegant, and engaging.”

The Portrait of an Actress, as it was titled, hung in an important position, near what proved to be Reynolds’s final academy exhibit, a commanding full-length of the opera singer Mrs. Billington as St. Cecilia (fig. 136), completed in 1789. Studied and beautifully composed but heavily baroque, and academic in conception, Mrs. Billington’s rather old-fashioned portrait was, by comparison, the loser. Evidence of Lawrence’s influence on his contemporaries exists in the form of a splendid drawing by Henry Fuseli, dating to about 1792 (fig. 137). Lawrence’s best works, and among the finest in the exhibition by common consent, were his portraits of Farren and of Queen Charlotte. While the queen’s portrait had not been commissioned, she had nevertheless agreed to sit in the autumn of 1789 and lent her rank and authority, as Miss Farren lent her celebrity, to the young painter’s cause, establishing him as the heir apparent to Reynolds. However, the king did not buy

Fig. 136. Sir Joshua Reynolds, Mrs. Billington as St. Cecilia, 1786–89. Oil on canvas, 94 7/8 x 58 1/8 in. (239.7 x 148 cm). Beaverbrook Art Gallery, Fredericton, New Brunswick, Gift of Lord Beaverbrook (1959.179)

Fig. 137. Henry Fuseli, A Fashionable Young Woman (A Lady Walking), ca. 1792. Graphite, pen and brown ink, brush and watercolor, 12 7/8 x 8 1/4 in. (32.8 x 21.1 cm). Collection of Jean Bonna, Geneva
the picture of the queen, as neither of them liked it. Lawrence meanwhile had gravely insulted Miss Farren, and in due course it would emerge that Lord Derby was not satisfied with her portrait either. In the first instance, there was the matter of the disrespect the painter had shown the lady in titling the picture. The following is from his draft letter of apology:

It has been remarked that Mr. Lawrence surely treated very lightly the merits of Miss Farren when he mentioned the picture in the exhibition as the Portrait of an Actress, a term equally applicable to the lowest hireling of the stage. . . . When in the first list Mr. L. . . . came to Miss Farren’s Picture, he set it down not as Portrait of an Actress, nor of a celebrated Actress, but simply as the Portrait of a Lady, and this he did as well from its being Miss Farren in Private as from the wish he had that it should be known to be from the likeness alone. . . . Mr. L.’s surprise was great when, on looking over the Catalogue, he saw the picture mentioned as it was; he has been down to the Academy to have the mistake rectified.

The tone rather suggests the painter’s obsequious parent, while the error may simply have been one of inexperience, or oversight, on either or both of their parts.

Meanwhile, the queen’s portrait and Miss Farren’s remained on Lawrence’s hands, Miss Farren’s for reasons the sitter explained in 1792:

You must have forgot that the last time I had the honour of sitting to you, you told me that the price of my portrait would be sixty guineas, and then I informed you that Lord Derby meant to be the purchaser. It is I trust needless to say more upon the subject; you are now (if you can think so after the above) at liberty to put what price you think fit upon the picture; but you will not think of selling it without my consent.

The earl must always have intended to own the picture, but Lawrence was inclined to accept the much higher offer of one hundred guineas from two gentlemen who had visited the studio and seen the work when it was scarcely begun. Lawrence Senior had advised the artist to take the higher price, while Lawrence’s mother and Mrs. Papendiek had counseled against, and the portrait had not left the studio.

Lord Derby eventually paid the hundred guineas, but this was not the end of it either, as Miss Farren writes:

Mr. Lawrence, you will think me the most troublesome of all human beings, but indeed it is not my own fault; they tease me to death about this picture, and insist upon my writing to you. One says it is so thin in the figure, that you might blow it away; another that it looks broke off in the middle: in short you must make it a little fatter, at all events, diminish the bend you are so attached to, even if it makes the picture look ill, for the owner of it is quite distressed about it at present. I am shocked to tease you, and dare say you wish me and the portrait in the fire—but as it was impossible to appease the cries of my friends, I must beg you to excuse me.

Lawrence did not do as she requested. No evidence of significant changes has been found on the surface, in the X-radiograph (fig. 138), or by the use of infrared reflectography.7 The application of the paint throughout is direct, with little reworking (the toe of the sitter’s black shoe was made smaller),8 though the artist may at first have conceived of including an architectural element of some kind in the background. The canvas was trimmed for lining, but the cusping at the edges indicates that the cropping is minimal and that Lawrence intended the figure to appear at the edge of the picture space, as
if entering the landscape, with the hem of her skirt touching, or even hidden behind, the lip of the frame, her torso silhouetted against the expanse of sky.

Miss Farren was, and wished to appear, unfashionably slender (figs. 139, 140). In Lawrence’s portrait she wears her hair rather high but not wide. The draping of the cloak makes her torso look short, and her turning body, while it enlivens the composition, accentuates the narrowness of her shoulders. Convention would perhaps have dictated a different look, here illustrated by John Downman’s chalk drawing (fig. 141).

Miss Farren’s dress is white muslin, with a narrow hem and a pleated collar. The blue ribbon at her throat matches the bow on the huge muff and so perhaps belongs to the fox-trimmed satin cloak. She wears one brown suede glove and carries the other. It is somewhat romantically reported that Lawrence saw her taking off her cloak when she arrived for a sitting and wished to paint her as she was then. If the cloak was appropriate for an early spring day in London, viewers nevertheless would object to her wearing a winter garment in a summer landscape. It is in any event difficult to imagine that the choice of costume was casually taken. The picture and the lady invite entry, to the summer landscape and to her presence, by their very brightness and by the shimmer and tactility of every stroke of the brush. They have enjoyed enduring popularity (fig. 142).”


2. Charlotte Louisa Henrietta Papendieck, Court and Private Life in the Time of Queen Charlotte: Being the Journals of Mrs. Papendieck, Assistant Keeper of the Wardrobe and Reader to Her Majesty, ed. Mrs. Vernon Delves Broughton (London, 1887), vol. 2, p. 198. Mrs. Papendieck, as Queen Charlotte’s dresser and reader, had met Lawrence at Windsor in 1789 and had been permitted to pose in the queen’s place, wearing the jewelry she wears in the portrait (see note 3 below). At that time Mrs. Papendieck sat with her son Fred for an elaborate drawing in which her hands are arranged rather like the queen’s in the painting. The drawing belongs to the Metropolitan Museum (48.149.19).

Fig. 140. Ozius Humphry, *Elizabeth Farren, Actress*. Pastel, 9 1/4 x 8 1/4 in. (23.6 x 20.9 cm). Courtesy of the National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin

Fig. 142. Francesco Bartolozzi, after Lawrence, *Miss Farren, 1792*. Stipple engraving and etching, printed in color, 22 1/4 x 14 1/4 in. (56.3 x 35.8 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Bequest of Mary Stillman Harkness, 1950 (50.583.9)
3. According to Thomson, “Farren, Elizabeth,” Farren’s possible birth dates are July 16, 1739; July 7, 1751; and July 6, 1752.


6. Sir Thomas Lawrence’s Letter-Book, ed. George Somes Layard (New York, 1906), p. 13. The academy required two lists, the first with the titles to be used and the second with the sitters’ names, as the letter explains. The other two letters cited below are on pp. 14–15.

7. The painting was X-rayographed and examined with infrared reflectography by conservator Charlotte Hale in 2003. A Mylar tracing made from it was laid over the X-rayograph. I quote from her report: “The only apparent changes in the figure are on the left side of the dress, which was originally slightly (approx. 1 in.) fuller, and at the center and bottom of the right side of the cape, which also swelled out slightly more than we see from the surface. Were these modifications of profile the artist’s response to the sitters’ request? By reducing these swellings on both sides the body looks marginally shorter, but hardly fatter. It seems more likely that these adjustments were part of the original painting.”

8. The shoe is at an odd, twisted angle with respect to the body.

9. See also Garlick 1989, p. 2, 18, no. 244(b), who illustrates a study in the collection of Lord Allendale (15 x 12 1/2 in.), “traditionally and fairly convincingly identified as Miss Farren,” which shows a woman with a narrow face, long neck, and tight mouth and an expression that is not beaming. Of great charm, but differing from others by Lawrence that are more familiar, is a sketch reproduced by Garlick in Sir Thomas Lawrence: Portraits of an Age, 1790–1830, exh. cat., Yale Center for British Art, New Haven, and other venues (Alexandria, Va., 1993), p. 14, fig. 9. The latter now belongs to the Metropolitan Museum (2006.67).


106. The Calmady Children

Oil on canvas, 30 3/4 x 30 1/4 in. (78.4 x 76.5 cm)

Inscribed (on label removed from verso): Emily & Laura Anne Calmady, / daughters of Chat B. Calmady & / Emily Greenwood his wife, born / 1818, & 1820, painted by Sir / Thomas Lawrence / 1824, / Emily Calmady 1824.

Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900 (55.110.3).

Ex coll.: Charles Biggs Calmady, Langdon Hall, Exbury, near Plymouth, Devon (until d. 1835); Vincent Pollexfen Calmady, Langdon Hall, later Knighton, Wembury, and Tetcott, Holsworthy, Devon (1835–86); sale, Christie’s, London, May 22, 1886, no. 115, for £1,890 to Vincent, bought in); Collis P. Huntington, New York (until d. 1900; life interest to his widow, Arabella D. Huntington, later [from 1919] Mrs. Henry E. Huntington, 1900–d. 1924; life interest to their son, Archer Milton Huntington, 1924–terminated 1935).


Selected References: D. E. Williams, The Life and Correspondence of Sir Thomas Lawrence, Jr. (London, 1835), vol. 2, pp. 332–46; Memoirs and Recollections of the Late Abraham Raimbach, Esq., Engraver, ed. M. T. S. Raimbach (London, 1843), pp. 128–29; Charles Blanc, “Thomas Lawrence,” in W. Bürger [Théophile Thoré], Histoire des peintres de toutes les écoles: Ecole anglaise (Paris, 1865), pp. 10, 12, ill. p. 3; Ronald Sutherland Gower, Sir Thomas Lawrence (Lon-


According to Lawrence’s much-quoted remarks, The Calmady Children was his “best picture of the kind” and “one of the few I should wish hereafter to be known by.” Emily Greenwood Calmady, an amateur artist, had brought her two elder daughters to the artist’s London studio in July 1823 on the advice of a friend, the engraver Frederick Christian Lewis, in the hope that Lawrence would offer to paint them. Lawrence was captivated by Emily and her younger sister, Laura Anne. He asked two hundred guineas for a double portrait, though his regular price was two hundred and fifty guineas, and when Mrs. Calmady still “looked despairingly,” he reduced the price to one hundred and fifty pounds. The following morning at nine thirty he set to work on “the two little heads in a circle, and some sky,” apparently beginning with a study in pencil and colored chalks (fig. 143). When Mrs. Calmady expressed her pleasure in the work, the artist replied that he “would beg her acceptance of it, as he would begin another.” Lawrence grew fond of the children, sometimes keeping them with him for much of the day and playing with them. Once their mother, having left for an hour to care for her baby, returned to find the president of the Royal Academy feeding one of the girls mashed potatoes and mutton chops.

The Calmady Children was destined for the Royal Academy exhibition opening on May 3, 1824. The busy artist stayed in touch with the
girls' mother, observing in a letter of March 23 that "I should have been most happy to avail myself of the opportunity given me, by your stay, for another sitting from my sweet subjects, but for a long engagement at Buckingham House." The picture proved a success. Lawrence wrote again on October 25, thanking her for sending it back to him so that, upon the recommendation of George IV's sister, the Duchess of Gloucester, he could take it to Windsor to show to the king. September of the following year, 1825, found Lawrence in Paris. He had exhibited two portraits at the 1824 Paris Salon and was there to work on the portraits of Charles X and the dauphin (Royal Collection) that George IV had commissioned from him for the Waterloo Chamber at Windsor. The painter brought with him in his baggage The Calmady Children, which he showed privately. It was lithographed in color, becoming an extremely popular image in France.

This originally much-loved work has been the object of a mixed critical reception. The London papers had been enthusiastic. The Times, on May 4, 1824, called it one of Lawrence's "happiest works"; the Literary Gazette, on May 8, described "the playful and beautiful sentiment that shines through all"; and the Examiner, on May 10, felt that only Correggio could have surpassed it. George T. Doo's line engraving of 1832 and Samuel Cousins's mezzotint of 1835 (Fig. 144)—both titled Nature—have enjoyed an independent life of their own and are still popular today. Lawrence's first biographer, D. E. Williams, in 1831, admired the foreshortening but thought the figure of the older girl too massive and deplored the effect of what he described as glassy, bluish shadows. In 1886 The Calmady Children was bought in at auction after sluggish bidding.

Lawrence wished his picture to be seen as natural. While it is painted with seemingly effortless ease and mastery, it is also cogitated, and very bold. Laura Anne's knees and elbow project emphatically in relief, drawing the eye. A child cannot hold such a pose, which, with the swirling white drapery, is manifestly made up. The artist was a collector and connoisseur, and possible sources for his double portrait are Raphael's Madonna della Sedia and Saint John the Baptistis, Michelangelo's Doni Tondo, Carlo Maratta's paintings, and the Laocoön (of which Lawrence owned and displayed a lifesize cast). Its joy and sentiment have attracted this Museum's visitors since 1825, and it has been widely exhibited recently, contributing to a revival of interest in both the artist and his school.

1. See D. E. Williams, The Life and Correspondence of Sir Thomas Lawrence, Kt. (London, 1831), vol. 2, p. 342, and Kenneth Garlick, Sir Thomas Lawrence: Portraits of an Age, 1790–1820, exh. cat., Yale Center for British Art, New Haven, and other venues (Alexandria, Va., 1993), p. 36, on the subject of Lawrence's use of his initials. It is difficult to read the traces of red pigment at the lower left as a monogram.

2. Williams, Sir Thomas Lawrence, vol. 2, pp. 336–43, who based his account of the painting of the picture on a memoir by Emily Greenwood Calmady.

3. Little is known of the girls' lives. See W. Roberts, "Some Unpublished Lawrence Portraits," Connoisseur 41 (February 1913), p. 66, who notes that Laura Anne died on August 10, 1894, and Emily "some twelve years ago." His information was from a first cousin.

4. The drawing (Fig. 143) is signed "T. Lawrence, P.R.A. Delit" and dated July 1823. It is inscribed in the same style as the painting, on the verso. Ex coll.: by descent in the Calmady family; sale, Bearne's, Exeter, July 4, 2001, no. 286, ill. (colorpl.); exhibited: British Institution, London, "Works of the Late Sir Thomas Lawrence, P.R.A.," 1830, no. 54; engraved: Frederick Christian Lewis (1824, 1827). It is pictured in an 1824 drawing by Mrs. Calmady of Lawrence's studio (pencil, 8⅛ × 17⅞ in., signed "EC 1824"). Ex coll.: by descent; sale, Christie's, London, November 17, 2005, no. 35, ill.; engraved: Frederick Christian Lewis (1824). A portrait of the children's mother by George Henry Harlow (sale, Christie's, London, July 12, 1996, no. 75) is inscribed on a label on the stretcher: "Emily Calmady, wife of Charles Biggs Calmady &/ eldest daughter of William Green- wood of Brookwood / Park Hampshire—born 1794. Married 1816. / Painted by Harlow—1817. / Emily Calmady. 1844." An 1830 portrait of C. B. Calmady by Frederick Richard Say was sold at Bearne's, Exeter, October 24–26, 1995, no. 496.


107. Lady Maria Conyngham

Oil on canvas, 36 1/4 x 28 1/4 in. (92.1 x 71.8 cm)
Gift of Jessie Woolworth Donahue, 1955 (55.89)

Ex coll.: Henry Conyngham, 1st Marquess Conyngham (until d. 1852); by descent to Victor George Henry Francis Conyngham, 5th Marquess Conyngham, Slane Castle, County Meath, Ireland (from 1897; sold to Duveen); [Duveen, London and New York, until 1913; sold with Lawrence’s Lady Elizabeth Conyngham for £311,000 to Stotesbury]; Edward T. Stotesbury, Whitemarsh Hall, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia (1913–d. 1938; his estate, 1938–42); [Knoedler, New York, and O’Toole, New York, 1942; sold to Donahue]; Jessie Woolworth (Mrs. James P.) Donahue, New York (1942–55)


The sitter’s parents, Henry and Elizabeth Conyngham, were almost invariably at court in the 1820s, from George IV’s accession until his death in 1830. Henry Conyngham had been created Viscount Slane, Earl of Mountcharles, and, in 1816, Marquess Conyngham in the peerage of Ireland through the influence of his wife, who in 1820 became the future king’s final mistress. Lawrence recorded a sitting for a portrait of Lady Conyngham in the costume of a peeress in 1823 (fig. 145).1 Together with Lawrence’s portraits of George IV’s sisters, Mary and Amelia (Royal Collection), and of Lady Conyngham, this picture of her younger daughter, Maria, was placed in the king’s bedroom at St. James’s Palace on June 3, 1826. Lawrence had painted Maria’s brother, Francis (private collection), in time for the Royal Academy exhibition of 1823, and he completed a portrait of her sister, Elizabeth (Museu Calouste Gulbenkian, Lisbon), for Christmas that year. It seems likely that the present three-quarter-length representing the youngest child, of whom the king is reported to have been very fond, dates to 1824 or 1825. The portraits of the Conynghams were paid for by George IV but were probably intended for the sitters, in whose family at Slane Castle, County Meath, they descended.2 Lawrence charged two hundred and ten pounds for this one and three hundred and ten pounds for each of the other three.

In 1832 Maria Conyngham became the first wife of Sir William Meredith Somerville, fifth Baronet and member of Parliament for Drogheda from 1837 until 1852, who was later raised to the peerage of Ireland as Baron Athlunney. She had two children, a son who predeceased her and a daughter; she died in 1843. Her appearance in the portrait and the date of her marriage suggest that she was born about 1812.

The picture displays Lawrence’s mastery of design and the fluidity and panache of his technique.3 The characterization of the sitter, who was on the cusp between adolescence and womanhood, offers an interesting contrast to that of her sister, already of marriageable age, and to that of her complacent, heavysket mother. All are dressed in fashionable white, with their dark hair curled in ringlets. Maria’s is the least formal, with the simplest jewelry and setting. Her fingers are of disproportionate lengths, but the pose is easy and relaxed, the cast shadows are accomplished, and the even white teeth between bowed and parted lips contribute to her vivid smile. A dog identified by contemporaries as a collie balances the triangular design at the lower left. A portrait by Lawrence that is comparable in handling and in sensibility is that of Jane Alnutt (location unknown), begun and left unfinished in 1826.4

1. The portrait of Lady Conyngham was destroyed in a fire at Slane Castle. For the others mentioned below, see Garlick 1989, p. 172, nos. 205(b)–206, illus.; p. 195, no. 311(b), illus.; p. 267, no. 730, pl. 79; p. 133, no. 21, illus.

2. Oliver Millar, in a letter, 1968, notes that the two Conyngham portraits installed in the king’s bedroom in 1826 were transferred to Windsor in 1828 and returned to St. James’s in 1829. According to Millar, “the king may always have intended that these portraits should ultimately belong to the Conynghams. They were very closely associated with [him] in his last years and it is most doubtful whether William IV would have wished to retain them. . . . I doubt if they ever formed part of even the private part of the royal collection.”


Fig. 145. Sir Thomas Lawrence, Elisabeth, 1st Marchioness Conyngham. Oil on canvas, 50 x 40 in. (127 x 101.6 cm). Formerly Slane Castle (destroyed)
108. John Julius Angerstein

Oil on canvas, 36 × 28 in. (91.4 × 71.1 cm)
Bequest of Adele L. Lehman, in memory of Arthur Lehman, 1965 (65.188.9)

Ex coll.: by descent to John Julius William Angerstein, Weeting Hall, Norfolk (1859–d. 1866; his trustees, 1866–96; their sale, Christie’s, London, July 4, 1896, no. 117, as John Julius Angerstein, Esq., in red robe, 35 × 28 in., for £75.15.0 to Blakeslee); [T. J. Blakeslee, New York, from 1896]; Mrs. Benjamin C. Porter, New York (by 1908 at least 1910); [Newhouse, New York, by 1932–33 sold to Leyman]; Harry S. Leyman, Cincinnati (1933–35 sold to Levy); [John Levy, New York, 1935–36 sold to Mrs. Lehman]; Adele L. (Mrs. Arthur) Lehman, New York (1936–d. 1965)


For much of his professional life, Lawrence benefited from the patronage, friendship, and financial acumen of John Julius Angerstein, a financier, who as a young man underwrote marine insurance at Lloyd’s and who later played a major role in transforming the firm into the great insurance house that it became.1 He was born Johann Julius Angerstein in St. Petersburg on January 24, 1736. His mother was Eva Pritzen Angerstein; it is not clear whether he was the legitimate son of Johann Heinrich Angerstein, a surgeon from Coburg, or the natural son of Andrew Thompson, a British merchant. J. J. Angerstein, who became a British subject in 1770, formed a small but very important collection of European paintings in the 1790s and early 1800s. Tickets for visits to his house could be had by application in advance, and the collection came to be well known to contemporary artists, dealers, and other private collectors. Fourteen months after Angerstein’s death on January 22, 1823, the British government bought his fifty-four old masters, which had been amassed with some advice from Lawrence, among others, though Angerstein himself was not at all averse, as Judy Egerton has pointed out.2 The pictures thus secured for the nation included major works by Raphael, Sebastiano del Piombo, Rembrandt, Rubens, and Van Dyck; five paintings by Claude Lorrain; and six Hogarth, constituting the series Marriage à la Mode. The Angerstein residence at 100 Pall Mall, leased from his executors, opened to the public on May 10, 1824, as the National Gallery, London.

Among Lawrence’s numerous portraits of John Julius Angerstein and members of his family, there is a half-length of Angerstein (fig. 146) painted when he was in his early eighties and exhibited in 1816 at the Royal Academy. With other portraits, this work passed to the sitter’s son, John, and grandson, John Julius William, by whose trustees it was offered for sale at Christie’s on July 4, 1896, as no. 189, and bought in for 189 pounds. Sometime after 1931, it was sold to Lloyd’s by a descendant. On December 5, 1823, Lawrence had written Angerstein’s son asking to borrow the portrait so that he could use it as the model for a posthumous replica ordered by George IV. The king’s replica (fig. 147), paid for in 1824 but not delivered until 1828, went to William IV and was presented by him to the National Gallery in 1836.

The present canvas, which was bequeathed to the Museum in 1965 by Mrs. Arthur Lehman, can be identified with certainty only from 1932. It is a possible candidate for number 117 of the 1896 sale, Angerstein “in red robe,” thirty-five-by-twenty-eight inches, and sold to the New York dealer Blakeslee, and could also be the Angerstein portrait that Mrs. Benjamin C. Porter of New York lent to this Museum between 1908 and 1910.3 The persuasive characterization and suave fluidity of handling suggest that it is largely autograph, which would mean that it was painted between 1824 and 1828.4 On the other hand, it may be illogical to propose that an artist as busy as Lawrence would have painted a second replica, even if destined for a member of the Angerstein family. The London and New York portraits have not been seen together in this century, and a more conclusive determination could be made only in the unlikely event of a one-to-one comparison.
William Owen
Baptized Ludlow, Shropshire, November 3, 1769; died London, February 11, 1825

Owen, the son of a hairdresser and bookseller at Ludlow, in the West Midlands, was sent to London to study painting in 1786. He was apprenticed to the elder Charles Carton, coach painter to George III and a founder member of the Royal Academy; later, in 1791, he entered the academy schools. From 1792 until his death he showed regularly at the academy, exhibiting 203 works in all. Owen was elected an associate of the academy in 1804 and a member in 1806, the year he exhibited the picture catalogued below. After Hopper's death in 1810, he was appointed portrait painter to the Prince of Wales, later George IV. Although Owen's royal patron never sat for him, he was nevertheless highly regarded as a portraitist, standing for a time near Lawrence in public opinion, and he had many eminent clients. Owen was disabled by a disease of the spine and could no longer paint after 1820. He died in his fifties, having taken opium from a mislabeled bottle. His work more or less disappeared from view in the twentieth century.

109. The Grandchildren of Sir William Heathcote
Oil on canvas, 35 1/4 x 67 1/2 in. (140.3 x 171.5 cm)
Label (of Vicars Brothers, on reverse of frame):
Selected exhibition: Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1806, no. 242 (as Portraits of grandchildren of Sir W. Heathcote)
Selected reference: Connoisseur 102 (October 1938), ill. p. xvii

The 1938 sale catalogue of the heirlooms of the Heathcote family identifies the baby as Sir William Heathcote, fifth Baronet, and the girls as Harriet and Anne Lovell and Ellen Heathcote, who were his first cousins. Harriet and Anne were the daughters of Harriet, elder daughter of the third Baronet; she had married Langford Lovell on April 28, 1798. Ellen was the youngest of three daughters of the Reverend Samuel Heathcote, third son of the third Baronet. William, the family heir, was born May 17, 1801, the only child of the second son, the Reverend William Heathcote, vicar of Worting in Hampshire. The family house was Hursley Park, also in Hampshire, but according to the dealer's label on the reverse of the frame, the children were painted in 1801 at Embly, in the same county. The canvas was doubtless commissioned by their grandfather, whose wife, born Frances Thorpe, was co-heir to Embly. Owen exhibited it at
the Royal Academy in 1806, the year he was elected an academician.

The Heathcote pictures were sold off in the 1930s by a distant cousin, a clergyman living in Canada, who had succeeded as the ninth Baronet. Until that time, the family portraits by Dahl, Kneller, Daniel Gardner, Charles Hayter, and Owen, among others, constituted a rather comprehensive record of the appearance of succeeding generations from the late seventeenth century until shortly after 1800.1 Owen, the most popular of them all, had painted the third Baronet, his wife, seven children, a daughter-in-law, and a granddaughter, Maria, as well as the four grandchildren pictured here. Although Owen was known principally as a portraitist, the Redgraves admired “his subjects of rustic life, elevated both above common life and mere portraiture by some reference to poetry or story.”2 The present picture combines the two genres in showing the dark-eyed grandchildren of the baronet in peasant costumes, though the baby, William, has a more formal bonnet. Ellen Heathcote balances a sheaf of wheat on her head, and another sheaf lies on the ground beside the infant, a reminder of the fruitfulness of autumn and the presence of a young male heir. The picture is well composed but with an overabundance of slick curves.

Sir Martin Archer Shee

Irish, born Dublin, December 20, 1769; died Brighton, August 19, 1850

Archer Shee, born into a Roman Catholic family, lost his mother in 1771 and was brought up by his aunt and his father until the latter’s death in 1783. Having received some formal education and studied drawing at the Royal Dublin Society, he left home at fifteen and set up on his own as a portraitist in pastels. His career followed a traditional course: he moved on to painting in oils, began to work on a larger scale, and developed a fashionable clientele. Gilbert Stuart urged him to move from Dublin to London. In 1789 he had two portraits accepted for exhibition at the Royal Academy and met Thomas Lawrence, who would become his friend and lifelong rival. Archer Shee entered the academy schools in 1790 and exhibited regularly until 1845, showing portraits, occasionally supplemented by a historical subject or a fancy picture. He was elected an associate in 1798 and an academician in 1800, upon submission of a painting titled Belisarius (Royal Academy of Arts, London). In 1796 he had married Mary Power, a Roman Catholic from County Cork, and in 1799 the couple moved into the house in Cavendish Square that previously had been occupied by Romney.

The artist visited France in 1802, and in 1803 he published the first of a number of books, Rhymes on Art; or, The Remonstrance of a Painter. He was a founder of the British Institution in 1807 and showed works other than portraits there regularly. One of the art world’s most tireless and successful politicians, Archer Shee was popular with his fellow painters. On this account, he was elected president of the Royal Academy in 1830 and became the academy’s principal spokesman and defender. Sir Martin and Lady Archer Shee had six children.

Selected References


110. William Archer Shee, the Painter’s Son

Oil on canvas, 30 x 24¼ in. (76.2 x 61.9 cm)
Bequest of Maria DeWitt Jesup, from the collection of her husband, Morris K. Jesup, 1914 (53.30.48)

Ex coll.: [Fischer Galleries, Washington, D.C., until 1905; sold to Jesup]; Morris K. Jesup, New York (1905–d. 1908); Maria DeWitt (Mrs. Morris K.) Jesup, New York (1908–d. 1914, as Portrait of a Boy by Ophie)

The principal version, titled The Artist’s Son (fig. 148), belongs to the Diploma Galleries of the Royal Academy of Arts, London. Bought from the sitter by Mrs. E. A. Dadd shortly before her death, it was bequeathed by her to the Royal Academy in 1894.1 A replica was sold at Christie’s, London, on March 27, 1982.2 In 1923 Lieutenant Colonel Sir Martin Archer-Shee wrote to the Museum to identify the artist and the sitter and to suggest that our painting, if not by his great-grandfather, might be by the sitter’s brother, Martin Archer Shee Jr., Queen’s Counsel and an amateur painter.3 There is no other evidence to indicate that this might be the case, and the present, sympathetic picture seems worthy of Archer Shee. Unfortunately, there are drying cracks in many areas, and the glazes, which have darkened, are sensitive, so that the old varnish cannot be removed. The composition of the portrait may have influenced Lawrence, whose Master Lambton (private collection) in a similar pose was painted five years later. In 1843 the sitter, William, married Harriet, daughter of George Harcourt and widow of Colonel William Cubbitt. Their three children, and the painter’s only grandchildren, were Mary, Martin, and Harriet. William died at eighty-nine in 1899.

The artist’s other children were George (1800–1879), Martin (1804–1899), Anna, Mary, and Eliza Jane. He may well have painted them all, several of them more than once. Portraits of Martin, wearing a costume similar to William’s, and of Mary, as a little girl, seated and holding a flower, are recorded and may belong still to members of the family.

Fig. 148. Sir Martin Archer Shee, The Artist’s Son, 1820. Oil on canvas, 30 x 25 in. (76.2 x 63.5 cm). Royal Academy of Arts, London (03/606)

A boy with a rabbit in a portrait titled Master Shee might represent George.4 Photographs of the various family portraits are at the National Portrait Gallery and the Witt Library, Courtauld Institute of Art, London.

2. It was no. 135, measured 30¾ x 25 in., and made £4,800.
3. In the same letter, Archer-Shee also stated that in the 1890s the sitter sold the principal version to Mrs. Dadd.
4. Master Shee was owned by Newhouse Galleries, New York, as a version of the present work.
George Chinnery

Born London, January 5, 1774; died Macau (China), May 30, 1852

The son of an amateur artist, Chinnery first exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1791. He moved in 1796 to Dublin, where in 1799 he married Marianne Vigne. In his early years he painted portraits in miniature and in oils as well as small whole-lengths in pencil and watercolor. To the inaugural exhibition of the Society of Artists of Ireland in 1800 he contributed twelve pictures, and to the second exhibition, eleven. In 1802, leaving his wife and their two children, he sailed from London to Madras, India, where his brother John was employed in the East Indian civil service as a partner in the agency house of Chase, Chinnery & Macdowell. The artist moved to Calcutta in 1807, working there and in Dacca (Dhaka in modern Bangladesh) until 1821, when he departed for Serampore to escape his creditors. In 1825, once again leaving his wife (she had traveled out to India with his daughter, who had married, and his son, who died), two illegitimate sons, unfinished commissions, and substantial debts, Chinnery abandoned Calcutta for China, landing in Macau in September. There, with visits to the nearby trading center of Canton (modern Guangzhou) and to Hong Kong, he remained until his death in 1852.

In China and China Chinnery filled notebooks with figures and landscapes in pencil or pen and ink, some of which he elaborated either as paintings or as watercolors. He showed at the Royal Academy, sending works from Ireland until 1801, from London in 1802, and from Macau, intermittently, between 1830 and 1846. An enigmatic figure, Chinnery was eccentric and volatile, with a tendency to hypochondria, a raconteur and wit with a gift for friendship. In Macau, he was popular with Chinese, Europeans, and Americans alike.

Selected References

III. Self-Portrait

Oil on canvas, 8 ¼ × 7 ½ in. (21.9 × 18.4 cm)
Rogers Fund, 1943 (43.131.4)

Ex coll: Benjamin Chew Wilcocks, Macau (China) and Philadelphia (until d. 1843); by descent to his granddaughter, Mrs. Percy Madeira, later Mrs. Campbell Madeira, Washington, D.C., and Philadelphia (to 1977); her niece, Mrs. Benjamin Brannan Reath, Merion, Pennsylvania (sold to Woodhouse); Dr. Samuel W. Woodhouse Jr., Philadelphia (by 1932–d. 1943); his estate sale, Samuel T. Freeman & Co., Philadelphia, November 15–16, 1943, no. 317, to MMA


This canvas was probably painted between 1825, when Chinnery moved to China, and 1828, when he signed and dated the portrait of Benjamin Chew Wilcocks belonging now to the Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation (fig. 149). Meanwhile, Wilcocks himself had departed in 1827 for his native Philadelphia. One of the most prominent Americans in China, Wilcocks had engaged in the opium trade with Turkey, and later with India, for nearly twenty years, dividing his time between Canton and Macau. He had been appointed United States consul in China in 1812. The Philadelphian evidently shipped back (he had continued in the opium trade) his own portrait, the present self-portrait, and two other paintings by or after Chinnery of Chinese merchants from the Canton trading group, the Co-Hong.

Chinnery had exhibited the first of his many self-portraits at the Royal Academy in

Fig. 149. George Chinnery, Benjamin Chew Wilcocks, 1828. Oil on canvas, 28 × 18 ½ in. (71.1 × 47 cm). Courtesy of The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation Ltd.

Fig. 150. George Chinnery, Self-Portrait, 1824. Graphite, touched with pen and brown ink, 5 ½ × 4 ¾ in. (14.1 × 12.2 cm). The British Museum, London (1954,0710.60)
1798. He made more than a dozen others—paintings, drawings, and miniatures. Several show him as he appears here, seated and facing three-quarters to the right, holding his palette in his left hand (fig. 130). All but the face is unfinished in this small canvas, which lacks the smooth, porcelain-like surface and fine detail typical of his commissioned works. Although the handling is free, infrared reflectography reveals a careful preparatory pencil sketch of the head, including the shadow of the eyeglasses. The collar and the end of the tie are loosely indicated. By all accounts, including Chinnery’s own, he was odd-looking, with bushy hair and eyebrows, wide nostrils, jowls, and a soft, full mouth with a projecting lower lip. He wore wire-rimmed spectacles. This work, treated in 2009, is among the most intimate and engaging of the self-portraits, with its small size, relatively rough technique, and palette of browns and vermilion highlights. Most are dated on the basis of the sitter’s appearance.


3. The Exhibition of the Royal Academy, exh. cat. (London, 1798), p. 20, no. 495, as Portrait of an artist.

4. This information was supplied by conservator Dorothy Mahon, who examined the painting with infrared reflectography in 2009.

5. See Conner 1993, p. 239.

6. Chinnery was much interested in technical matters and had intended to write a book about painting, an initial draft of which is in the British Library. He favored vermilion and commented upon how to use it. See ibid., pp. 271–72.
Joseph Mallord William Turner

**Born London, April 23, 1775; died London, December 19, 1851**

J. M. W. Turner, the son of a London barber and wigmaker, was baptized at St. Paul’s, Covent Garden. His earliest drawings may date to a 1786 visit to a relative at Margate, Kent. He was admitted to the Royal Academy schools in 1789, and in 1790 submitted a watercolor to an exhibition there. As a topographical draftsman and painter Turner was largely self-taught, spending evenings in the mid-1790s with his friend Thomas Girtin copying landscape and other drawings belonging to Dr. Thomas Monro. He also established the practice of traveling in the summer to sketch outdoors. In 1794 topographical engravings after his drawings were first published; in 1796 he showed a painting at the Royal Academy for the first time. Turner was elected an academician in 1802. That summer he visited Switzerland and France during a hiatus in the Napoleonic Wars, and exhibits inspired by his travels were well received at the academy the next year, during which he built a private gallery adjoining his London house.

Between 1807 and 1819 Turner published parts of his Liber Studiorum, prints after his major works modeled on Claude Lorrain’s Liber Veritatis. By this time he numbered among his patrons William Beckford of Fonthill; the third Earl of Egremont, whose Sussex estate, Petworth, provided the artist with beautiful subjects; and Walter Fawkes of Farnley Hall, Yorkshire. Turner was elected professor of perspective at the academy in 1807 and began lecturing there in 1811. That summer, he took a sketching tour to prepare drawings for the engraved illustrations to *Picturesque Views on the Southern Coast of England*, issued between 1814 and 1826. He exhibited such important classical subjects as *Dido Building Carthage* (National Gallery, London) in 1815 and *The Decline of the Carthaginian Empire* (Tate, London) in 1817. Travels on the Rhine in 1817 inspired a major body of work in watercolor. Turner was in Italy in 1819–20, and again in 1828–29, while many important watercolors were prepared for *Picturesque Views in England and Wales*, published between 1827 and 1838.

In 1825 the artist sent *Harbor of Dieppe* to the Royal Academy and in 1826, *Cologne, the Arrival of a Packet Boat* (both Frick Collection, New York). Paintings exhibited at the Royal Academy in the 1830s sold well, including *Mouth of the Seine, Quille-Boyeu*, 1833 (Museu Calouste Gulbenkian, Lisbon), and *Juliet and Her Nurse*, 1836 (private collection). The summer of 1840 saw his last visit to Venice; in the four succeeding years he was in Switzerland. Ruskin’s anonymous defense of Turner in the first volume of *Modern Painters* dates to 1843. Among the artist’s late works is *Rain, Steam, and Speed—the Great Western Railway* (National Gallery, London), shown in 1844. In 1850 he exhibited for the last time.

**Selected References**


**112. Saltash with the Water Ferry, Cornwall**

Oil on canvas, 3½ in. x 47½ in. (89.9 x 120.7 cm)

Inscribed: (on building in right foreground) *SALTASH [sic]; ENGLAND / EXPECT [sic] EV'RY / [MAN TO DO HIS DUTY] [after Admiral Lord Nelson’s signal to the fleet before the Battle of Trafalgar in 1805]; (on building in middle ground) AT BEER

Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889 (89-15-9)

**Ex coll.:** the artist (until at least 1846); Joseph Hogarth, London (until 1851; Royal Gallery of British Art, Christie’s, London, June 13, 1851, no. 50, as Saltash, Devon, for £36.10.0 to Bicknell); Elhanan Bicknell, Herne Hill, Surrey (1851); John Miller, Liverpool (1851—after 1858; his sale, Christie’s, London, May 22, 1858, no. 249, for £40 to Gambart for Miller); his daughter, Maria C. Miller (by 1868—87; sold for 3,000 gns. through Charles W. Deschamps to Marquand); Henry G. Marquand, New York (1887–89)


A strategically located Cornish market town on the west bank of Plymouth Sound, near the mouth of the Tamar River and inland from Plymouth and Devonport (known until 1824 as Plymouth Dock), Saltash lies at a ferry crossing (fig. 151) connecting two ancient roadways. Plymouth has been the home of a royal dockyard and naval station since the late seventeenth century.

As is often remarked, the subject here is an ordinary one. Ruskin, writing in 1852, called it "what the mind sees when it looks for poetry in humble actual life": "the weather is hot—& everything is dirty—and the sunshine glowing." For Finberg, the thematic material, "devoid of classical . . . allusions," was also "practically free from topographical interest." The components are some ramshackle buildings, including an inn or tavern, arranged parallel to the picture plane, a passage and a roadway into the town, a muddy beach inhabited by a quantity of mostly local people and half a dozen pack-horses, and, drawn up to the waterline, at least three boats. To the left of the passage a soldier stands guard, and on the wall of a building in the foreground is a famous phrase from Nelson's 1805 signal to the fleet at Trafalgar, reminders of the ongoing Napoleonic Wars.

Turner's painting was first shown at his own London gallery in May 1812. Exhibited
for sale, it was among recent works mentioned in the June 9 edition of the Sun as mentioned from the artist’s tour in Devon and Cornwall the previous summer. A quick pencil drawing (fig. 152) of the buildings with figures in the foreground is on page 62 verso of what Finberg in 1909 called the first Devonshire Coast Sketchbook, forming part of the Turner Bequest at the Tate. The tiny sketchbook is an interleaved copy of a 1799 guidebook, Colman’s British Itinerary, which, according to the subtitle, provided direct routes to every borough and town in the kingdom. It is not difficult to imagine the painter with the book in his pocket, arriving under sail or in a rowboat to be set down on the beach at Saltash on a hot, hazy afternoon. This is neither a maritime subject nor a pastoral one and, in addition to being ordinary, it is quite atypical for Turner.

At the suggestion of Evelyn Joll, the painting was cleaned by John Brealey in 1980, and, excluding the sky, it is generally in quite good state for a work by this artist.

1. In a letter of November 22, 1886, Deschamps offered Marquand the painting from the collection of Miss Miller, with the recommendation of Frederic Leighton. The original letter is in the files of the Department of European Paintings.

2. Ruskin, in a letter of November 22, 1852, to Belfast merchant and collector Francis McCracken. The original is in the Museum’s archives. The picture also attracted attention in the Athenaeum (February 7, Portfolio (February), and the Spectator (March 5) when it was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1885.


### 113. Venice, from the Porch of Madonna della Salute

Oil on canvas, 36 × 48 1/4 in. (91.4 × 122.2 cm)

Bequest of Cornelius Vanderbilt, 1899 (69.31)

**Ex coll.:** H. A. J. Munro of Novar, London (by 1847–60; sale, Christie’s, London, March 26, 1860, no. 150, for £6,010 to Gambart); [Gambart, London, from 1860; sold to Heugh]; John Heugh, Manchester (until 1862; sold to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1862; sold to Mendel]; Sam Mendel, Manley Hall, Manchester (1862–75; cat., 1867, no. 125; sale, Christie’s, London, April 24, 1875, no. 445, for £7,250 to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1875; sold to Dudley]; William Ward, 1st Earl of Dudley, Dudley House, London (1875–1883; William Humble Ward, 2nd Earl of Dudley, Dudley House (1883–1886); sold through Farrer to Vanderbilt]; Cornelius Vanderbilt, New York (1886–87–d. 1899)


According to the artist's first biographer, Walter Thornbury, writing in 1862, Turner . . . went to Venice for Mr. Munro, insisting on his travelling expenses being paid. The commission was for a drawing; but when Turner came back, he brought [this] large ambitious painting, which Mr. Munro never much took to. The artist was greatly mortified at seeing Mr. Munro's disappointment, and would not at first sell him the picture; but at last he consented. This picture Mr. Munro got tired of a few years ago, and sold for 3000!" Turner made three trips to Venice, in the late summers of 1819, 1823, and 1840, and as the present painting was first exhibited in 1835, Munro must have sponsored the artist's second stay, of a week to ten days, in the lagoon city. Turner first arrived in Venice on September 8, 1819, for five days. He returned on September 9, 1833, and again on August 20, 1840, remaining until September 3. In all, he seems to have spent rather less than a month there.

Thornbury's evidence to the contrary, it is clear from the shortness of Turner's stay in 1833 that he did not paint this large canvas while he was there, but instead upon his return, presumably using his own drawings and watercolors as source materials. He showed other views of Venice at the 1834 Royal Academy, and when he did exhibit the painting the following year, he, not Munro of Novar, was the lender. Critical commentary was extensive and mostly favorable, the writer for the Literary Gazette admiring "its general gaiety." When, in 1860, Munro sold it, John Ruskin Senior proposed to Gambart that twenty gentlemen should be found who
would contribute to the purchase price so that, "as Turner is so little known and so little esteemed on the Continent," the work could be presented to the Louvre.²

Among the pencil drawings in the 1819 Milan-to-Venice sketchbook in the Turner Bequest at the Tate, there are two that could perhaps have been used as aide-mémoire.³ The first (fig. 153), quite detailed and showing the church of Santa Maria della Salute from the opposite direction, was made from the other side of the Grand Canal. The second (fig. 154), rather slighter, must have been drawn from a boat and illustrates the mouth of the canal, with palaces in front of the bell tower of San Marco to the left and the Dogana, or customs house, to the right. There do not seem to be any particularly close correspondences with later pencil drawings, although some show shipping of the sort illustrated here. There is a related watercolor, from either 1833 or 1840, at the Tate; another, of about 1840, is in the British Museum (fig. 155).⁴

The finished painting was engraved twice, in 1838 by William Miller, as a large single plate under the title The Grand Canal, Venice, and in 1850 by Robert Brandard, for the Vernon Gallery.⁵ Both prints include Turner’s initials on a plank at the lower left, but these are not found on the painting and as far as is known were never there. John Ruskin owned an example of Miller’s engraving and greatly admired it, mentioning it often in his writings.⁶

The title, Turner’s own, is not an accurate description of his subject. Longhena’s Baroque church of Santa Maria della Salute does not have a porch, and no view of Venice from the church resembles this one, which is a bird’s-eye view taken from a height above the Grand Canal that can only be imagined. The mouth of the canal at the entrance to the Bacino is too narrow, as has been remarked, while the expanse of water in the foreground is too wide and the opposite bank of the canal seems to bend away at the left edge of the canvas, which it does not. Most of the palaces are shown with three windows on each upper floor, for which there is no basis in fact. Turner varies the heights of the buildings for effect and makes all of them taller than they are, without respect to the local topography. There are other discrepancies of the kind, all of which represented choices made by a skilled draftsman who could have shown exactly what he had seen
114. Whalers

Oil on canvas, 36 1/4 x 48 1/4 in. (91.8 x 122.6 cm)
Catharine Lorillard Wolfe Collection, Wolfe Fund, 1896 (66.29)

Ex coll.: Elhanan Bicknell, Herne Hill, Dulwich, Surrey (in 1845); Joseph Hagarth, London (until 1851); Royal Gallery of British Art sale, Christie's, London, June 13, 1851, no. 48, as The Whaler: “Harrah for the whaler; Erebuss, another fish”; Beaulé’s Voyage, for £299 to Gambart; [Gambart, London, from 1875; probably sold to Miller]; John Miller, Liverpool (by 1858–67); his sale, Christie's, London, May 22, 1885, no. 247, as The Whale Ship, for £657.10.0 to Gambart for Miller; sold to Agnew; [Agnew, London, 1885; sold for £1,890 to Graham]; John Graham, Skelmorlie Castle, Ayrshire (1887; sold to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1887–88; sold to Leyland]; Frederick Richard Leyland, Liverpool (1886–74; his sale, Christie’s, London, June 13, 1874, no. 115, as The Whale Ship, for £500 to bought in); Thomas Woolner, London (in 1875; his sale, Christie’s, London, June 12, 1875, no. 132, as Whalers, for £315 to Ellis, bought in); Charles Cooper, London (until 1883; his sale, Christie’s, London, April 21, 1883, no. 151, as The Whale Ship, for £4,945 to Vokins); [Vokins, London, 1883; sold for about £1,500 to Hadlen; Sir Francis Seymour Haden, Woodcote Manor, Alresford, Hampshire (1885–96; his sale, Christie’s, London, May 23, 1896, no. 110, for £4,945 to Wilson bought in; sold to MMA];


Two letters of 1845, one from Turner to Elhanan Bicknell and the other from John Ruskin Senior to his son John, must pertain to this painting, to its pendant at the Tate, or to both. “I have a whale or two on the canvas,” Turner advised Bicknell, in a note the date of which should be read as January 31, 1845. “I will thank you for a call in Queen Anne Street at your earliest convenience.” And, on September 19, according to a letter Ruskin Senior wrote Ruskin Junior, who was traveling abroad, “[Bicknell] found Water Colour in Whalers & rubbed out some with...
Handky. He went to Turner who looked Daggers & refused to do anything, but at last he has taken it back to alter ... all say it is not finished. They account for his hurry & disregard for future fame by putting Water Colours by his stronger passion, love of money. I am sorry he sacrifices his great fame to present effect & object." Sequentially, the Metropolitan Museum’s Whalers is the second of four whaling subjects, the first in narrative order (fig. 156) has the same title as ours, while the third and fourth are called, respectively, “Hurray! for the Whaler Erebus! Another Fish!” and Whalers (Boiling Blubber) Entangled in Flavo Ice, Endeavouring to Extricate Themselves. The first two were shown at the Royal Academy in the summer of 1845, and the others were exhibited the following year. Three of the series never sold and form part of Turner’s bequest to the Tate.

If there is no hard evidence that the whaling paintings were commissioned, then Turner’s letter at least indicates that he intended to sell Bicknell one or more of them, and perhaps all four, while Ruskin’s demonstrates that Bicknell took temporary possession of the present canvas after the close of the Royal Academy exhibition. It must have been this painting that Bicknell wiped with his handkerchief, because it is the only one ever to leave the studio, whether in the first instance it was paid for or not. Perhaps Bicknell felt under obligation to buy it but not to keep it, and he sold it to Joseph Hogarth for use in a deluxe print volume called The Royal Gallery of British Art, in which, ultimately, it did not appear. No one has been able to establish where the picture was from 1846 to 1851.

Turner’s principal literary source was Thomas Beale’s Natural History of the Sperm Whale, published in London in 1835 and in an expanded edition in 1839 (the second edition included an account of a whaling voyage that began in 1830). Beale, a ship’s surgeon, had sailed for Thomas Sterge of Newington Butts, Southwark, who had financed the first Pacific whaling venture and who subscribed for twenty copies of the second edition of the book. Bicknell had made his fortune as a director of Langton and Bicknell, oil merchants of Newington Butts, whose financial interest was also in ships of the Pacific sperm-whale fishery. He subscribed for four copies and may have given or lent one to Turner, whose patron he already was. The artist subtitled his 1845 exhibits "Vide Beale’s Voyage," referring to page 163 for Tate’s picture and page 175 for ours.

There are related watercolors on nine pages of Turner’s undated Whalers Sketchbook, and, among loose sheets, a fine whaling subject (fig. 157) is at the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. While the watercolors are as evocative as the painting, none is closely related in thematic material, and all may in any event be later. The Fitzwilliam watercolor is thought to have belonged to the Ambleteuse and Wimereux sketchbook, used between May 4 and 15, 1845, after the present work was painted. In the 1840s, few people in England knew what a sperm whale looked like. Turner may never have seen one and, using the descriptions and illustrations that were available to him, he created these works in part from his imagination, bringing to bear many years’ observation of the seas in the Channel and elsewhere along the English coast. For his depiction of the whale, which is clearly visible only in this canvas, he consulted wood engravings by William James Linton (fig. 158) and after William Huggins that illustrate Beale’s book. Bicknell’s firm also owned a canvas by Huggins (fig. 159), painted about 1835, that Turner
Fig. 158. William James Linton, Boats Attacking Whales. From Thomas Beale, The Natural History of the Sperm Whale, [2nd ed.] (London, 1839), frontispiece

Fig. 159. William Huggins, A Whaler in the South Sea Fishery, ca. 1835. Oil on canvas, 33 3/4 x 50 in. (84 x 127 cm). Private collection, United Kingdom
must have used as a source for details in this picture and its companion.

The book illustrations provide a gloss on Beale’s text, which gives an account of the events of June 18, 1832, in the “off-shore ground” of Japan. Beale wrote that the whale
dodged us about until nearly four P.M., at
which time the men were dreadfully exhausted
from their exertions in the chase, which had
been conducted under a broiling sun, with
the thermometer standing in the shade at 93°.
About half-past four, however, Captain
Swain contrived, by the most subtle manage-
ment and great physical exertions, to get
near to the monster, when he immediately
struck him with the harpoon with his own
hands; and, before he had time to recover
from the blow, he managed with his usual
dexterity to give him two fatal wounds with
the lance, which caused the blood to flow
from the blow-hole in abundance. The whale,
after the last lance, immediately descended
[and] again rose to the surface with great
velocity, and striking the boat with the front
part of his head threw it high into the air
with the men and everything contained
therein, fracturing it to atoms and scattering
its crew widely about. While the men were
endeavouring to save themselves from
drowning by clinging to their oars and pieces
of the wreck of the boat, the enormous ani-
mal was seen swimming round and round
them, appearing as if meditating an attack
with his flukes, which if he had thought
proper to do, in return for the grievous
wounds he himself had received, a few
strokes of his ponderous tail would soon have
destroyed his enemies; but this was not
attempted. They had now nothing to hope for
but the arrival of the other boats to relieve
them from their dangerous situation, ren-
dered more so by the appearance of several
large sharks, attracted by the blood which
flowed from the whale, which were some-
times only a few feet from them; and also
from the inability of one of the boats’ crew to
swim, by which three or four of his mates
were much exhausted in their efforts to save
him, which they succeeded in doing after
having lashed two or three oars across the
stem of a boat, which happened to be not
much fractured, on which they placed their
helpless fellow-adventurer. After they had
remained in the water about three quarters
of an hour, assisting themselves by clinging
to pieces of the wreck, one of the other boats
arrived and took them in, no doubt greatly
to their relief and satisfaction. But although
these brave whale fishermen had been so
defeated, they were not subdued: the moment
they entered the boat which took them from
the ocean, their immediate determination
was for another attack upon the immense
creature.9

Turner shows a single ship under sail in
relatively calm seas off Japan on a bright, hot
late afternoon. The huge whale is mortally
injured and, jaws wide, spouts from his
blowhole a vaporous, opaque, bloodstained
stream that rises above his blunt nose and
pours down into the turbulent water. To
the right and in front of the ship are the
boats. Three are upended; two are partly
destroyed. The sailors struggle to reach
them and rescue their mates who are still
in the water.10

The two paintings exhibited in 1845
received a mixed reception. The younger
Ruskin was among those who did not think
well of them, though he did not explain his
view.11 The critic for the Times, on the other
hand, attempted to do the present work jus-
tice: “The greater portion of the picture is
one mass of white spray, which so blends
with the white clouds of the sky, that the
spectator can hardly separate them, while
the whiteness is still continued by the sails
of the ship. . . . Those who are inclined to
admire him, will find in the picture a free,
vigorous, fearless embodiment of the effect
of a moment.”12

In 1849 Herman Melville visited London
for the first time. He returned to New York
in January 1850; that April he withdrew two
books on whaling from a local library and
asked Putnam to import for him Beale’s
second edition. On the title page of his copy
of Beale, Melville wrote, “Turner’s pictures
of whalers were suggested by this book.”13
It is thus documented that Melville knew
of Turner’s paintings, even though he may
never have seen them, and that he drew on Beale,
as well as his own experience as a sailor
and harpooner, when writing Moby-Dick,
the first draft of which was largely finished
by August of the same year.14 In chapter
three Melville describes a picture hanging
in the entryway to the Spouter-Inn. Large,
“be-smoked, and every way defaced,” the
image was so difficult to read “that at first
you almost thought some ambitious young
artist . . . had endeavored to delineate chaos
bewitched”:15

But what most puzzled and confounded you
was a long, limber, portentous, black mass
of something hovering in the centre of the
picture over three blue, dim, perpendicular
lines floating in a nameless yeast. A bogggy,
soggy, squatting picture truly, enough to drive
a nervous man distracted. Yet was there a sort
of indefinite, half-attained, unimaginable
sublimity about it that fairly froze you to it,
till you involuntarily took an oath with
yourself to find out what that marvellous
painting meant.16

This could be said of Whalers, and of a cer-
tain number of sea pieces by Turner, but
not of the work of any other marine painter
of the time.

The painting, acquired by the Museum in
1896, was first photographed, according to
our records, in 1906. It was relined and
cleaned in 1933, and treated again in 1968.
Close comparison of the various black-and
white photographs reveals rather little
change, although the variation in tonality in
the sky has diminished. The surface is flat-
tened. The ship is considerably abraded, but
some of the rigging can still be read. The
best-preserved passages are the small boats
and figures, the head of the whale, and the
dark, choppy surrounding sea. Turner
changed the contours of the whale’s nose,
gradually widening and enlarging the shape.
Examination under the microscope reveals
the remnants of scumbles associated with the
darkest gray pigment that may originally
have subsided the contrast between this pig-
ment and the surrounding areas.

1. Charles Deschamps, in a letter of November 22,
1886 (Department of European Paintings files), to
Henry G. Marquand stated that his uncle, Gamb-
bart, bought the picture back for John Miller at his
1858 sale. He also alleged, in error, that Gambart
sold it to Sir Donald Currie.

2. F. Seymour Haden, writing on October 23, 1887,
to Samuel P. Avery (transcript in Department of
European Paintings files), stated that the painting
had belonged to H. A. J. Munro of Novar, but
none of the catalogues in which it was offered for
sale mentions him as a previous owner, and this
seems unlikely. In the 1871 sale the title of number
48 was confused with that of one of the other
paintings of the series for the first of many times.

3. Walter Armstrong, Turner (London, 1902), p. 175,
read the date in error as 31 June 1845. Butlin and
John Constable

Born East Bergholt, Suffolk, June 11, 1776; died Hampstead (London), March 31 or April 1, 1837

Constable was the son of a mill owner and merchant in the Suffolk village of East Bergholt. In 1799 he was permitted to leave the family business for London to enroll in the Royal Academy schools, supplementing his training by copying the old masters. He first exhibited at the academy in 1802, and from 1807 onward showed there every year until his death. Constable was dedicated to the study of nature and, while spending the winters in London, returned in the summer to East Bergholt to sketch out of doors. His style developed slowly, reaching maturity with The Stour Valley and Dedham Village (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston) and Boat-Building near Flatford Mill (Victoria and Albert Museum, London), Royal Academy exhibits in 1835. The following year he married Maria Bicknell. On account of her fragile health, the family spent more and more time on the outskirts of the city in rural Hampstead, where they moved permanently in 1827. Maria died in 1828, leaving the painter with seven young children.

In the late 1810s and the 1820s Constable gave up his visits to Suffolk to paint for the Royal Academy his six-foot canvases of views on the river Stour. The first to be exhibited, in 1819, was The White Horse (Frick Collection, New York). In 1829 he was elected to full membership and began preparations for Various Subjects of Landscape, Characteristic of English Scenery, mezzotints after some of his most important paintings that were engraved under his supervision by David Lucas. Constable never visited the Continent, Wales, or Scotland, and his early trips to the Peak and Lake Districts left no lasting mark. He was inspired by the gentle Suffolk landscape, the inhabited counties to the south, the beaches he visited with Maria, and the panorama around Hampstead. He was concerned with the importance of landscape painting, emphasizing its emblematic significance as well as its truth to nature, and hoped to promote it in the hierarchy of genres. However, his brilliant sketches in oils, rather than his set pieces, constitute his unique gift to the national school.
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115. Stoke-by-Nayland
Oil on canvas, 11 3/4 x 14 1/4 in. (29.8 x 36.2 cm)
Red wax seal (on stretcher); galerie / sedelmeyer / paris

Charles B. Curtis Fund, 1926 (26.128)

ex coll.: [Sedelmeyer, Paris]; Aureliano de Beruto, Madrid; [Dario de Regoyos, sold to MMA]


Martha Smith, Constable’s aunt, had the idea that he should paint an altarpiece for her local church at Nayland, a village on the north bank of the Stour River several miles west of East Bergholt.¹ The artist took the picture in hand in the summer of 1820 and soon brought it with him to Suffolk, where he stayed from early August until early November that year. The altarpiece was installed in the church during his visit. In connection with the commission, or in the course of visiting his aunt, he would have
Two variants are in London: one, belonging to the Tate (fig. 163), is a little less blond and includes a woman balancing a bundle on her head; the other, on paper, at the Victoria and Albert Museum, also has the woman with the bundle but is dark in overall tone. The subject was among those selected by Constable in 1829 for David Lucas to mezzotint for publication in the second number of English Landscape Scenery (1830), and a proof extensively retouched by Constable is in the Museum’s collection (fig. 164). While this sketch and the Tate’s date to 1810 or 1811, the one at the Victoria and Albert may have been made in 1829–30 in preparation for the mezzotint.

1. For the altarpiece, see Reynolds 1996, vol. 1, p. 146, no. 10.8, vol. 2, pl. 836 (colorpl.).
6. Parris, Tate Gallery Constable Collection, pp. 60–64, no. 11, colorpl., ca. 1810–11; and Reynolds 1996, vol. 1, p. 162, no. 11-44, pl. 927.
8. The published print is titled Stoke by Nayland, Suffolk. Constable took up the view again in a full-scale oil sketch now in the Art Institute of Chicago, for which see Reynolds 1984, vol. 1, p. 292, no. 36.19, vol. 2, pl. 1070 (colorpl.).

Constable shows a meadow, two cows, houses at the edge of the village, and the perpendicular church of Saint Mary the Virgin at Stoke-by-Nayland (fig. 162) from the south, but he was principally interested in the shady road that lay before him to the right. As Graham Reynolds pointed out, the painter took the canvas off the original stretcher and folded it out at the left, widening it by slightly more than an inch. Four original tack holes are visible, and a slight change in the color of the ground marks what had at first been the edge of the paint surface. Although flattened in an old relining, the picture is otherwise in good state, boldly painted, with highlights of blue and white and dense, glossy black strokes for the trunks and thicker branches of the trees and for a figure standing in deep shadow in the roadway. Reynolds remarked that “the figure painted wholly in black is a remarkable piece of virtuosity.” This small picture is not a rough sketch after nature but a highly cogitated work of art.
Fig. 163. John Constable, *Stoke-by-Nayland*. Oil on canvas, 7¼ × 10½ in. (18.1 × 26.3 cm). Tate, London (no1819)

Fig. 164. David Lucas, after Constable, *Stoke by Nayland, Suffolk*. Intaglio, 8¾ × 12½ in. (21.9 × 32.1 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1927 (27.4.18)
Mrs. James Pulham Sr.

Oil on canvas, 39\(\frac{1}{4}\) x 24\(\frac{3}{4}\) in. (99.7 x 62.9 cm)
Inscribed (on label on reverse of stretcher): Portrait of / / painted by John Constable R.A. / in or about the year 1821.
Gift of George A. Hearn, 1906 (06.1272)

**Ex coll.:** James Pulham Sr., Oxford House, Woodbridge, Suffolk (until d. 1870); Mrs. James Pulham Sr., Woodbridge (1790–d. 1856); James Brook Pulham, Woodbridge (1796–d. 1860); Mrs. James Brook Pulham, Woodbridge (1860–d. 1868); Captain Rolla Rouse, Melton, Suffolk (from 1868); George A. Hearn, New York (until 1906)


**Fig. 165.** John Constable, *Mrs. James Pulham*, 1818. Oil on canvas, 30\(\frac{1}{2}\) x 23\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. (77.5 x 64.5 cm). Tate, London (no. 1272)

Reverend Dr. John Wingfield that is signed and dated 1818. Constable’s half-length of Mrs. James Pulham (fig. 165) is more similar, however. Each woman is seated, fully frontal, with her head turned slightly toward the source of light at her right. Their faces are honestly rendered, to judge by the sitters’ double chins, the modeling smooth, the tones blended, and the strokes disguised. By contrast, their clothes—Mrs. Andrew is dressed for home, Mrs. Pulham for the street—afforded Constable an opportunity to display the brilliance of his technique, especially in the highlights. In both cases, the handling of the drapery is broad, fluent, and more suggestive than descriptive.

---

2. Ibid., vol. 1, pp. 17–18, no. 18, pl. 36.
117. Salisbury Cathedral from the Bishop’s Grounds

Oil on canvas, 14 1/4 x 44 in. (36.9 x 111.3 cm)
Bequest of Mary Stillman Harkness, 1950 (50.145.9)

Ex coll.: the artist (until d. 1837); his estate sale, Foster and Sons, London, May 16, 1838, no. 30, as Salisbury Cathedral, [from] the Bishop’s Garden, nearly finished, for £66.6.0 to Archburt; Samuel Archburt (1838–39); his sale, Christie’s, London, April 13, 1839, no. 114, for £31.10.0 to Theobald; John Davis, Manchester and Wykin Hall, Hinckley, Leicestershire (until d. 1881); E. J. Foxwell, Hinckley (until 1907); sale, Christie’s, London, April 30, 1907, no. 104, for £1,575 through Gribble to Agnew; [Agnew, London, 1907; sold to Lee]; A. H. Lee (from 1907); Sir Joseph Beecham, 1st Baronet, London (by 1911–1916); his estate sale, Christie’s, London, May 3, 1917, no. 6, for £65.10.0 to Smith; [Eugène Cremetti, London]; sold to Agnew and Knoedler; [Agnew and Knoedler, London, 1923; Agnew share sold to Knoedler]; [Knoedler, New York, 1923–26; sold to Harkness]; Edward S. Harkness, New York (1926–d. 1940); Mary Stillman (Mrs. Edward S.) Harkness, New York (1940–d. 1950)


From July 13 until August 22, 1820, Constable, with his family, paid a visit to Archdeacon John Fisher and his wife in the cathedral town of Salisbury.2 He had been there twice before, in September 1811, at the invitation of one of his first patrons, the archdeacon’s uncle, Dr. John Fisher, bishop of Salisbury, and, briefly, on his wedding trip with Maria, in early October 1816. On both occasions, he had made drawings of the cathedral, notably, in 1811, one from the southwest (fig. 166) that contains the germ of the present composition. If not commissioned by the bishop, his first finished painting titled Salisbury Cathedral from the Bishop’s Grounds (fig. 167), now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, was eventually finished for him and in 1823 was exhibited at the Royal Academy.

The artist may have referred to an oil study (fig. 168) for the London picture when he wrote on September 13, 1820, to the younger Fisher, reporting that his Salisbury sketches, including the one made in the cathedral grounds, had been “much liked.” In May 1822 Bishop Fisher visited Maria Constable in London in her husband’s absence and, according to her account, “rummaged out the [oil sketch of] Salisbury Cathedral & wanted to know what you had done”; in November, the bishop opined that he would like to see the sketch finished, “to grace my Drawing Room in London.” Instead, Constable painted the new and larger canvas referred to above, showing, at the left, the bishop, with his wife on his arm, pointing toward the cathedral with his walking stick.

Constable remarked, with respect to the Victoria and Albert picture, that he had “not flinched at the work, of the windows, buttresses, &c,” but that it was “the most difficult subject in landscape” he had ever undertaken. However, the bishop expressed his dislike of the dark cloud directly over the spire in the finished work, wanting a sunnier sky. Meanwhile, Constable painted a smaller, squared oil sketch (private collection) and then a smaller finished painting of the cathedral (Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens, San Marino, California) as a wedding present from the elder Fisher to his daughter, Elizabeth, which was finished in time for her marriage on October 16, 1823.

In August 1823, Bishop Fisher was still awaiting “a more serene sky.” The following year, Constable engaged a Suffolk boy, John Dunthorne Jr., to join him as an assistant in his London studio. The artist sent for the bishop’s cathedral picture on July 18, presumably to use it as a model for another work. He had decided to begin anew, as he noted in a letter to Maria of July 12, writing that young Johnny had just “done a delightful outline of my Cathedral same size for me to copy.”

The present canvas is the full-scale study for Constable’s sixth and final painting (see fig. 171) of the great Gothic building from the grounds to the southwest, which, although intended finally to fulfill his commission from the bishop, was never received by him. Now in the Frick Collection, it is fully signed and dated 1826, but the old gentleman had died in May of the previous year. Both of the

Fig. 166. John Constable, Salisbury Cathedral: Exterior from the South West, 1811. Black and white chalk on gray paper, 39 1/4 x 29 7/8 in. (99.4 x 75.8 cm). Victoria and Albert Museum, London (291–1888)
Fig. 167. John Constable, *Salisbury Cathedral from the Bishop's Grounds*, 1823. Oil on canvas, 34⅛ × 44 in. (87.6 × 111.8 cm). Victoria and Albert Museum, London (PA 33)

Fig. 168. John Constable, *Salisbury Cathedral from the Bishop's Grounds*, 1820. Oil on canvas, 29⅝ × 36⅜ in. (74.3 × 92.4 cm). National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa (18687)
paintings in New York show the spire of Salisbury Cathedral rising into a bright sky, its height and shape emphasized by white clouds and flanked by the slanting trunks and branches of the old trees to either side in the foreground. While the present canvas was on Constable’s easel, he made changes in the design, suppressing foliage that met in an arc over the top of the cathedral spire, the existence of which is documented by infrared reflectography (figs. 169, 170).

A secure chronology for the six paintings of Salisbury Cathedral from the southwest has been developed in recent years, and it has been assumed that Dunthorne prepared his “delightfull outline” on the present canvas. In fact, on the evidence of recent infrared reflectography (figs. 170, 172), the apparent differences in preparation and handling between the Metropolitan and Frick pictures are minimal. Constable may have asked Dunthorne to transfer the design of the cathedral to the two additional canvases, but as there is really no evidence for Dunthorne’s style, nor any way to judge what an “outline” by him at this or any stage of his career might have looked like, it cannot be said at present whether any of the drawing visible in the infrared images is, or is not, his.

What can be said is that in the underlying drawing for the Metropolitan’s picture (see fig. 170), the trees still meet above the cathedral spire, as in the canvas in the Victoria and Albert Museum. The composition seems to have been opened up by Constable in the later stages of painting the sketch, so that there is blue sky not only above the spire but also among the branches of the trees to the right. The weight of the dark foliage has been shifted from one side of the canvas to the other. The underdrawing of the Frick picture (see fig. 172), which follows the Metropolitan’s painted sketch, is slightly more elaborate, while the two compositions are on the same scale and perfectly aligned. Constable must have completed them in succession, between late July 1824, the date after which he began the Metropolitan Museum picture, and November 1825, when he described the one in the Frick Collection as “nearly compleated.”

Salisbury Cathedral with its stone spire, the tallest in England, dates to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and is surrounded by a flat landscape of water meadows.
Constable’s drawing, dated September 11 and 12, 1811 (see fig. 166),4 shows the southwest elevation with much of the nave hidden behind the trees in the foreground, a corner of the close wall, the spire, and the south transept. An enormous tree screens the chapter house, and other trees mask the southeast transept and the chapel at the east end. What the bishop saw from the palace would have been rather similar. A drawing dated July 22, 1820, depicts the chapter house and the south and southeast transepts, with the east end again hidden behind an evergreen and other trees.5 There must have been many more drawings of the kind than now survive.

The three finished paintings of the cathedral and the Metropolitan Museum sketch contain abundant and accurate architectural detail, such as the bishop, a person of eighteenth-century taste and sensibility, would doubtless have required. In each of the finished paintings (although not in the sketches), there is a railing along the south side, and many small figures, townsmen or visitors, suggest the vast scale of the structure. In only one of the six, the sketch for the wedding-presentation picture, the chapter house is hidden behind the tree shown in the 1811 drawing. The trees at the east end, minimized in the finished paintings, are omitted altogether from the present work. In all, the chapter house, an octagon, reads as square, perhaps in the interest of legibility. It may be imagined that Constable would have been glad of an assistant, Dunthorne, to prepare an outline of some sort before he took up his fifth and sixth canvases of the subject.

1. Christopher Kingzett of Agnew’s, in response to a request for information, advised in a letter of 1984 that the picture had been purchased in March 1923 from “R. Cremon.” It seems likely that this was in fact the dealer Eugène Cremoni of the McLean Galleries, Haymarket, who on June 1, 1923, sold part of his stock at Christie’s upon his retirement.

2. Constable’s work at Salisbury has been the subject of several fine articles, and this entry takes the form of a summary depending principally on Graham Reynolds, John Constable: Salisbury Cathedral from the Bishop’s Grounds / La Cathédrale de Salisbury Vue des Jardins de l’Évêché (Ottawa, 1977), while all of the quotations are from Beckett 1963–68 (given in the order in which they appear here): vol. 6 (1968), p. 36; vol. 2 (1964), p. 276; vol. 6, pp. 102, 115, 135; vol. 2, p. 360, vol. 6, p. 206.
3. Maryan Ainsworth, Curator of European Paintings, made the first infrared reflectograms of the Metropolitan’s picture for Charles Rhyne, in connection with the exhibition “Constable and Dunthorne,” which he organized in 1988 for the Sander-O’Reilly Galleries, New York. The results of his research were not published. In 2006 and 2008 both sketch and finished work were reexamined by conservators Dorothy Mahon and Charlotte Hale. We thank Susan Galassi for her help and interest, and for allowing access to the Frick picture, and we intend to study the problem further together. Meanwhile, Charlotte Hale, who made the digital infrared reflectogram, points out that Dunthorne’s outline would probably have been limited to the architecture. By contrast, the underdrawing of the landscape in both is free and calligraphic. She observes that given its freedom, especially in the Frick work, it is more likely that Constable himself executed the underdrawing of the landscape (memo of 2008).


ENGLISH ARTIST, CA. 1830

118. Tottenham Church

Oil on canvas, 20 1/2 x 18 1/2 in. (52.1 x 46 cm)
Inscribed (in black ink, on stretcher): Tottenham Church / J. Constable; red wax seal (on stretcher): galerie / sedelmeyer / PARIS
Bequest of Maria DeWitt Jesup, from the collection of her husband, Morris K. Jesup, 1914 (15.30.50)
Ex coll.: [Sedelmeyer, Paris]; Morris K. Jesup, New York (until d. 1908); Maria DeWitt (Mrs. Morris K.) Jesup, New York (1908–d. 1914)


The parish church of All Hallows, Tottenham, is shown after alterations made to the structure between 1816 and 1821, that is, after the flint-and-rubble north wall was rebuilt in brick, as (vaguely) seen here. If by Constable, the painting would have to be an early work, of about 1800; however, the presence of the brick wall and the woman’s costume, which seems to date to about 1830, are against this. The painting is not included in Graham Reynolds’s Constable oeuvre catalogues, nor, as far as we know, elsewhere in the literature of the last twenty-five years. Only Ellis Waterhouse, in 1974, called it “a perfectly good Constable.” Jonathan Mayne and Robert Wark were doubtful about the attribution, which had been rejected by Malcolm Cormack, Leslie Parris, Charles Rhyne, and repeatedly by Reynolds. Rhyne summarized the position when he noted that “the general type is not unlike Constable, but [the picture] is no closer to him than to a hundred other English painters.” Robert Hoozee’s acceptance of the work was probably based on a photograph. The state of preservation is very good, the handling a little primitive.

1. Graham Reynolds, in a letter, 1974, pointed out the discrepancy between a presumed date based on Constable’s style and the much later date of 1830 for the costume, observations with which Leslie Parris agreed (see note 3 below).


David Cox

Born Birmingham, April 29, 1783; died Harborne (Birmingham), June 7, 1859

Cox studied with a drawing teacher, Joseph Barber, before gaining employment as a painter of theatrical scenery in Birmingham. He moved to London in 1804, intent upon continuing in that field, but he did not find work and instead fell under the influence of the watercolorist John Varley and embarked upon a career as a drawing master and painter in watercolor. He also supplied material for drawing manuals to several London publishers. Cox showed at the Royal Academy beginning in 1805 and with London’s Associated Artists in Water Colours from 1809 to 1812. He then joined the Society of Painters in Water Colours, exhibiting with them regularly until his death. In 1814 he accepted a teaching position at a school in Hereford, where he lived with his wife and son until returning to London in 1827. Cox visited Belgium and Holland in 1826, and France in 1829 and 1832, and also traveled widely in the north of England. Until 1841, when he settled at Greenfield House, Harborne, outside Birmingham, the artist had supported his family principally by teaching. He began to paint in oils regularly in the late 1830s, taking lessons from William James Müller, and thereafter devoted more time to this pursuit, but he showed his paintings only in the provinces. Much of Cox’s late work was inspired by the mountainous Welsh landscape around the village of Betws-y-Coed, where he stayed each summer from 1844 until 1856. Cox’s oil paintings were little known in his lifetime and form a relatively small part of his practice.
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II9. Landscape with a Gypsy Tent

Oil on wood, 9 x 14 in. (22.9 x 35.6 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): David Cox / 1848.
Gift of Mary Phelps Smith, in memory of her husband, Howard Caswell Smith, 1964 (65.258.2)

Ex coll.: Edwin Bullock, Hawthorn House, Handssworth, Birmingham, until d. 1870; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, May 23, 1870, no. 271, as A Landscape, with a gipsy tent, 1848, for £89.5.0 to Agnew for Murrieta; Messrs. Murrieta (1870–72; sale, Christie’s, London, April 30, 1892, no. 85, 1870 [sic], 9 x 15 in., for £126 to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1892; sold to Orrell]; J. Orrell (from 1892); Charles Stuart Smith, New York (until d. 1909); Howard Caswell Smith, Oyster Bay, New York (1909–63); Mary Phelps (Mrs. Howard Caswell) Smith (1965)


This modest oil sketch, on a prepared panel and in very good state, belonged to several well-known collectors of nineteenth-century art. Edwin Bullock, a Birmingham industrialist who was an enthusiastic patron of Cox’s work as a painter, bought it from the artist and kept it until his own death in 1870.1 Bullock, a steady patron, had works dating to just about every year from 1840 to 1853, and it may be imagined that he acquired the sketch shortly after it was completed. The following year, 1849, he commissioned from Cox four panels to decorate his summerhouse at Hawthorn House, the designs for which are preserved at the Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery. Bullock’s sale fueled a resurgence of interest in Cox, and the picture passed to the Murrietas, one of whom, Cristobal, was a collector of Alfred Stevens and Leighton, among other Victorians.

Typically for Cox, the principal motif is engulfed and made one with the rolling country landscape. The gypsy tent is hidden by a hedgerow, more or less surrounded by dense shrubbery, and shaded by a tree in full leaf. The small figure huddles over a washtub or a cooking fire, while the field in the background is sprinkled with daubs of white that are to be understood as sheep. Although its variegated surface suits the theme and conception, the work cannot match Cox’s brilliant, transparent watercolors.2

1. This information, communicated by Stephen Wildman, in a letter, 1983, is from John C. Neve’s unpublished working papers for a catalogue raisonné of Cox’s oil paintings, undated but compiled after 1948. Wildman’s own scholarship is the principal source for this entry.
2. The painting has been accepted by Malcolm Cormack, verbally, 1978; Roy Davis, verbally, 1983; and Stephen Wildman, in a letter, 1983. Scott Wilcox, in a letter, 1983, called it “a genuine and fairly representative work of 1848—not one of his more ambitious . . . but typical in size, composition, and handling.”
Wilkie, the son of a clergyman, was schooled locally. From 1799 until 1804 he studied drawing and painting at the Trustees’ Academy, Edinburgh, where in 1803 he won a prize for a history picture. He painted portraits of necessity but was interested in genre, particularly the work of the seventeenth-century Flemish artists David Teniers the Younger and Adriaen van Ostade, which he knew through prints. In 1805 Wilkie moved to London and enrolled in the Royal Academy schools, and in 1806 he began to make a name for himself exhibiting genre subjects. He was elected an associate of the Royal Academy in 1809 and an academician in 1811, the year in which he sold Village Festival (Tate, London) to John Julius Angerstein and, through Benjamin West, received a commission from the Prince Regent for Blind-Man’s Buff (Royal Collection). He commissioned engravings made from his pictures.

In 1817 Wilkie visited the Highlands of Scotland in search of new subjects. Three years later, he started on what was to become his best-known work, Chelsea Pensioners Reading the Gazette of the Battle of Waterloo (Apseley House, London), which was painted for the Duke of Wellington and represents the old soldiers of Chelsea Hospital being given the news of the victory over Napoleon. In 1823 George IV appointed Wilkie King’s Limner for Scotland. At the height of his success, he lost his mother and two brothers within a year. He fell ill and in 1825 went abroad to recover his health, traveling to Italy, Germany, Spain, and Switzerland. He returned in 1828 to London and thereafter served George IV, William IV, and Victoria as painter-in-ordinary, much engaged with contemporary and historical subjects on a grand scale as well as with portraits. In 1840 Wilkie left for the Holy Land and Constantinople; during the return journey he died suddenly and was buried at sea.
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120. The Highland Family

Oil on wood, 24 1/2 × 36 in. (61 × 91.4 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): david wilkie f. i (1824)
Bequest of Maria DeWitt Jesup, from the collection of her husband, Morris K. Jesup, 1914 (55.30.52)

Ex coll.: George Capel-Coningsby, 5th Earl of Essex, Cassiobury Park, Watford, Hertfordshire (1815–d. 1839); Arthur Algernon Capel, 6th Earl of Essex, Cassiobury Park (1839–d. 1843); sale, Christie’s, London, July 22, 1843, no. 49, as Interior of a Highland Cottage: A Highland Warrior, returned from battle, for £357 to Sedelmeyer; [Sedelmeyer, Paris, 1893–at least 1894; cat., 1894, no. 100]; [Knoedler, New York, about 1904]; Morris K. Jesup, New York (until d. 1908); Maria DeWitt (Mrs. Morris K.) Jesup, New York (1908–d. 1914)

Selected Exhibitions: Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1825, no. 112 (as The Highland Family); Royal Scottish Academy, Edinburgh, 1821, no. 79 (as The Highlander’s Return to his Family, lent by the Earl of Essex); British Institution, London, “Works of the Late Sir David Wilkie, R.A., Together with a Selection of Pictures by Ancient Masters,” June 1842, no. 61 (as The Highland Family, lent by the Earl of Essex); Manchester, “Art Treasures of the United Kingdom,” 1857, Paintings by Modern Masters, no. 601 (as Interior of a Highland Cottage, lent by the Earl of Essex)


The fifth Earl of Essex (whose portrait by Reynolds is no. 30) is reported to have commissioned The Highland Family in 1824 and to have given three hundred guineas for it. Wilkie was in Scotland from the late spring through the autumn of the year, and Allan Cunningham asserted that this panel is “a portrait of what he had seen in the north rather than a work of the fancy” and that the artist put the “finishing touches” to it for the 1825 Royal Academy exhibition. The Highland Family, Wilkie’s only work at the academy that season, and the last to be shown before the artist departed for a sustained period to the Continent, is thus the ultimate illustration of his style to this point.2

Wilkie was a marvelous draftsman. It was his long-standing practice to prepare important pictures with sketches, which may have been the case with the present work, though none have been identified. On the other hand he was at the time much burdened with family problems, unwell, and overworked, and he may have developed the composition from an earlier painting or drawing. A study of a family group (fig. 173), preparatory to the Chelsea Pensioners Reading the Gazette of the Battle of Waterloo shows a man in top boots, britches, neck cloth, and shirt, seated in the same position, with a baby on his

Fig. 173. David Wilkie, Study for “Chelsea Pensioners Reading the Gazette of the Battle of Waterloo.” Pen and brown ink, 4 1/4 × 5 3/4 in. (11.9 × 13 cm). The British Museum, London (1856,0209,330)
shoulder and his wife beside him. Wilkie may have had this study or another like it in mind when he painted not only the figure of the Highlander but also that in The Sportsman (Wallace Collection, London), who sits at the right, facing left, with his legs extended and a gun in his left hand. The Sportsman was signed and dated, and also exhibited, in 1824. The Border collie must have been based on the same drawing as an animal in Roger Piping to Jenny, from “The Gentle Shepherd,” a small panel signed and dated the previous year.

Wilkie sometimes arranged lay figures in a stagelike box, so that he could deploy them in groups and observe the effects of light. This and similar devices may have contributed to his fondness for horizontal compositions, low interiors with openings into other spaces, and sharp, directed light, often from a single source. The dark domestic interiors and the presence of a variety of barrels, kettles, and ceramic, copper, and glass vessels testify to his earlier studies of Flemish genre painting. While the still lifes in the fore- and middle ground of this painting are closely observed and in very good state, there is a major change in the background to the left, where Wilkie seems to have added the open door at a fairly late stage. In the 1820s his figures, as here, were often fewer in number and assumed larger proportions relative to the size of the interiors they inhabit. Wilkie rarely depicted Highlanders in kilts. The subject may be generic, as the work apparently does not have a literary source.

3. For the painting and various other related drawings, see Brown 1985, p. 16, and nos. 12–21, 31, ills.
5. Tromans 2002, pp. 94–95, no. 21, colorpl.
With little formal education, Etty, aged eleven in 1798, was indentured for seven years to a printer in Hull. In 1809 his older brother Walter joined their uncle William as a business partner. William Senior had invited the aspiring young artist to London in 1809, and later Walter gave him financial help. He made drawings from casts, from prints, and from nature to prepare for enrollment in the Royal Academy schools in 1807, when he was also apprenticed for twelve months to Thomas Lawrence. Throughout Etty’s career, the Royal Academy was an essential source of support and inspiration. For years he attended life-drawing classes to work from the model. John Opie’s lectures at the academy led him to become a history painter, and the examples of Titian and Rubens fired his interest in the female nude. From 1811 he was a regular contributor to Royal Academy exhibitions, and he also showed at the British Institution. He visited France in 1815, and France, Switzerland, and Italy in 1816.

Etty first made his mark in 1820 with two academy exhibits, one of which was The Coral Finder: Venus and Her Youthful Satellites Arriving at the Isle of Paphos (private collection), but within a year or two he was harshly criticized in the press for his female nudes, which were described as indecent. From 1822 to 1824 the artist was again in Italy. He returned to London to exhibit Pandora Crowned by the Seasons (Leeds City Art Gallery), which was bought by Lawrence, and in the same year he was elected an associate of the Royal Academy. The next decade saw his large works in the grand manner, notably Judith and Holofernes and its companion paintings (National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh), exhibited in 1827, 1830, and 1831, respectively. Etty became an academician in 1828. He also painted portraits and, in the 1840s, landscapes, and lived to see a monographic exhibition of his work held at London’s Society of Arts in 1849. After his death, Christie’s sold the hundreds of studies that remained in his studio.

Lord Leverhulme was much interested in Etty, whose paintings decorated the stair hall of his London house, The Hill, on Hampstead Heath.¹ Dennis Farr has dated this one to 1827–35, the artist’s most important period, after his return from a long stay in Italy.² While the shape of the canvas, which is somewhat abraded, suggests that it may have been intended as an inset or sketch for a ceiling, there is no other evidence to support either this supposition or the fanciful title, The Wood Nymph’s Family, which Martin Birnbaum, the donor, supplied.

The nymph or model wears a necklace of flowers and blossoms in her hair. In her left hand she holds a flask, from which water trickles. Two muscular little satyrs, one with dark skin and both with large ears, accompany her, while kneeling behind her is a disproportionately small, nude figure. In the foreground is a still life of fruit and flowers, with a pitcher and panpipes, and in the background, a woody landscape and a drapery (evidently a studio property) fastened to a tree trunk. The specific subject, if there is one, has not been identified. Neither the drawing of the secondary figures, which is awkward and lacking in Etty’s usual gravitas, nor the rather finicky handling of the landscape is typical.

² Farr, in a letter, 1960.

---

**Selected References**


**121. Allegory**

Oil on canvas, laid down on wood, oval, 28 × 14½ in. (71.1 × 87.6 cm)

Gift of Martin Birnbaum, 1959 (39.131)

**Ex coll.:** Arthur Kay, Tregartha, Glasgow (by 1924–11; his sale, Christie’s, London, May 11–12, 1931, no. 252, as An Allegory of Plenty, for £21 to Gooden & Fox; [Gooden & Fox, London, 1912; sold to Lever]; William Hesketh Lever, Baron Leverhulme, later 1st Viscount Leverhulme, 1911–1925; his estate sale, Anderson Galleries, New York, February 17, 1926, no. 79, for $400 to Hawkins]; J. T. Hawkins (from 1926); [Martin Birnbaum, New York, by 1938–59, as The Wood Nymph’s Family, the project for a Palace Ceiling]

**Selected Exhibition:** Cartwright Memorial Hall, Bradford, “Works of Art in the Cartwright Memorial Hall,” 1904, no. 18 (as Allegory, lent by Arthur Kay)

The Three Graces

Oil on millboard, 22 1/2 x 18 1/4 in. (57.2 x 47.6 cm) Rogers Fund, 1905 (05.31)

Ex coll.: G. T. Andrews, York (by 1849–51; sale, Christie's, London, June 23, 1849, no. 76, as Study for the Graces, in a picture of "Venus attireing," for £60.18.0, bought in; sale, Christie's, London, May 31, 1851, no. 80, as "The Graces, for £120 to Hatch); Thomas MacKenzie, Daluaine House, Car-

Fig. 174. William Etty, Venus and Her Satellites. Oil on wood, 30 1/2 x 42 1/2 in. (77.5 x 108 cm). Museo de Arte de Ponce, Fundación Luis A. Ferré

ton, Strathspay (until 1902; sale, Christie's, London, May 10, 1903, no. 110, as Study for "The Three Graces,"

22 x 18 in., for £79.18.0 to Smith); [Henry Ellis Hey-

man, London, until 1905; sold to MMA]


This oil sketch is a study for the Three Graces in Etty's painting Venus and Her Satellites (fig. 174), which was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1835 and which the artist regarded as one of his principal works.1 Venus is dressed by three young women and accompanied as well by the Graces, one of whom offers strings of pearls and another a wreath of flowers. The sensuous nude bodies set off by brightly colored draperies in the final painting gave offense, and the picture, when first exhibited, was criticized as too erotic. Roger Fry bought the sketch for the Metropolitan Museum in December 1905, shortly before he became curator of paintings. He described it as "unfinished but superfluous."2 Whether Etty would have called it "unfinished" is open to question. It is probably as he intended that it should remain, and this is fortunate, in that many of Etty's figure studies were completed after his death by others, who added landscape backgrounds or draperies to make them more salable.3 As well as sketching nudes at the Royal Academy, Etty employed models to pose in his studio, which seems likely to have been the case here, as the grouping appears to have been carefully arranged and the motif was carried over quite precisely.

1. William Etty, "Autobiography of William Etty, R.A., in Letters Addressed to a Relative," Art Journal, January 1849, p. 40. A thinly painted version of the Ponce picture, possibly a studio copy, is in the York Art Gallery; see Farr 1958, p. 156, no. 100 (ii), who also mentions a watercolor copy inscribed "W.E." Another oil sketch, of the same size as the one in York and also on panel, was sold at Sotheby's, London, February 22, 1989, no. 47, colorpl.

2. Fry, in a telegram, 1905.

3. See Martin Poole in Kim Sloan, Victorian Painting in the Beaverbrook Art Gallery / Peinture victoriennne: The Beaverbrook Art Gallery, exh. cat., Beaverbrook Art Gallery and other venues (Fre
George Henry Harlow

Born London, June 10, 1787; died London, February 4, 1829

The painter’s father, a London merchant in the China trade, died before he was born. Harlow studied with Hendrik de Cort and Samuel Drummond, and for twelve months beginning on December 9, 1803, he attended the studio of Sir Thomas Lawrence, whose work was central to the development of his style as a painter and draftsman. The young artist exhibited at the Royal Academy beginning in 1804 and thereafter had success with both portraits and theatrical subjects, examples of which may be found in the collection of the Garrick Club, London. Harlow was foppish, affected, precocious, and prodigiously productive. His portrait drawings are particularly accomplished. In June 1818 he embarked on a study trip to Italy to remedy the deficiencies in his education and, while in Rome, caused considerable amazement when he painted in eighteen days a full-size copy of Raphael’s Transfiguration (Pinacoteca Vaticana, Rome). Both Byron and Canova befriended him. Harlow was admitted to the Accademia di S. Luca, Rome, presenting his painting Wesley Receiving the Cardinal’s Hat in Westminster Abbey, and, later, to the Accademia di Belle Arti, Florence. He died at thirty-one early in 1819, shortly after he returned to England, and sales of his work were held in London on June 21, 1819, and June 3, 1820.
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123. Self-Portrait
Oil on canvas, 30 × 25 in. (76.2 × 63.5 cm)
Gift of George A. Hearn, 1895 (95.27.2)
Ex coll.: ?W. Anthony (in 1868); George A. Hearn, New York (until 1895)
Selected Exhibition: South Kensington Museum, London, “Exhibition of National Portraits, Commencing with the Fortieth Year of the Reign of George the Third and Ending with the Year MDCCLXVII,” opened April 13, 1868, no. 111 (as To waist, seated to r.; paper in l. hand, dark cloak; landscape background. Canvas, 30 × 25 in., lent by W. Anthony)
Selected References: F. Gordon Roe, “Mr. Lionel U. Grace’s Collection of Miniatures,” Connoisseur 55 (October 1910), p. 93; Mary Webster, Firenze e l’Inghilterra: Rapporti artistici e culturali dal XVI al XX secolo, exh. cat., Palazzo Pitti (Florence, 1971), n.p. (see under no. 72)

In December 1818, upon admission to the Accademia di Belle Arti in Florence, Harlow must have taken pleasure in presenting his self-portrait (fig. 175) to the Uffizi.1 It is inscribed: “G. H. Harlow / Academician of St. Luke / Rome. 1818.” The present painting is not a copy of the Uffizi picture, as had been suggested, but instead seems to be a preliminary study.2 The compositions of the Uffizi canvas and that in the Metropolitan Museum conform when the latter is masked at the left and bottom to increase the scale of the figure in proportion to the space. The changes in this work, apparently indicated by the artist, would be atypical for a replica or a later variant, whether by Harlow himself or another hand. There are other differences here: the figured pattern of the curtain at the left is simpler, the sunset in the background is less bold, and the tassel, rope, and curtain at the right are not as highly finished. Even so, the technique, much the same in both, is that of someone working rapidly and with limited interest in finishing detail.

There are two closely related figure drawings. A pencil study by John Jackson (fig. 176) is inscribed “GH. Harlow,” “From the portrait in the Gallery at Florence,” and “J. Jackson. R.A.” According to Richard Walker, the original cardboard was further annotated by Jackson to the effect that the drawing had been given by him to his mother, Harlow’s sister, Mrs. White, in 1819.3 Doubtless it was offered as a memento. The second study, in ink heightened with white and inscribed “G H Harlow / His Portrait,” is somewhat different in technique, but also rather tightly drawn and similar to the first. It was offered to, and declined by, the National

![Fig. 175. George Henry Harlow, Self-Portrait. Oil on canvas, 29 × 24 3/4 in. (73.5 × 62 cm). Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence](Image)

![Fig. 176. John Jackson, George Henry Harlow. Graphite, 7 3/4 × 5 7/8 in. (19.7 × 14.6 cm). National Portrait Gallery, London](Image)
Patrick Nasmyth
Scottish, born Edinburgh, January 7, 1787; died London, August 17, 1831

The Nasmyths were an able, industrious, and established Edinburgh family. Patrick was the eldest son and one of twelve children of Alexander Nasmyth and Barbara Foulis. Alexander was apprenticed to a coach painter and to the gifted portraitist Allan Ramsay, before setting up on his own to paint portraits in 1778. He had turned to landscapes by about 1788, teaching his children among others and working in this genre until his death in 1840. He visited Italy and was deeply influenced by the classicizing style of Claude Lorrain. While six of Alexander’s eight daughters were artists, Patrick, a naturally gifted draftsman, was his father’s successor. In 1810, having completed his training, the younger painter left Edinburgh for London to settle and open a studio. Reportedly, he toured private collections in the English capital with his father in the same year, looking principally at Dutch paintings. A bachelor, eccentric, not good with money and often in debt, the younger Nasmyth sold his works for a few pounds each when he was short of funds. Later in the nineteenth century his style became popular and was widely imitated. He exhibited at the most important venues in Edinburgh, and in London showed at the Royal Academy, the Society of British Artists, and the British Institution. It was his practice to walk and sketch in the country around London and, while drawing polluted willows by the Thames, he was soaked in a summer storm, caught cold, and died suddenly at forty-four. Fellow Scottish artists in London erected a stone over his grave at St. Mary’s Church, Lambeth, and an obituary writer wrote admiringly of him as “the English Hobema.”
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124. Near Penshurst, Kent
Oil on wood, 27 1/4 × 31 1/4 in. (69.9 × 92.1 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): Pat*r Nasmyth. 1828
Inscribed: (on typewritten label on verso) At Penshurst Kent England by P. Nasmyth / exhibited in Leeds Exhibition 1868 from / the Collection of Ralph Brocklebank of Chilwell Hall near Liverpool; (on verso) [label of Arthur Tooth]
Bequest of Maria DeWitt Jesup, from the collection of her husband, Morris K. Jesup, 1974 (55.30.66)

Ex coll.: Ralph Brocklebank, Chilwell Hall, near Liverpool (by 1868–d. 1891; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, April 25, 1892, no. 71, as Landscape, Exhibited . . . 1868, to Agnew for £75; 10.0.1); [Agnew, London, from 1893]; [Arthur Tooth]; Morris K. Jesup, New York (until d. 1908); Maria DeWitt (Mrs. Morris K.) Jesup, New York (1908–d. 1914)

Selected exhibition: Leeds, “National Exhibition of Works of Art,” 1868, no. 1564 (as Landscape, lent by R. Brocklebank)

This panel painting came to light after the death in 1914 of Mrs. Jesup, who bequeathed it to the Museum with the title At Penshurst, Kent. It shows a mature tree, probably an oak, and a tumble-down fence beside a still pool, with a village among gently rolling hills in the background. There are two figures: a man with a gun, seen from behind and accompanied by two dogs, in the distance at the left, and a man in profile walking with a stick, at the center.

A more or less identical painting (fig. 178) has been in the Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto, since 1948.1 On wood, practically the same size, and likewise signed and dated 1828, it is called Landscape, Pool and Tree. The dogs are omitted, and the figures are not as solidly drawn. A third, smaller and undated canvas (location unknown) representing the same scene but with many slight changes was identified as View near Godstone in 1924, when in the collection of Colonel Douglas James Proby.2 It differs in showing a woman riding a white horse accompanied by a man on foot in the background at the left. A fourth (location unknown), the smaller size but on wood, signed and dated 1826, was on the London art market in 1976 with the title Near Clifton.3 For some reason, the subject was
exceptionally popular and at least one further large version, lighter and feathery in handling, has been sold repeatedly at auction.4

Penshurst and Godstone lie to the south of London and are separated by no more than several miles. The church shown here is St. John the Baptist, Penshurst. This view was certainly influenced by seventeenth-century painters: Meindert Hobbema, Jacob van Ruisdael, or perhaps Jan Wijnants. Typically for Nasmuth, four versions are on view, which may be symptomatic of the importance for him of the Dutch School. The technique is minutely precise and detailed. Our landscape, unpublished in the modern era and rarely exhibited, is in impeccable state, having been cleaned in 2004, for the first time since we acquired it nearly a century ago.


3. Here the single figure on the path is accompanied by two dogs, and there are shadows on the path. The work was with M. Newman, London, in 1976, when it was advertised in Connoisseur and Apollo. It was identified as a view of Godstone when sold at Sotheby’s, London, March 2, 1983, no. 105.

4. Also on panel, signed and dated 1828, it was at Sotheby’s, London, March 18, 1964, no. 209, and probably is the work reproduced in a catalogue of the Lowndes Lodge Gallery, London, The Nasmuth Family (London, 1964), no. 25, Heathfield near Godstone, Surrey. As in our painting, there are dogs, but in this one, no birds. As far as I can tell, this panel was sold at: Sotheby’s, London, November 17, 1971, no. 14; Christie’s, London, November 18, 1971, no. 38; Christie’s, London, November 26, 2002, no. 58, bought in; and Christie’s, London, June 10, 2003, no. 59.

Frederick Richard Lee

Born Barnstaple, Devon, June 10, 1798; died Hermon Station, Malmesbury, Cape Colony (South Africa), June 5, 1879

As a young man, Lee obtained a commission in the army and served in the Netherlands but was forced to resign owing to ill health. Having entered the Royal Academy schools in 1818 with the intention of becoming a landscape painter, he was elected an associate in 1834 and an academician in 1838. Between 1822 and 1870 he exhibited regularly in London, at the British Institution, the Royal Academy, and the Society of British Artists. Lee lived mostly in the family house at Pilton, on Barnstaple Bay. He specialized in views of the bucolic British countryside, especially his native Devon, sometimes working with the animal painter Thomas Sidney Cooper. As a lover of the sea and a lifelong yachtsman, Lee also painted the coasts of his native county and of Cornwall, France, Spain, and Italy. He sailed as far afield as the Baltic, Africa, and Australia and died abroad. John Ruskin rather touchingly described his style as “well-intentioned, simple, free from affectation or imitation, and evidently painted with constant reference to nature,” while Anthony M. Clark, when accepting General Garibaldi’s Residence at Caprera for the Museum, called it “a capital piece” by a “very fine Victorian artist.”
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125. General Garibaldi’s Residence at Caprera

Oil on canvas, 34 1/4 x 34 1/4 in. (85 x 85 cm) Signed and dated (lower right): F.R.Lee RA 1865 Inscribed (in black ink on label at top center of stretcher bar): N° 1 / General Garibaldi’s residence / at Caprera. looking across the straits / of Bonifacio. towards Corsica. Painted / from oil sketches done on the Island during / a visit to the General in the Autumn of 1864 / Fred. R Lee RA Gift of Dr. Melvin Goldberg, 1974 (74.159)

Ex coll.: Frederick Richard Lee, London (until at least 1869); Dr. and Mrs. Melvin Goldberg, Great Neck, New York (about 1941–74).

Selected Exhibitions: Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1865, no. 66 (as General Garibaldi’s residence at Caprera . . . ); Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1869, no. 199.


The Italian patriot Giuseppe Garibaldi, born near the border of Piedmont in Nice in 1807, joined the Sardinian navy and in 1834 attempted to incite his fellow sailors to seize the ship on which they served and occupy the arsenal of Genoa. When the plot was discovered, he was sentenced to death and fled to South America, where by 1846 his Italian legion had secured the independence of Montevideo. In Lombardy two years later he formed a volunteer army but was defeated by the forces of various foreign powers and fled abroad. In the midst of his career as a soldier and revolutionary, he returned once again to Italy and in 1854 bought property that comprises much if not all of the island of Caprera, off the northeast coast of Sicily. He stayed there for some five years and built a whitewashed stone house that he gradually enlarged and to which he often retired in the course of his long career. He died at Caprera on June 2, 1882.1

A figure of fascination to his contemporaries, Garibaldi was acclaimed as a popular
hero when he appeared in London in 1864. In the autumn, the general was staying at Caprera and Lee visited him there, making many sketches of his house in preparation for a painting to be shown at the Royal Academy in 1865. The artist sailed to the island aboard his yacht, *Kingfisher*, which he depicted in another work (location unknown) exhibited the same season. The present canvas must be the Royal Academy exhibit, as it is signed and dated 1865 and the academy catalogue describes it in the same terms as the artist’s label on the stretcher bar. Given the admiration in which the general was held, Lee must have imagined that such a subject would be well received, and though this view of Caprera seems to have remained on his hands for five years or more, eventually it became one of his best-known works. Restored at the Museum after it was acquired in 1974, the luminous landscape with its boxy buildings standing on a remote promontory among granite boulders and windswept growth is in very good state.

1. Garibaldi’s residence and property are maintained as a monument and national park by the Italian government.
2. According to Grant 1961, p. 690, Lee made two paintings of the house. The second one has not been traced, and its existence may have been predicated on the unlikely assumption that two different works were exhibited at the Royal Academy, one in 1865 and another in 1869.
Frederick Waters Watts married twice and with his first wife had five children. His second wife, Julia, who responded in 1911 to a request for information from the London dealers Leggatt Brothers, is the source of what little we know about him. His father is said to have been in the navy, while his mother was the daughter of a clergyman who was rector of Leverington, Isle of Ely. Confusion has arisen over whether, as seems likely, he is the William Watts who, according to the records of the Royal Academy schools, entered at seventeen in 1817 and won silver medals in 1819, 1820, and 1821. F. W. Watts was primarily a landscapist and followed Constable but was never his pupil. Between 1821 and 1860 he exhibited seventy-six paintings at the Royal Academy; he showed a like number at the British Institution between 1823 and 1862, and at the Society of British Artists between 1825 and 1836. Watts lived at various addresses in Hampstead throughout his professional life, painting and sketching there and at other locations in Middlesex, in the southern counties, and in Wales, Scotland, and the border regions. In 1826 he may have traveled to France. He ceased painting about 1860. According to his second wife, his notion of his own ability was modest.
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126. An Old Bridge at Hendon, Middlesex

Oil on canvas, 21¼ x 32¼ in. (53.5 x 82.2 cm)
Inscribed (on printed sticker on stretcher):
constable, john, r.a. (deceased) . . . London / View on the River Stour / From the collection of Lord Thurlow, purchased / and guaranteed by Th. Wallis, Esq., Pall Mall, London.
Gift of George A. Hearn, 1897 (97.41.3)
Ex coll.: Thomas John Howell-Thurlow-Cumming-Bruce, 5th Baron Thurlow, Ardglass Court, Colchester, Essex (sold to Wallis); [Wallis, London, as View on the River Stour by Constable]; George A. Hearn, New York (until 1897)
Selected Exhibition: Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1828, no. 54 (as An old bridge at Hendon, Middlesex by F. Watts)

Percy Moore Turner, writing in 1913, was the first to state that the painting is not by Constable; he gave it to William Watts. The Museum formally changed its attribution to Frederick Waters Watts in 1935.2 Graham Reynolds, in 1984, affirmed that the canvas is by F. W. Watts, a view now widely accepted, and identified the subject. Constable had made a drawing (fig. 179) of the same bridge, inscribing it “Hendon 8 Oct. 1820.”22 In the John G. Johnson Collection of the Philadelphia Museum of Art there is a painting (fig. 180) by the same hand as that in the Metropolitan Museum23 and of the same subject but from a more distant viewpoint, the two examples illustrating, in Reynolds’s words, “Constable’s assiduity in adopting subjects already chosen by Constable.” Fleming-Williams and Parris have published a third version (location unknown) that is also a more distant view but without the large tree in the left foreground of the Philadelphia picture.4

There is no way of knowing which, if any, of the three candidates was exhibited at the Royal Academy, though Fleming-Williams and Parris think it was most likely this work. Even if not, the canvas is an early one and may date to about 1828. It has been pointed out that F. W. Watts’s paintings from the 1820s and 1830s are more likely to be of named topographical subjects, whereas the later ones, broadly handled, are generically titled.5 The present picture, which is in very fine condition, is marked by the artist’s highly particularizing descriptive technique. The brickwork that is shown at the end of the old bridge in Constable’s 1820 drawing seems to have been shored up and squared off by 1828, so that, in all three Watts views, the end of the bridge is more nearly level with the span. The stumps of trees on the bank to the left and in the middle of the stream are visible in the paintings and the drawing as well. In each of the former, a man fords the stream in the background, whereas only in this one does Watts include a woman in a bonnet, apron, and shawl and a man in a straw hat with a hayfork or scythe over his right shoulder. There are also slight differences in the arrangement of the fencing in the right foreground.

1. C. H. Collins Baker, in a letter of 1933, was “still unable to say that the ‘Constable’ is not a Constable”; Robert Witt, verbally, in 1933, attributed it “absolutely” to F. W. Watts. In a letter of 1936, Collins Baker was forced to agree. Only Charles Cunningham, writing in 1939, took another view, suggesting the Constable collector and imitator James Orrick.
3. See Paintings from Europe and the Americas in the Philadelphia Museum of Art: A Concise Catalogue (Philadelphia, 1994), p. 28. Also by Frederick W. Watts, it was long given to William and titled Suffolk Landscape.
4. Fleming-Williams and Parris 1984, p. 208, pl. 120, as Hendon Bridge (“Bridge over the Stour”), 19 x 25 in. (45.7 x 63.5 cm), without details of ownership. According to a photo mount at the Witt Library, Courtauld Institute of Art, London, this variant was sold at Christie’s, New York, October 25, 1977, no. 241, ill.
Fig. 179. John Constable, *The Bridge at Hendon*, 1820. Graphite, 6\(\frac{1}{4}\) × 9\(\frac{3}{4}\) in. (16 × 23.5 cm). Victoria and Albert Museum, London (271-1888)

Fig. 180. Frederick Waters Watts, *The Old Bridge at Hendon, Middlesex*. Oil on canvas, 34\(\frac{1}{4}\) × 45\(\frac{5}{8}\) in. (87.6 × 115.9 cm). Philadelphia Museum of Art, John G. Johnson Collection, 1917 (874)
Richard Parkes Bonington

Born Arnold, near Nottingham, October 25, 1802; died London, September 23, 1828

Bonington, the son of a drawing master and purveyor of artists’ materials, spent his childhood in Nottingham. In 1817 Bonington Senior found himself in financial straits and moved with his wife and son to Calais, where he went into business. There the younger Bonington received instruction in watercolor painting from Louis Francia; when the family moved to Paris in 1818, he began assiduously to copy Dutch and Flemish works in the Louvre. Later he met Eugène Delacroix and entered the studio of Antoine-Jean Gros. In 1821 Bonington made his first sketching trip on the Seine, traveling through Rouen to Le Havre and the north coast, and in 1822 he exhibited two watercolors from that trip at the Paris Salon. He also embarked on a career as a lithographer and illustrator of antiquarian topographical subjects. In February 1824 he departed with Alexandre Colin for Dunkirk, and during a spring and summer of self-imposed exile there he developed his skills as a marine painter in oils. In August he sent paintings, watercolors, and a lithograph to the Salon, where A Fishmarket, near Boulogne (Yale Center for British Art, New Haven) was awarded a gold medal, and he suddenly found himself at the forefront of Romantic landscape painting.

Bonington spent the summer of 1825 in London, working from time to time with Delacroix and Eugène Isabey, visiting collectors of old master and modern paintings, and falling under the spell of Constable and Turner. He began sketching out of doors. He shared Delacroix’s studio for a while and expanded his repertory to include genre subjects. In February 1826 he exhibited for the first time in London, sending views of the French coast to the British Institution. Spring found him en route with Charles Rivet to Switzerland and Italy, where in Venice he made drawings and sketches that would provide material for his exhibits in 1827 and 1828 at the Salon, the British Institution, and the Royal Academy. That summer, perhaps in part from the strain of overwork, he collapsed and was found to have tuberculosis. He died before his twenty-sixth birthday.
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127. View near Rouen

Oil on millboard, 11 x 15 in. (27.9 x 33 cm)
Purchase, Gift of Joanne Toor Cummings, by exchange, 2002 (2002.45)

Ex coll.: the artist (until d. 1828); his estate, 1828–34; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, May 24, 1834, no. 139, as View of Rouen from the opposite side of the river, with blocks of stone under some trees on the quay, for £1010.0.0 to Normantont; Welbore Ellis Agar, 2nd Earl of Normanton, Sonemery, Ringwood, Hampshire (1834–d. 1868); Earls of Normanton, Somerley, Hampshire (1834–d. 1868); cat., 1884, no. 63, inv., 1848, no. 96, as A View among trees on the river at Rouen; Shaun James Christian Welbore Ellis Agar, 6th Earl of Normanton, Somerley (1867–2001; sold through Sayn-Wittgenstein to MMA).


Bonington’s early preference for marine views was never entirely abandoned. The two landscapes in this collection are atypical in their landlocked subjects, and View near Rouen is also unusual in being a sketch laid in before the motif with broad ribbons and daubs of color. While the English-born Bonington was trained in France, the impetus for painting out of doors seems to have come from Constable, whose work he first saw at the Paris Salon of 1824 and came to know better while visiting London and its environs the following summer. In the present study, which may date to the late summer or autumn of 1825, the view is as found, rather than as composed, and is thus more in accordance with English than with French practice.

Fig. 181. Richard Parkes Bonington, A Wooded Lane, ca. 1825. Oil on millboard, 11 x 9 in. (27.9 x 22.9 cm). Yale Center for British Art, New Haven, Paul Mellon Collection (1987.23.51)
Patrick Noon has pointed out that from this time on, Bonington chose the particular type of commercially available millboard used here for sketching en plein air.¹

In the catalogue of the artist’s 1834 estate sale, the picture is described as Rouen from the opposite side of the Seine, “with blocks of stone under some trees on the quay.” Absent this explanation, it would not have been easy to know exactly what is represented. Large blocks of dressed stone are lying about as if abandoned during a pause in, or at the end of, a construction project, perhaps the bridge in the background.² Rouen has shrunk to the size of a village and its topography is difficult to read, even though Bonington could be, when he wished, a superbly precise architectural draftsman. The figures by the river and the barrow or cart behind them are evidently part of the original design, while the man and woman crouching over a stone are painted on top of the ground and were perhaps added later. The fine, sharply angled branches of the trees and the thinly painted foliage, in which the brush has been lightly dragged over the surface, are closely paralleled in A Wooded Lane (fig. 181), of the same date.³ Malcolm Cormack suggested the influence of Constable in the latter work,
while Noon proposed that of Paul Huet. Despite the fact that this sketch is listed in Bonington’s estate sale, Pierre Miquel attributed it to Huet. However, in its originality, immediacy, and lightness and variety of touch, it is far beyond that artist’s capacity. View near Rouen has changed hands only once, is splendidly preserved, and retains its original frame.

2. According to François-Gabriel-Théodore Busset de Jolimont, Monuments les plus remarquables de la ville de Rouen (Paris, 1822), reverse of p. 39, a stone bridge had been under construction for some years at the time.

128. Roadside Halt

Oil on canvas, 18 1/4 x 14 7/8 in. (46.4 x 37.8 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): RPB. 18½6
Gift of Francis Neilson, 1945 (45.146.3)

Ex coll.: Louis-Joseph-Auguste Coutan, Paris (until d. 1830; his estate sale, Schroth, Paris, April 19, 1830, no. 5, as Paysage; sur le devant, une Paysanne sur un cheval blanc, et vue de dos, parle à un Vieillard assis sur un pièce de bois); private collection [Reitlinger], Paris (until 1838; sale, Sotheby’s, London, May 18, 1838, no. 84, postponed until June 15, 1838, no. 117); Samuel Archbutt (until 1839; his sale, Christie’s, London, April 13, 1839, no. 109, for £287.6, bought in); Joseph Gillott, Edgbaston, Birmingham (until d. 1872; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, April 26, 1872, no. 178, for £110 to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1872; sold to Mievillé]; Jean-Louis Mievillé, London (1872–99; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, April 29, 1899, no. 13, for £725 to Agnew); [Montaignac or ?Boussoil]; [William Permain, London; sold to Neilson]; Francis Neilson, Chicago (until 1943)


The uneventful nature of the subject is suggested by the descriptive title in the Coutan sale catalogue: “Landscape; in the foreground, a peasant woman on a white horse, and seen from behind, talks to an old man seated on a log.” A little girl accompanies him. The woman wears a traditional starched bonnet and a plaid shawl, and her overskirt is gathered up behind her.1 A cloaked figure approaches along a heavily wooded road. Sheep graze in a high, sunny meadow. The figures and costumes are delineated with care, and the handling, with the exception of the whites, is soft and finished. The bucolic scenery of Normandy is here reminiscent of the English countryside, and the design and tonal contrasts suggest the influence of Constable. Bonington’s Landscape with a Pond (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge) is similar in feeling. It is possible that both works reflect a renewal of interest on the artist’s part in Dutch seventeenth-century painting. Patrick Noon points out that Bonington used a dual-perspective system favored by Dutch painters as well as by J. M. W. Turner.

Coutan, a prescient collector, seems to have acquired Roadside Halt during Bonington’s lifetime. He also bought one of Constable’s most important large canvases, View on the Stour near Dedham (Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens, San Marino, California), exhibited at the Paris Salon of 1824 and also included in his 1830 estate sale.2 Roadside Halt was relined and somewhat strongly cleaned before it was acquired by the Museum.

1. For similar Norman costumes, see a Bonington watercolor, signed and dated 1835, illustrated in Noon 1991, p. 197, no. 83, colorpl.
Landseer was educated at home. As a small boy, he began to make animal studies, one of which won the silver palette from the Society of Artists in 1813. He became a pupil of Benjamin Robert Haydon in 1815, and under his direction studied figure painting and anatomy (he would later own Stubbs’s anatomical drawings of the horse). The following year he entered the Royal Academy schools. Landseer’s first major success came in 1818, when he exhibited Fighting Dogs Getting Wind (Musée du Louvre, Paris) at the Society of Painters in Oil and Water Colours. Although dubbed the English Snyders, he was rather more than one of England’s most gifted sporting artists: without betraying their natures, he was able to use animals to comment on complex social and historical issues. Landseer first visited Scotland in 1824, staying with John Murray, fourth Duke of Atholl, in the Highlands, and with Sir Walter Scott at Abbotsford. Thereafter he spent part of every year in Scotland, executing works for sporting aristocrats and sketching the landscape.

In 1826 Landseer was elected an associate of the Royal Academy, and in 1831 a full academicians. He leased a property near Regent’s Park, where he was to remain for the rest of his life. He never married but was admired by women and was sought after as both a guest and an artist because he was an accomplished storyteller and a fine caricaturist. In 1840 Landseer suffered a nervous breakdown from which he never fully recovered. His later technique in painting is broader, while his later subject matter is marked by the seriousness of high Victorian art. Much admired by Queen Victoria and Prince Albert, and knighted in 1850, he was then Britain’s most famous artist. His images circulated widely as engravings, and his painting of a stag, The Monarch of the Glen (private collection), which was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1851, became the most famous of all images of the Scottish Highlands. Although in his last years he was nearly overwhelmed by mental illness, Landseer retained his abilities as a painter almost until the end.

Selected References

129. Copy after Rubens’s “Wolf and Fox Hunt”

Oil on wood, 16 x 23/8 in. (40.6 x 60.6 cm)
Catharine Lorillard Wolfe Collection, Wolfe Fund, 1990 (1990.75)

Ex coll.: the artist (until d. 1873); his estate, 1873–74; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, May 8, 1874, no. 143, as The Wolf Hunt, after Rubens, from Lord Ashburnham’s picture, for 105 gns. to White; Louisa, Lady Ashburnham, Kent House, London (until d. 1903); her estate, 1903–5; her estate sale, Christie’s, London, July 8, 1905, no. 9, as A Wolf Hunt, for £94, 10.0 to Agnew for the Marquess of Northampton; William George Spencer Scott Compton, 5th Marquess of Northampton (1905–d. 1913); Lady Loch, Stoke College, Stoke-by-Clare, Suffolk (1913–d. 1970); George Henry Compton Loch, 3rd Baron Loch (1970–73; sold to Wood); [Christopher Wood, London, 1983; sold to McCormick]; Mr. and Mrs. Edmund J. McCormick, Norcross, Dobbs Ferry, New York (1983–his d. 1988); Suzanne (Mrs. Edmund J.) McCormick, Norcross (1988–90; McCormick Collection sale, Sotheby’s, New York, February 28, 1990, no. 135)


Apparently the precocious Landseer’s practice as a young man was to make copies after the old masters: his estate sale lists studies after Ter Borch, De Hooch, and Steen, as well as two after Rubens, that remained in his possession throughout his life. It seems likely that over the winter of 1824–25, Landseer copied Wolf and Fox Hunt (fig. 182), now attributed to Rubens with the participation of his workshop and belonging to the Metropolitan Museum. The dealer John Smith had brought the picture to England from Paris in 1824 and by 1830 sold it to Alexander Baring, later first Lord Ashburton. Landseer referred to this copy after Rubens when preparing his first major history piece, The Hunting of Chevy Chase (fig. 183), which he had in hand in July 1825 and exhibited at the Royal Academy the following year.

The moment was an important one in the artist’s career. During his first visit to Scotland, in September 1824, he was at Blair Atholl intending to make studies of deer. That summer or the next, the Duke of Atholl commissioned Death of the Stag in Glen Tilt (Blair Charitable Trust, Blair Castle) and the Duke of Bedford thereupon ordered The Hunting of Chevy Chase. While the former is an animal and signeural portrait of the sort that would become Landseer’s specialty, the latter was something highly unusual for the young artist, a romantic evocation of Scottish late medieval border history inspired by Sir Walter Scott. He depended much on the example of Rubens, whose work he had copied with bravado, and on a light touch combined with exacting accuracy of color and detail. Many motifs from Rubens’s picture, notably the rough types at the center and the figure in red at the extreme left, were filtered through into Landseer’s medieval Scottish hunt scene. Landseer’s many skills did not extend to capturing figures in motion, and his composition, like Rubens’s, is given life by the vicious snarling animals in the foreground.

Louisa Mackenzie was the daughter of a Scottish landowner who in 1858 became the second wife of William Baring, second Baron Ashburton, whose family owned the
Fig. 182. Peter Paul Rubens and workshop, *Wolf and Fox Hunt*, ca. 1615–21. Oil on canvas, 96 5/8 in. × 12 ft. 4 1/8 in. (245.4 × 376.2 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, John Stewart Kennedy Fund, 1910 (10.73)

Fig. 183. Sir Edwin Henry Landseer, *The Hunting of Chevy Chase*, 1825–26. Oil on canvas, 56 1/2 in. × 67 1/4 in. (143.5 × 170.8 cm). Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery (1952 P2)
Rubens. Louisa had been in love with Landseer and for the balance of his life remained an intimate friend. It is not surprising that as the dowager Lady Ashburton she would have wished to own Landseer’s panel, which might have been bought for her at the artist’s studio sale. At Lady Ashburton’s estate sale, in turn, the work was acquired for the Marquess of Northampton, her son-in-law, and descended to her granddaughter, thus remaining in the family for generations.

Edward Lear

Born London, May 12 (or 13), 1812; died San Remo, Italy, January 29, 1888

Lear, a writer as well as a landscape painter in watercolors and oils, is probably best known as the author of A Book of Nonsense (1846) and of the poem “The Owl and the Pussy-cat.” He was one of the youngest of a very large family living in London, where his father was a member of the Fruiterers’ Company. As a youth with hardly any formal education, Lear embarked upon an unofficial apprenticeship with an ornithologist. He began his career in earnest making drawings for forty-two lithographic plates for Illustrations of the Family of Psittacidae, or Parrots (1830–32) and was then taken up by Lord Stanley, who invited him to draw the birds and animals in the Derby family aviary and menagerie at Knowsley Hall. Thereafter Lear made a sharp change of course: intending to become a landscape painter, he departed for Rome, where for most of the decade from 1837 to 1848 he created an immense body of pencil and watercolor sketches. His work was popular. Queen Victoria herself was impressed by his second travel book, Illustrated Excursions in Italy (1846) and asked him to give her drawing lessons.

Having visited Greece, Turkey, Albania, and Egypt in 1848–49, Lear returned to London. In the 1850s his exhibited pieces met with success, and he developed his oil painting technique under the tutelage of Pre-Raphaelite painter William Holman Hunt. However, his watercolors from the 1860s, based on earlier sketches, lacked spontaneity and were not well received. He had continued to travel, though less frequently, and toured the Near East in 1858, the Ionian Islands in 1865, India in 1873–75. He built a house in San Remo, into which he moved in 1871 and in which he died. His surviving works number in the ten thousands.
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130. Catania and Mount Etna

Oil on board, 12¼ x 9 in. (31.1 x 48.3 cm)
Dated and inscribed: (lower right, in sepia) Catania / 16 June / 1847; (lower left, in pencil) This was done on a thorough / Scirocco day & may therefore / make all the colors infinitely / brighter Etna bluer—sky warmer, / lava distant pinker—near browner / & Asphaltume.—
Rogers Fund, 1961 (61.233)

Ex coll.: Miss Kirkpatrick Caldecott, Sussex (until 1961; sold to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1961; sold to MMA]


The peripatetic Lear spent the winter of 1846–47 in Rome. In April he left for the south and by May 11 had reached Palermo, where he and his friend John Proby prepared for their tour of Sicily, which Lear had first seen in 1842. On May 20 the two were at Sciacca (fig. 184), and by May 29 they were visiting the ancient ruins at Agrigento. Working there, Lear inscribed a watercolor (Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts) and made an oil sketch (fig. 185), a view of the temple of Hera Lacinia from the northwest. They were in Syracuse from at least June 8 to 12, when Lear dated a watercolor (Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool) showing the stone quarries. He inscribed the present small painting of Mount Etna and Catania on June 16, 1847. The following evening, he wrote of his ascent to the cone of the volcano:

At midnight we started on mules & with a light & after two hours climbing reached the snow, beyond which it is necessary to go on foot. Here the trouble begins; fancy two hours of climbing up & slipping down, over the steepest hill of frozen snow. . . . Then we crossed a plain of snow which surrounds the cone, & began to climb that, an operation as difficult as the last, as it is nearly perpendicular, & made of fine ash & sulphur, into
Fig. 184. Edward Lear, *View of Sciacca in Sicily, May 20, 1847*. Pen and brown ink over graphite, 14 × 19⅞ in. (35.4 × 50.6 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Elisha Whittelsey Collection, The Elisha Whittelsey Fund, 1965 (65.214)

Fig. 185. Edward Lear, *Agrigento*, 1847. Oil on board, 13½ × 19¼ in. (34.3 × 50.2 cm). Houghton Library, Harvard College Library, Department of Printing and Graphic Arts (8TvD8805.153.474)
which you plunge up to your knees at each step... One is amply repaid by the extraordinary scene above—where you look on the whole island of Sicily just like a great pink map in the sky—with the sea round it so blue, & the dark purple triangular shade of the mountains over that part furthest from the sun which rose just before we got to the mouth of the crater.

Catania was the starting point for visits to Etna, the highest mountain in Italy and the highest volcano in Europe, and Lear was nothing if not disciplined and determined when on the road. He habitually rose at dawn, rested in the middle of the day and traveled into the evening, ate badly, and stayed in inadequate accommodations, working all the while and writing in his journals. Ultimately, the climb up the volcano must have been a moment of joy and satisfaction.

It seems probable that the present sketch, with slight indications of the principal contours in pencil, was begun on the road from Syracuse to Catania, from which Lear looked north over the unforgiving lava fields toward Etna, rising miragelike behind the town against the summer sky. His inscription supports the notion that it was completed in the course of a single day. The cone of the maive mountain is incircled by a delicate collar of snow, while the lowland is described with long strokes. The mounds of bituminous rock in the foreground are heavily impasted, practically sculpted, in varying tones of dark slate gray and brown. The priming of the canvas has not been completely covered. The image and the artist's notes describe the sort of punishingly hot, humid weather in which color is intensified by strong light. A related drawing (fig. 186) of Catania and the volcano is dated June 18. Lear was still in Sicily on June 27, 1847, when he inscribed a study of trees beside the sea at Taormina.

George Frederic Watts
Born London, February 23, 1817; died London, July 1, 1904

In 1827 Watts began working in the studio of the sculptor William Behnes, but, as he himself relates, the primary object of his interest was the Elgin Marbles. The example of Behnes, who was also an accomplished draftsman and portraitist, and of Behnes's younger brother Charles, a miniaturist, led Watts to take up small-scale portraiture in oils. In 1837 he first exhibited at the Royal Academy. Watts aspired to history painting and, having won a prize for a lifesize cartoon that he submitted to a competition sponsored by the Royal Commission of the Fine Arts in 1843, he went to Italy to study fresco technique. In Florence, the British minister, Henry Fox, fourth Lord Holland, and his wife, Augusta, befriended him. Watts painted portraits and historical subjects and traveled in Italy until 1847, when he returned to London to submit Alfred Initiation the Saxons (Houses of Parliament) to another Fine Arts Commission competition and won a major prize. In 1850 Thoby Prinsep and his wife, Sara, an ardent admirer of Watts, rented Little Holland House, and Watts moved in as their semipermanent guest. He visited Venice and Padua in 1853, wintered in Paris in 1855–56, and traveled to Turkey and Greece.

Watts decorated the dining room of Little Holland House and a town house at 7 Carlton House Terrace in the early 1850s, and in 1859 completed a mural for the Great Hall at Lincoln's Inn. In 1867 he was elected an associate and a full member of the Royal Academy and began to enjoy ever increasing success. A Watts retrospective at the Grosvenor Gallery in 1881–82 was the first such exhibition devoted to the oeuvre of a living artist. In 1884 he showed his work in New York. After a failed marriage in 1864–65, the artist married Mary Seton Fraser-Tytler in 1886. The couple acquired property at Compton, near Guildford, Surrey, and built a house called Limnerslease. Watts made gifts of his paintings to the nation and in old age built a gallery for his work at Compton that was open to the public.
131. Ariadne

Oil on canvas, 24 × 20 in. (61 × 50.8 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): G. F. Watts / 1894
Rogers Fund, 1905 (05.39.1)

Ex coll.: J. F. Haworth; [Dowdeswell & Dowdeswell, London, until 1903; sold to MMA]


Here Ariadne, daughter of King Minos, finds herself abandoned by the Athenian Theseus. She holds the ball of red wool that she had given him to guide him out of the Minotaur’s labyrinth: the moment depicted is one of solitude, desertion, and longing for the past. A satyr and a panther play in the right foreground.

This was a popular subject with G. F. Watts, who painted no less than five Ariadnes. One of the two horizontals (fig. 187) is signed and dated 1875, and the other (Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool) was first exhibited at the Metropolitan Museum in November 1884. One of the three uprights, the painting shown in 1865 (private collection, England) is the earliest and was the first classical subject Watts sent to the Royal Academy. A second large version (fig. 188), assigned by the artist’s wife, Mary, to 1888, is signed and dated 1890. The third is the present work, of which Mrs. Watts wrote in her unpublished manuscript: “On this canvas it seems likely that Mr. Watts made his first sketch of this subject. It was certainly taken up again and completed by him during 1893–4.” Watts frequently worked up a canvas, set it aside or even exhibited it, and then reworked it. Even if this is the case with the Museum’s Ariadne, as Mary Watts, writing forty years later, suggested, the painting is essentially a work of the 1890s, bright in color, less nostalgic, and not so much influenced by the Elgin Marbles as the various earlier versions. It is in notably good state, with one major pentiment: the white drapery originally covered the right breast and shoulder of the figure.

The English artist and critic Roger Fry was this Museum’s curator of paintings in 1906 and until 1909 served as the Museum’s adviser in Europe. In 1905, already acting on the Museum’s behalf, he was visiting dealers and collectors and recommended the purchase of Watts’s Ariadne, then on offer from Dowdeswell. Fry wrote on December 1 to the director, Purdon Clarke, that Watts is a very unequal painter whose works rarely come into the market. I consider the Ariadne to be one of his very finest works and in writing on Watts some time ago in the Quarterly Review mentioned this as one of a few masterpieces on which his fame [must] ultimately rest. It would therefore be a great
stroke of good fortune to be able to secure it for the Museum. Watts repeated the subject more than once and always successfully.4

In fact, the letter represents a sleight of hand on Fry’s part, as the Ariadne he named in the April Quarterly Review is the important horizontal composition now belonging to the Guildhall (see fig. 187), which was in the Watts retrospective at the Royal Academy from January 1905. Fry’s article was a defense of Watts, and it is not surprising, given that there were funds at the Museum for contemporary painting, that he would have bought this work for the city in which, twenty years before, the artist had enjoyed such an enormous success.

The frame is original and of the same design as that on Leighton’s Lucia (no. 133).

1. The Exhibition of the Royal Academy of Arts, exh. cat. (London, 1863), no. 133, as Ariadne.
3. From an account of expenses claimed by Fry for the years 1905–6, in the Museum’s archives.

William Powell Frith

Born Aldfield, near Ripon, Yorkshire, January 9, 1819; died London, November 2, 1909

Thomas Frith and Jane Powell, the artist’s parents, married in 1814 and in 1819 were house servants on a great estate, Studley Royal, near Ripon. Their son was born in the adjoining village. Later the family moved to Harrogate. William attended school, began to draw and copy, and in 1835 entered Henry Sass’s academy in Bloomsbury, London. In 1837 he was admitted to the Royal Academy schools, but he had little interest in the antique, perspective, or drawing from the nude model. That year Frith’s father died, and his mother moved with his brother and sister to a house near Regent’s Park. He joined them there, set up a studio, and began selling his work.

At the British Institution he exhibited a genre scene in 1839, a portrait in 1839, and in 1840, Othello and Desdemona (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge). He sent his first exhibit to the Royal Academy in 1840. Meanwhile, he joined other young painters to form a group called the Clique, whose members sought to respond to the growing public taste for literary and historical subjects.

Frith read avidly, favoring Dickens, who was a personal friend, as well as earlier writers such as Goldsmith and Sterne. His preferred subjects were drawn from contemporary life, and as he painted with a sharp eye for detail, his work was well suited to engraving. He was admitted as an associate of the academy in 1845 and in 1852 became an academicians. Two years later he completed Life at the Seaside (Ramsgate Sands) (Royal Collection), the first of the immense, multifigured panoramas that brought him fame. Derby Day (Tate, London) was exhibited to acclaim at the Royal Academy in 1858, while the third of his most important works was The Railway Station (Royal Holloway College, University of London), completed in 1862. The painter’s life thereafter followed a predictably successful, much honored course. Frith fathered twelve children by his wife and seven by his mistress, and he was thus obliged to paint and write into old age, supporting them all.
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132. The Two Central Figures in “Derby Day”

Oil on canvas, 187/8 × 12 5/8 in. (47 × 31.8 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): W.P. Frith 1878
Gift of Mrs. Charles Wrightsman, 2008 (2008.547.3)


The present small painting relates to Derby Day (Tate, London), and the best source of information about that enormous and climactic work of Frith’s midcareer is the artist himself. According to his Autobiography and Reminiscences, his inaugural visit to the course at Epsom was for the 1876 running of the Derby. His reaction was this: “My first Derby had no interest for me as a race, but as giving me the opportunity of studying life and character, it is ever to be gratefully remembered.” He mentioned the horses and jockeys only in passing, but listed the various con games on offer (notably thimberleg), in which he took a lively part, and also described acrobats, black minstrels, gypsy fortune-tellers, and pretty women. All these types feature in the finished work. Frith did not sketch while at Epsom, but between May 21 and 24 he set down in a charcoal drawing (location unknown) his plan for the composition and principal figures. After reportedly completing many studies from the model, he took a summer holiday at Folkestone, where he prepared “a small careful oil-sketch—with colour and effect finally planned” (location unknown). Upon seeing the first oil sketch, Frith’s friend Jacob Bell commissioned the six-foot picture now at the Tate and agreed to pay fifteen hundred pounds for it, while the artist, who retained the copyright for an engraving, sold this to the dealer Gambart for a like sum. Frith then made what he described as a larger sketch (Bethnal Green Museum of Childhood, London), which shows the middle third of the final panorama and demonstrates that the poses of the central couple in the work at Tate and in the Wrightsman picture were already fixed. In the Bethnal Green sketch, though, the lady wears a simple round hat of a solid color with a single dark bow.

According to Frith, the work of painting the Tate picture was begun on February 9, 1877, and completed in fifteen months, which must have been just before the May 2, 1878, opening of the Royal Academy show. Meanwhile, many more models of all social classes
and types were engaged to sit, and when, for example, the artist failed to capture the qualities of a model for the young woman shown here, he dismissed her and instead substituted “one of my own daughters.” Unfortunately the identity of her companion has not been recorded. However, the outstanding question is: what did Frith’s studies from models look like and can this be one? There are two possible answers: either the Wrightsman painting was begun in 1857 as a study and completed with the addition of the landscape in 1860, when the signature and date were added, or it was painted from the Tate canvas in 1860, before that work embarked on a four-and-a-half-year world tour that ended only in 1865. The latter hypothesis is the more likely. The only real difference between the couple in the big picture and the one here is that the purse held by the lady in Derby Day has been transformed into a pen and a notebook. The finish of the figures in the small work is unusually tight, but not unknown for Frith, and he probably had a studio assistant to help him with landscape backgrounds.

A review of the literature reveals only two single-figure studies for Derby Day: a rather slight pencil drawing of an adult male acrobat (British Museum, London) that was employed for the acrobat near the center of the Tate painting and an unfinished head of an elegant woman (fig. 189). In the latter, as one might expect, the face is carefully described, while the pose, hat, and other details are loosely indicated. By contrast, Frith made various finished pictures for the market of the type catalogued here.

1. See Frith 1887–88, vol. 1 (1887), pp. 268–303, for the complete account. I have also depended on Elizabeth E. Barker in The Wrightsman Pictures, ed. Everett Fahy (New York, 2005), pp. 381–86, who illustrates the painting, the replica at Manchester, the sketch at Bethnal Green, and the engraving as figs. 1–4. Another sketch is at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, according to Wood 2006, p. 58.
3. Ibid., p. 273.
4. Ibid., pp. 274, 183–84.
5. Ibid., p. 281.

Dante Gabriel Rossetti

Born London, May 12, 1828; died Birchingtonon-Sea, Kent, April 9, 1882

Rossetti’s Neapolitan father was a language teacher and a student of Dante’s Divine Comedy; his mother was also of Italian descent. Baptized Gabriel Charles Dante Rossetti, the artist changed his name to Dante Gabriel in 1849. He attended King’s College School from 1837 through 1841, and then enrolled in Henry Sass’s drawing academy. He was accepted by the Royal Academy in 1845, but in 1847, unable to tolerate its disciplines, he applied to Ford Madox Brown for private training. Rossetti read widely in English and Italian, became increasingly interested in Christian imagery, and began to write poetry and to translate Dante. In 1848 or 1849, with his brother William, J. E. Millais, William Holman Hunt, and several others, he founded the short-lived Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, whose members were determined to combat academicism and bring new life to English painting through renewed study of the work of their forebears and of nature. He and Holman Hunt traveled together in northern Europe in search of inspiration.

In 1850 Rossetti met Elizabeth Siddal, whom he married in 1860 and who died a year later, after delivering a stillborn child. He moved to Cheyne Walk, where he entertained various artists and writers, and where from 1862 he was looked after by, and enjoyed a sometimes intimate relationship with, the model Fanny Cornforth. He rarely exhibited but developed a circle of patrons for the exotic studies of women in which he increasingly specialized. He also began to drink heavily and suffered from insomnia and diminished eyesight. In 1865 Rossetti photographed and drew William Morris’s wife, Jane, with whom, by 1868, he probably shared an illicit relationship. His Poems were published in 1870, and when his literary work was attacked the next year as obscene, he had a breakdown and attempted suicide. While Rossetti experienced great success as a painter in the mid-1870s, he never completely recovered his health, and after a stroke in December 1881, he died on Easter Day 1882.
On April 8, 1882, the day before he died, Rossetti wrote a will in which he bequeathed to Jane Burden Morris "three of the largest and best of the chalk drawings for the subjects of which she sat that are now hanging in my studio at Cheyne Walk Chelsea aforesaid to be selected by her [and] also the profile head of her in chalk now hanging over the mantelpiece in the studio." While the present drawing belonged in 1882 to Aglaia Coronio, and is therefore unlikely to have been among those to which the artist referred, Rossetti's bequest suggests the degree of his attachment to its subject. His principal models were Elizabeth Siddal, his wife, who died in 1861; Fannie Cornforth, who first sat for him in or a little before 1858 and in 1863 became his mistress and housekeeper, and Jane Burden, whom he, Edward Burne-Jones, and William Morris met in 1857, and whom Morris married in 1859. Rossetti's relationship with Janey, as he called her, became the most important of his life, and his drawings and paintings of her are a vivid, looming presence that is archetypal for his later work.

Rossetti's earliest dated image of the seventeen-year-old Jane (Society of Antiquaries, Kelmscott Manor), a study in pencil of her head inscribed "Oxford" and "October 1859," shows a young woman with an angular face, a long nose, and a penetrating glance whose hair is parted in the center and pulled back in tight waves. A drawing made in Oxford the following year first shows her in three-quarter length, her hands resting in her lap (fig. 190). In 1860, on a visit to the Morrices in Kent, Rossetti drew her head, focusing also on her abundant mass of dark hair (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge), and he made many other drawings in 1865, the year the couple moved to Queen's Square, Bloomsbury. Rossetti's first painting of Jane in oils, entitled The Blue Silk Dress (fig. 191), is also a three-quarter-length, inscribed with her name and signed and dated 1868. It may mark the beginning of the period of intense involvement between the two, which lasted intermittently until about 1875. When William Graham, an important patron, saw it and asked Rossetti for a replica, the artist instead painted Jane in Shakespearean guise, calling the work, which he monogrammed and dated 1870, Mariana (fig. 192). At the upper right he introduced a musician who is usually described as a page and who, according to the artist's papers, represents Graham's son Willie. The boy's song begins with the words painted on the original frame, "Take, O, take those lips away," and the picture alludes to the opening of the fourth act of Measure for Measure.

It could be argued that Rossetti began work on both The Blue Silk Dress and Mariana in 1865, as the seeds for both may be found in photographs taken that year (fig. 193). His 1868 drawing of Jane seated in a wicker chair (fig. 194), her hands resting in her lap, a chest of drawers holding a bouquet of roses in a glass vase beside her, is best described as a portrait. Her dress, a modern costume with wide sleeves and a pleated bodice gathered loosely at the waist, is similar to the one she had worn in the photographs. Her gaze is directed outward. Her hair is relatively short and more conventionally arranged than in the two paintings. The Museum's drawing, also dated 1868, may be the later of the two: Jane's expression is contemplative and unfocused, her hair is wrapped in a scarf or snood, and a scarf knotted at one end has been draped at the neck. The vase of flowers, now standing on a shelf, is arranged in a less lifelike, decorative pattern. She sits on a chair or bench that might be construed as medieval. In her hands, which are separated one from the other, is a branch of sycamore. Were it not for the date, one might have thought the drawing as late as or later than Mariana, of 1870, in which Jane's hands are similarly placed, though engaged in embroidery. She wears a dress of more or less the same design, with a figured scarf at the neckline. Rossetti sometimes put his paintings aside in an incomplete state for long periods, and it is entirely possible that he started Mariana in 1868 and finished it two years later.

Rossetti kept the portrait drawing he had made of Jane in 1858 (see fig. 190). She was dressed formally and looked as young, thin,
and uncertain as she must have been. In this early sheet he had already focused on her heavy, dark hair and lashes and her deep-set eyes, as well as on the long, curving lines of her neck and jaw. The fact that eleven years later he employed the same angle for her face, the uneven, sloping shoulders, and the placement of her hands one within the other suggests the degree of his obsessive interest and attachment. In the later works Jane is mature, with a softer face and a new lassitude of manner; yet her hands, with their long fingers and prominent knuckles, are unchanged. In the compressed pictorial spaces she is a more dominant presence than before. As their relationship was intimate, Rossetti masked his paintings of her under various allegorical guises, distancing himself and screening her from his patrons and the public. Curiously, his images of Jane travel a course opposite in intensity to the evolution of their relationship.

Rossetti manipulated the colors artfully, using stumping, particularly in the still life, direct application of the point of the crayon, and some reductive techniques, and revealing minute areas of the tan paper. The composition is adapted to the four joined sheets. The simple frame and the fitted board mat and backing are probably original.


2. See William Sharp, Dante Gabriel Rossetti: A Record and a Study (London, 1885), Appendix, no. 185. Surtees 1971, vol. 1, p. 122, states that the sheet belonged first to the sitter, but there is no other evidence to this effect. Thanks to Virginia Surtees for her help.

3. For Rossetti’s association with Jane, see, among many other sources, William Michael Rossetti, “Memoir of Dante Gabriel Rossetti,” in Dante Gabriel Rossetti: His Family-Letters (London, 1893), vol. 3, pp. 244-45; Dante Gabriel Rossetti and Jane Morris: Their Correspondence, ed. John Bryson, with Janet Camp Troxell (Oxford, 1976); and Frank C.
Sir John Everett Millais, First Baronet

Born Southampton, June 8, 1829; died London, August 13, 1896

J. E. Millais’s parents settled in London in 1838 so that he could receive professional training in the arts, and in 1840 the eleven-year-old boy transferred from a private drawing academy to the Royal Academy schools, thus becoming the youngest student ever admitted. He won a prize from the academy for a drawing after the antique in 1843 and in 1846 began to exhibit regularly. However, together with William Holman Hunt, Millais soon rejected the Raphaelæan classicism propounded in academic circles in favor of a literal approach to painting based on close observation. In 1848 the two friends joined with Dante Gabriel Rossetti and several others to form the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. Millais began to explore the possibilities of the new style and in 1850 at the Royal Academy exhibited Christ in the Carpenter’s Shop (Tate, London), a work that to the artist was more honest than traditional interpretations, but to the critics was so realistic that they accused him of blasphemy. He exhibited Ophelia (Tate, London) in 1852 and, as his popularity grew, was elected an associate of the Royal Academy in 1853. That summer, Millais traveled with John Ruskin and his wife, Effie, to Scotland, where he fell in love with Effie, whose marriage was annulled in 1854 and who married him the next year.

Millais’s paintings were published as engravings, his work was handled by the major dealers of the day, and in 1863 he was elected an academician. He sought out the old masters, as well as eighteenth-century English painting, and developed a revival style that was an important element in the burgeoning Aesthetic movement. A sportsman who spent part of every year in Scotland, he also became a landscape painter. In the 1870s Millais had enormous success with child subjects and became the portraitist of the leading figures of the Victorian age. Gladstone created him a baronet in 1885, and in 1896 he was elected president of the Royal Academy in succession to Leighton. He died wealthy and honored, but his reputation did not long survive him.
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134. Portia

Oil on canvas, 49 1/4 x 33 in. (125.1 x 83.8 cm)
Signed and dated (lower right): JEM [monogram] / 1886
Catharine Lorillard Wolfe Collection, Wolfe Fund, 1906 (66.1228)

Ex coll.: [? Thomas McLean, London, from 1886]; James Staats Forbes, London (by 1889–d. 1904; his estate, 1904–5; sold through Grafton Galleries for £1,200 to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1905–6; sold to MMA]


In December 1885 Rupert Potter, the father of Beatrix, photographed his friend Millais in tweeds and cap, seated before a fire in his London studio, reading the paper (fig. 195).1 Two paintings in an unfinished state appear in Potter’s photograph: the so-called Study of a Girl in Greek Dress and Bubbles (private collection), a portrait of Millais’s four-year-old grandson, Willie James, which the artist had undertaken for his own pleasure. Bubbles, completed in 1886, was acquired not long thereafter by Pears soap and used for advertising purposes, becoming one of the best-known (some would say most debased) images in, and of, Victorian England.

In his biography of his father, J. G. Millais reproduced the only other photograph of the incomplete and for long unlocated Study of a Girl in Greek Dress (fig. 196). It appeared opposite text relating to the year 1885, in which the author described how the artist came to hire a Miss Dolan as the model for “one of Shakespeare’s heroines that he intended to paint.” Several pages on, J. G. Millais illustrated a striking sketch of a head, evidently the same person but in a different costume (fig. 197), titling it, with reference to the heroine of The Merchant of Venice, “Head of Portia.”2 The confusion arising from the existence of the three disparate photographs was finally put to rest in 1977, when Malcolm Warner proposed that they must all represent earlier stages of the Metropolitan Museum’s picture, indications...
of which would likely be revealed by an X-radiograph.\(^3\) This proved to be the case (fig. 198).

It had been suggested in the November 6, 1886, issue of the Athenaeum that Portia had been "mainly studied from" the American actress Mary Anderson, who, however, as Lucy Oakley pointed out, was touring in the United States from September 1885 until June 1886, during most of the period when the picture was painted. Anderson never played Portia, but she had acted in various roles that called for classical costume (fig. 199) of the sort depicted in the earlier stages of the picture. On August 2, 1886, Ronald Sutherland Gower had called on Millais in his studio and had seen Portia "in Ellen Terry's red dress in that part, but not a portrait of that actress."\(^4\) That this information is correct is confirmed by any number of images of Terry as Portia, for example, G. W. Baldry's 1883 portrait (fig. 200). If, as has been claimed, the picture represented Anderson, Terry, or one of Millais's daughters, doubtless the artist or J. G. Millais would have said so, which leaves us with the fact that the latter instead mentioned a model, a Miss Dolan. The young woman reportedly sat for Leighton as well, and later for Burne-Jones (fig. 201). Her first name is recorded elsewhere as Kate.

Portia is splendid in the lawyer's robes of Shakespeare's role. Millais shows a woman of commanding stature. The velvety, sonorous shades of red and persimmon impart warmth and intimacy, while the verticals provided by the costume contribute to the gravity of her presence. However, as Oakley observed, the fact that the artist "could transform the Girl in Greek Dress into Portia merely by changing her clothes underlines his fundamental lack of interest in the narrative possibilities of the subjects."\(^5\)

2. According to Oakley, "Millais's Portia," p. 188, a print of the photograph of the head that belongs to a descendant of the artist is inscribed on the reverse of the mount "R.P. December 6, 1885."
4. Terry wrote to Millais on March 30, 1886, lending one of her costumes. There are letters confirming that she was not the sitter from her nephew, Augustin Rischgitz, in 1916, and from her niece, Mabel Terry Lewis, in 1927.
Frederic Lord Leighton  

**Born Scarborough, Yorkshire, December 3, 1830; died London, January 25, 1896**

From the age of eight or nine, Leighton traveled widely with his family in Europe. He was briefly at the academy schools of Berlin (1842–43) and Florence (1845–46); in Frankfurt he entered the Städelisches Kunstinstitut in 1846, and from 1850 to 1852 studied painting there intermittently with a leading Nazarene artist, Edward von Steinle. Thereafter Leighton moved to Rome, where in 1853 he painted *Cimabue’s Celebrated Madonna Carried in Procession through the Streets of Florence* (Royal Collection), a huge canvas that was shown at the Royal Academy to high praise and bought by Queen Victoria. To complete his education, he settled in Paris, where he visited artists’ studios and absorbed the tenets of Neoclassicism before traveling to Italy and returning to London in 1859. While at first the Royal Academy afforded Leighton an unfriendly reception, he was championed by John Ruskin and made the acquaintance of members of the Pre-Raphaelite circle. Leighton’s Continental travels had exposed him not only to the Venetian School, but also to Raphael and to the antique; he was interested in wall painting on a grand scale and kept a cast of the Parthenon frieze in his London studio.

Leighton developed an elegant, nostalgic academic style that owed much to his abilities as a drapery painter. In 1864 his academy exhibits found favor, and he was elected an associate that year and a full member in 1868. He continued to travel, making sketching trips to Italy, Spain, Greece, and North Africa. Elected president of the Royal Academy in 1878 by a large majority, he became Victorian painting’s spokesman and figurehead. He was raised to the peerage as Lord Leighton of Stretton. Austere, solitary, and increasingly melancholy, Leighton represented the end of an era and left no pupils or followers.
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**135. Lucia**

Oil on canvas, 14 1/8 x 10 in. (37.8 x 25.4 cm)  
Catharine Lorillard Wolfe Collection, Bequest of Catharine Lorillard Wolfe, 1887 (87.15.79)

Ex coll.: A. B. Stewart, Rawcliffe Lodge, Glasgow (until 1881; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, May 7, 1881, no. 91, as Lucia, for £250 to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1887; sold to Wolfe]; John Wolfe, New York (from 1881); Catharine Lorillard Wolfe, New York (until d. 1887)


Leighton painted many head-and-shoulders studies of this approximate size and type, and in 1881 A. B. Stewart sold, in addition to *Lucia*, two others, called *Teresa* and *Lily* (fig. 202).1 The latter shows a young woman seen from behind with her face in profile to the right, wearing a chemise draped with a shawl. Her red hair is elaborately braided and coiled. *Lucia* and *Lily* have frames of the same style, and perhaps the three works were originally installed as a group. While *Lucia* must be the original title of the present work, there is not enough evidence to assume that the young woman who sat for the picture was Italian, that Lucia was really her name, or that, as the Ormonds have suggested, she was painted in 1874.2 Titles of the kind

Fig. 202. Frederic Lord Leighton, *Lily*. Oil on canvas, 13 1/4 x 10 1/8 in. (34.9 x 27.6 cm). Richard Green Gallery, London

Fig. 203. Frederic Lord Leighton, *Rubinella*. Oil on canvas, 24 x 19 in. (61 x 48.3 cm). Location unknown
could also be construed simply as romantic or could have been intended to suggest that the young women were models, not portrait sitters. A similar half-length figure, in the same pose as Lucia and with the same sort of costume, was exhibited under the title Rubínel (fig. 203) at the Grosvenor Gallery, London, in 1880. 3 The pose was one of the artist’s favorites, and he used it when Dorothy Dene modeled in the early 1880s for Antigone (private collection). 4 Lucia may date from the late 1870s, and Stewart was probably its original owner.

The picture was surface-cleaned for the first time since it came into the Museum (almost certainly for the first time ever) in 2007. 5 One or two minor scratches along the edges of the canvas were inpainted. The stencil on the reverse (fig. 204) indicates that Leighton bought the prepared, stretched canvas from the supplier Roberson. Two pieces of commercially primed canvas were fixed to the stretcher with the primed surfaces facing out, which, it was thought, would offer protection from industrial pollution. The rather crudely made frame is evidently the original.

1. *Teresa* (no. 92, 1.5/12 x 10.5/12 in.) sold for 260 gns. to Agnew, and *Lily* (no. 93, 1.5/12 x 11 in.) went for half as much, 130 gns. The subsequent history of *Lily* is: (sale, Christie’s, London, November 22, 1968, no. 109, for 150 gns. to Douglas); [Old Hall Gallery, Iden, Rye, until 1969, sold to Capozello]; Thomas N. Capozello, New York (from 1969; sold to Green); [Richard Green, London, by 2008]. *Teresa* has not been traced.

2. L. Ormond and R. Ormond 1975, p. 161, no. 228, pp. 174–75, observed that “the name of this Roman model occurs in a [Leighton] notebook of 1874 (Royal Academy, XI).” They mention untraced studies of models named—Anita, Corona, Dorothea, Faith, Janita, Leandra, Sheleh, Teresa—that need not be indicative of nationality.


5. Thanks to conservator DorothyMahon for treating the picture on short notice, for her advice, and for the photograph of the reverse.

---

Fig. 204. Frederic Lord Leighton, *Lucia* (no. 135), reverse

136. *Lachrymae*

Oil on canvas, 62 x 24 1/4 in. (157.5 x 62.9 cm)

Catharine Lorillard Wolfe Collection, Wolfe Fund, 1896 (66.28)

*Ex coll.*: [Tooth, London, until 1896; sold to MMA]


Leighton’s title, the Latin for “tears,” indicates that this figure draped in Victorian mourning black personifies grief. 6 On March 2, 1895, the *Athenæum* announced that the canvas was ready for exhibition and suggested how the artist intended it to be understood:

*[Lachrymae] is the present title of a [large] picture, which may be taken as a type of stately grief, and represents a noble Greek maiden near a pedestal. . . . which supports a funeral urn entwined with ivy. . . . She has brought a cup for libation . . . and a withered wreath lies near her feet. The background, to be in keeping with the sentiment of the figure and its coloration, comprises a large group of the ruddy stems of tall cypresses, between the gloomy foliage of which is seen the mournful glare of sunset.*

The picture was well received at the Royal Academy in May, although the *Athenæum*’s reviewer amended his earlier remarks, describing it as animated by a sentimental rather than a pathetic motive. The commentator for the *Times* aptly characterized the canvas as “a Greek girl . . . leaning in desolation against a funeral column, like some milder Electra at the tomb of Agamemnon.”

A compositional study in chalks (fig. 205) and preliminary drawings for the head of the figure and for the drapery around the column are at Leighton House in Holland Park; there is also a drawing of a gnarled cypress tree beside a cistern (fig. 206) that Leighton made in Florence in 1854 and used here for reference. 7 The Royal Academy holds a linear sketch of the whole that has been squared for transfer. 8 A drawing for the drapery of the grieving figure belonged to the artist when it was published in 1895, 9 but it is not among the six hundred or more sheets now at Leighton House, and its location is unknown. Both overall designs show a stress on the verticals as pronounced as in the final painting.

Leighton, traditionally educated, was familiar with the art and literature of antiquity. On various occasions he used Greek vases as props, and classical scholar Ian
Fig. 205. Frederic Lord Leighton, *Study for *“Lachrymae”: Composition*, ca. 1894. Black and white chalk on gray-brown paper, 8 3/8 x 4 3/4 in. (21.2 x 10.8 cm). Leighton House Museum, The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Fig. 206. Frederic Lord Leighton, *Study of a Cypress Tree, Florence*, 1854. Graphite, watercolor, and body color on buff paper, 16 x 10 1/2 in. (40.8 x 26.6 cm). Leighton House Museum, The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
Jenkins has identified three vase types in *Lacrymae*: a white-ground hydria stands on the Doric grave stela, while at its foot rest a red-figured kylix and a kalpis. Dietrich von Bothmer of the Metropolitan Museum pointed out that the source for the kylix decorated with a figure of Hermes is a cup in the manner of the Euaion Painter in the Louvre. The hydria, according to Jenkins, is based on one in the British Museum that depicts women fetching water from a fountain. It is even possible that the entire composition was inspired by a mourning scene from an Attic white-ground lekythos, a vessel intended to hold offerings of oil at a tomb. The classicizing frame (fig. 207) is the original, having been ordered by the artist, and the painting is in an exceptionally fine state of preservation.

The model had been identified simply as a “Miss Lloyd” until Martin Postle found an article about her in the London Sunday Express for October 22, 1933. Mary Lloyd’s middle-class background was unusual for an artist’s model; she described herself as the beautiful daughter of a bankrupt Shropshire squire who secured a letter of introduction to Millais. She stated that Lawrence Alma-Tadema, Burne-Jones, and Leighton were also among the artists by whom she was employed and that she had posed for Thomas Brock’s bronze allegorical figure *Sculpture*, seated at the foot of Leighton’s tomb in St. Paul’s Cathedral. Postle believes that Lloyd sat not only for *Lacrymae* but also for *Twist Hope and Fear* (private collection) and probably for *Flaming June* (Museo de Arte de Ponce, Fundación Luis A. Ferré), Leighton’s best-known work. All three were exhibited at the 1895 Royal Academy exhibition, and all appear in a photograph of Leighton’s studio taken just after his death.

2. M. H. Spielmann, “The Royal Academy Exhibition.—I,” *Magazine of Art* 18 (1893), p. 243, illustrated the drawings of the head (w/0708; black and white chalk on gray-brown paper, 22.7 × 16.3 cm) and the drapery (w/0716; black and white chalk on gray-brown paper, 22.2 × 10.8 cm). See also Geré, Newall, Robbins, and Suleman in Martin et al. 2006, pp. 32–33, no. 1.6, colorpl., p. 121. Reena Suleman, Curator of Collections and Research, The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, kindly answered my queries about them.
3. Annette Wickham, research curator at the academy, supplied a digital photograph of the drawing (o/4/166; pencil on tracing paper, 19.8 × 8.8 cm). My thanks to her and to Mary Anne Stevens, the academy’s collections secretary and senior curator.
5. Dietrich von Bothmer, in a memo, 1973, identified it as Louvre 2471, acquired by the museum in 1879, for which see J. D. Beazley, *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters*, and ed. (Oxford, 1963), vol. 2, p. 798.
6. For photographs, see Martin Postle, “Leighton’s Lost Model: The Rediscovery of Mary Lloyd,” *Apollo* 143 (February 1996), p. 27, figs. 1–3, p. 29, fig. 7.

John Brett

*Born Bletchingly, Surrey, December 8, 1831; died London, January 7, 1902*

In 1851 Brett moved to London, where he was a pupil of the painter James Duffield Harding. By 1853 he had met William Holman Hunt and become fascinated with the Pre-Raphaelite movement. He entered the Royal Academy schools and first exhibited there in 1856, sending three portraits. In December, having read the newly issued fourth volume of John Ruskin’s *Modern Painters*, subtitled *Of Mountain Beauty*, Brett departed for Switzerland. He established his credentials as a landscape painter with *Glacier of Rosenlaui* (Tate, London), which he showed at the Royal Academy in 1857. The work then traveled in an exhibition of British paintings to Boston, where the Swiss-born Harvard geologist Louis Agassiz admired its scientific accuracy. Ruskin tried to persuade Brett to turn his attention exclusively to landscape, but for a time he continued to paint some figural subjects. In 1858 he was in the Val d’Aosta. He revisited the Alps and went to Florence in 1861–62; he spent the next winter in Florence and the following two in southern Italy painting coastal views.

Brett was interested in geology, meteorology, and astronomy, and in 1871 was elected to membership in the Royal Astronomical Society. About this time he married, and he and his wife eventually had seven children. Brett specialized in views of sea and sky and coastal subjects, sailing and sketching from his various yachts in the summer months. He was elected an associate of the Royal Academy in 1881. He kept a series of studios in London and died there in his house at Putney Heath.

**Selected References**


137. Kynance

Oil on canvas, 7 × 14¼ in. (17.8 × 35.9 cm)
Dated and inscribed (lower right, with the butt of the brush): Kynance 27 Sep 88; stamped (on verso): PREPARED BY / WINDSOR & NEWTON / LIMITED / 23, RATHBONE PLACE / LONDON


In 1867 this oil sketch, which is dated September 27, 1888, was sold with a pendant of the same size, Rocky Shore with Breakers (location unknown), to Agnew’s, from whence it was acquired by Theodore Rousseau, then the Metropolitan Museum’s curator of European paintings. It has never been treated, or even varnished, and is to all intents and purposes in perfect state.

Kynance Cove lies north and west of Lizard Head, the furthest southwest point in Cornwall. The site would likely have held great appeal for Brett on account of its natural beauty and geological interest. The cliffs are serpentine, “an igneous and intrusive rock akin to felspar porphyry, of beautiful aspect, which has derived its name from the supposed resemblance of its streaks and colours to those of a serpent’s skin.” The subject of the pendant sketch was identified while it was with Agnew’s as Mullion, a cove near the eastern end of the same peninsula. While there was a carriage road nearby, Kynance Bay was landlocked and could be visited only for several hours each day at low tide by descending a steep path passing through a notch in the cliff. The retreating water revealed a wide white sand beach and many isolated rocks with fantastic shapes. The rocks, “dark almost to blackness, but varied with stains of red, green, and white steatites, [glisten] in the sun from the polish produced by the friction of the stones carried by the waves. The geologist may observe . . . brown diallage, jade, compact felspar or saussurite, asbestos [sic], and a vein of granite descending the cliff in the manner of a dike.” Brett, a yachtsman, doubtless reached Kynance and Mullion by sea, as in the 1870s and 1880s he spent his summers sailing the coast.

In the catalogue of an exhibition at London’s Fine Art Society, Brett described his travels in the summer of 1886, when he explored the Scottish coast:

‘The object of this little exhibition . . . . is to place before the public an average summer’s work of a landscape-painter out of doors. . . . It consists of forty-six sketches and three small pictures, painted between June and September, 1886. Many days were of course unfit for sketching in the open, by reason of the badness of the weather, and some of those days were devoted to the production of the finished pictures. . . . A similar collection is produced every summer, chiefly for the purpose of extending my own acquaintance of the visible world. . . . These sketches, such as they are, were each of them produced in a single sitting, usually of two or three hours.’

The artist writes of his practice and interests with clarity, explaining that he endeavored to make his views optically correct and debunking criticism that his technique is too detailed. The essay is a useful guide to Brett’s activities and should encourage exploration of his sketches, about which relatively little is known. It may, for example, be possible to reconstruct his summer tours of the West.
Sir Edward Coley Burne-Jones, First Baronet

Born Birmingham, August 28, 1833; died Fulham (London), June 16, 1898

Burne-Jones, the son of a frame maker and gilder, went up to Exeter College, Oxford, in 1853. There he met William Morris, and after they had toured the cathedrals of northern France in the summer of 1855, the two determined not to return to university. Intent upon careers in the arts, they settled in 1856 in London, where Burne-Jones encountered Dante Gabriel Rossetti, from whom he received some informal training. All three were among the young painters who contributed to the murals with medieval subjects in the Oxford Union. Burne-Jones visited Italy for the first time in 1859. The next year, he married Georgiana Macdonald, daughter of a Methodist minister, and the year after that, he helped his friend Morris set up the firm of Morris, Marshall, Faulkner & Co., for which he worked for years as a designer of stained glass and tapestries.

With his friend and patron John Ruskin, Burne-Jones returned in 1862 to Italy and was deeply influenced by Venetian art. Between 1864 and 1870 he worked principally in watercolor and exhibited at the Old Watercolour Society; thereafter he concentrated on oil painting, returning to study in Italy, and especially Venice, in 1871 and 1873. He was also a gifted book illustrator. Burne-Jones had a number of private patrons, among whom William Graham was the most important. His paintings came to wider notice in 1877 at the first exhibition at the Grosvenor Gallery, where he showed until 1887, and later at the New Gallery, where his retrospective opened in 1892. He was created a baronet in 1894, and he was also a recipient of the Légion d’Honneur, as his work was extremely popular in France, and in Italy as well, from a relatively early date.
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138. The Love Song
(Le Chant d’Amour)

Oil (with some gold paint?) on canvas, 45 × 60 ¼ in. (114.3 × 153.9 cm)
Signed and inscribed: (lower left) EB; [on label removed from verso] Chant d’Amour. / This picture is painted in pure oil colour / without any vehicle, and if ever it is / varnished only mastic, much diluted, should be used. Glass before it protects / from many dangers.

The Alfred N. Punnert Endowment Fund, 1947 (47.26)

Ex coll.: William Graham, London (by 1882–d. 1883; inv., 1882, no. 1; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, April 3, 1886, no. 163, for £3,307.10.0 to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1886; sold to Raston]; Joseph Raston, Monk’s Manor, Lincoln (1886–d. 1897; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, May 21, 1898, no. 23, for £7,350 to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1898; sold to Ismay]; Thomas Henry Ismay, Davenport, Thurston, Wirral, Chester (1898–d. 1899); James Hainsworth Ismay, The Cottage, Bambridge, Isle of Wight (1899–d. 1930); Mrs. James Hainsworth Ismay (1930–45; sold to Williams); [Williams & Son, London, 1945–47; sold to MMA]


In a May 30, 1868, letter to Burne-Jones, William Graham accepted the painter’s offer of first refusal of a version in oils of his watercolor *Le Chant d’Amour* (fig. 208), or *The Love Song*, which is signed and dated 1865. Graham had bought the watercolor after it was exhibited in 1866 at the Old Watercolour Society, the first work of Burne-Jones that he acquired. As it was hanging in Graham’s London drawing room, he offered to lend it back to the artist from August until November of 1868, when he would be in Scotland.

The theme of the Breton love song was a refrain in Burne-Jones’s work over more than fifteen years. When, in June 1860, he had married Georgiana Macdonald, the couple had received as a wedding gift a small upright piano made by Frederick Priestley and constructed, in Georgiana’s words, of “unpolished American walnut, a perfectly plain wood of pleasing colour, so that Edward could paint upon it. The little instrument when opened shows inside the lid a very early design for the ‘Chant d’Amour’” (fig. 209). The vignette, undated, is medieval in feeling and shows an angel working the bellows of
a portable organ played by a beautiful young woman. It is thought to have been painted as a tribute to the artist’s wife, who was an accomplished musician.

About 1863–65 Burne-Jones made a preparatory study in pencil and red chalk for the musician, and, perhaps also at that time, a sepia wash and gouache study from a model of a boy in the pose, but not the costume, of the knight in armor (fig. 210). He also made a drawing in pencil or chalk that was described in the catalogue of his 1898 estate as a "study for Love in the Chant D’Amour," 1865. After he completed the watercolor that went to Graham, the artist made yet another, which is signed and dated 1866 and shows only the musician and the angel.

In 1868 Burne-Jones signaled his intention to begin the present large canvas, which he had in hand in 1871 and 1873, completed after a month’s work in 1877, and showed for the first time at the Grosvenor Gallery exhibition of 1878. Its critical reception was mixed. For Henry James, Le Chant d’Amour "looks at first like some mellow Giorgione or some richly-glowing Titian. The tone is full of depth and brownness, the shadows are warm, the splendor subdued." He thought it "a brilliant success in the way of color." By contrast, critic W. H. Mallock reacted against the picture’s latent sexuality, finding in the figure of the woman the "langouer of exhausted animalism" and opining that he would prefer to hear "the most ill-natured
gossip of Mayfair" to the love song of the picture's title.

At the time of the Grosvenor Gallery show, or shortly thereafter, it seems likely that Burne-Jones prepared the beautiful graphite replica (fig. 21) of the painting that bears his monogram and is inscribed "to JCC. . . The dedication may refer to Joseph Comyns Carr, a friend and critic who was a codirector of the Grosvenor Gallery from its opening in 1877 and who established the New Gallery in 1886. Le Chant d'Amour also made an appearance in miniature. Burne-Jones had fallen in love toward the end of the 1860s with Maria Zambaco, a member of the Greek community in London whose portrait in half-length (Clemens-Seis-Museum, Neuss, Germany) he signed and dated on August 7, 1870. Behind Maria is Cupid with his arrow, and on the shelf upon which she leans are another arrow and an illuminated book, open to a page with a tiny replica of the version in watercolor. The white blossom the sitter holds is a symbol of passion.

For Burne-Jones and for his time, Le Chant d'Amour is a key picture, in which Romantic medievalism is suffused with a dewy, pastoral warmth emanating from Renaissance Venice. The traditions of manuscript illumination merge with the influences of Botticelli and Titian. The composition is a balanced pattern of horizontals, diagonals, and verticals, and delicate details enliven the entire surface. In the foreground there are wall-flowers for bitterness and tulips for ardent love. The figures are seductive in their mutual indifference, beautiful in their languor, each set apart from the other. Henry James remarked that they are grouped "in rather an unexpected manner, upon the top of a garden wall," quite like three separate sculptures on a pedestal. The extraordinary fineness of the artist's technique and the gentle lyricism of his image render its oddities insignificant.

139. The Backgammon Players

Oil and silver leaf on leather, each door 23 3/4 × 20 1/4 in. (60.3 × 51.8 cm)
Rogers Fund, 1926 (26.54)

Ex coll.: Henry Labouchere, Baron Taunton, Quaintock Lodge, near Taunton, Somerset (1862–d. 1869); Honorable Mary Dorothy Labouchere, later Mrs. Edward James Stanley (from 1863); Captain Stanley (until 1946; sold through an agent to Douglas); [R. Langton Douglas, London, 1946; sold to MMA]


The cabinet (figs. 212–214) was one of the first to be made by the London firm of Morris, Marshall, Faulkner & Co., which had been established on April 11, 1861. Designed by Philip Webb and embellished with leather-covered doors painted by Burne-Jones, it was exhibited in the summer of 1862, priced at thirty guineas, in the Medieval Court at the South Kensington International Exhibition. The piece was bought from the show by Lord Taunton, a distinguished politician and collector, and installed in a corridor at Quaintock Lodge, the Gothic Revival country house he had built in Somerset in 1857. A prescient purchase for the Museum, the cabinet was acquired in 1926 from Taunton's grandson through the good offices of the dealer Robert Langton Douglas.

Contemporary accounts of the contents of the Medieval Court in the 1862 exhibition vary widely in their assessment of the furnishing exhibited by Morris's new firm. William Burges, a preeminent designer in what might be called the modern medieval style, who had been deputed by the Ecclesiastical Society to arrange the display, was unashamedly enthusiastic:

One of the curious features of the Mediaeval Court is the attempt to revive [painted] furni- ture; and this is not in one or two solitary cases, but in such profusion that it forms the most conspicuous feature of the Court. It is very true that the London papers, as a
general rule, have fulminated against it, and critics have loudly exclaimed against the wickedness of making such dry bones as furniture live and tell stories for our instruction or amusement; but, after all, here the fact is proved that such things can be done decently in the present time, and that they cost very little more than the usual good upholsterery-work. For instance, compare the price of Mr. Morris's cabinet with the lectern ornamented by what is called pyrography: the one is thirty guineas and the other forty, but the former has two most beautiful figures painted on it by Mr. E. B. Jones, while the latter has some commonplace little figures of apostles burnt in by the new process.

Burges described Morris's new business as “an association of architects and painters, who have set up a shop in Red Lion Square, in the same manner as the Italian painters [of] the Middle Ages.” As for the furniture, he singled out the use of “an Eastern system of diaper” for the backgrounds, combined with rather dark-toned painting, the colors of which were inspired by the Venetian School.

The ecclesiologists, sponsors of the installation in the Medieval Court, were in general satisfied with the result of Burges's efforts and admired the painted furniture that he himself exhibited. However, Morris & Co. did not come off well in their estimation: “Some painted and japanned furniture . . . is simply preposterous. . . . We must totally decline to praise the design or execution of these specimens. The colouring in particular is crude and unpleasing.” Neither did they agree with Burges that the Morris cabinets were reasonably priced. The editors of the Building News opined in the same vein that the Morris hangings and furnishings would suit “a family which might suddenly be awakened after a sleep of four centuries, and which was content to pay enormous prices suitably to furnish a barn.” They drew attention to the beautiful “single figures on a punctured gilt background” that decorate the cabinet and concluded that if they were its possessors “we should cut them out and frame them, and put the rest behind the fire, because it gives us perfectly the rude execution and barbarous ornament of centuries ago. Messrs. Morris, Faulkner, & Marshall’s works are the most complete, and the most thoroughly mediaeval of any in the Court. They are consequently the most useless.”

By the end of the exhibition it must have been clear to Morris that the manufacture and sale of furniture of this kind would not be commercially viable, and Lord Taunton’s piece is a rare survivor. The cabinet, of pine with copper and iron hardware, measures seventy-three inches in height and is decorated inside and out. Webb was paid one pound, ten shillings for the design at an unspecified date in 1861, and the wooden carcass was made in the Morris firm’s shop. The subject of Burne-Jones’s picture, a couple playing backgammon in an enclosed garden, had already (more or less) been decided upon, as Webb called it the “chess player” cabinet. An entry in Burne-Jones’s account book with Morris for the months of January to April 1861, which probably applies to this piece, reads: “Gold cabinet: woodwork £5 painting £10.” If the entry is relevant, then Burne-Jones may have painted or designed the decoration of the woodwork; if not, the

Figs. 212–214. Cabinet designed by Philip Webb (with doors painted by Sir Edward Coley Burne-Jones, The Backgammon Players, no. 139). Painted and gilded pine, leather, copper hardware, painted iron hinges, 73 × 45½ × 22¾ in. (185.4 × 114.6 × 57.7 cm). Rogers Fund, 1926 (26.54)
decoration could be by Webb, who also did "painting and lacquering" at the time.  

Burne-Jones’s most elaborate treatment of the theme of backgammon players takes the form of an exquisitely detailed chalk drawing (fig. 215) in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, signed and dated “FBJ 1861” and measuring roughly forty inches in width. The young couple are seated at the door of a house, within a trellised enclosure, and surrounded by an improbable tapestry of wild and cultivated flowers. The drawing is roughly the size of the cabinet doors, and the poses of the figures on the doors are unchanged. The sheet was preceded by a small study of the couple in pencil (fig. 216), differing in that the young man holds his left arm at his breast, while the young woman,
her head lowered, crosses her arms at her waist. It must have been made from life, and one of the models seems to be Fanny Cornforth. When the gaming board was introduced into the Fitzwilliam composition, the hands of the figures from the sketch were adjusted in accordance with the exigencies of the game. A watercolor that may date to 1862 (fig. 217) is a reduction and simplification of the Fitzwilliam pencil drawing: the door to the right is maintained, a hedge or screen of trees is introduced behind the trellis, and there are fewer flowers and some grass in the foreground.

Burne-Jones adapted his design to the leather support principally by simplifying it. First the unpainted background was punched with a tool to form an overall pattern. That the limits of the punching conform for the most part to the outlines of the figures and the bench indicates that these contours were delineated first. The bench, a horizontal supported by two uprights, replaced the trellised enclosure with its climbing roses. A poppy from the left foreground of the drawing is silhouetted against the background, and opposite is a sapling, very slight, with a few leaves and small fruits. The shallow foreground is dappled with little flowers. Here the artist gave his attention instead to elaborating the costumes: the youth wears a robe that might have been intended to suggest Italian figured damask, and the young woman’s blue dress is patterned with sprigs and a spray of tiny flowers.

While the cabinet is in very good condition, the painting has suffered owing to the instability of the leather support. Damage has resulted mainly from repeated attempts to press the pigments back into plane. The young man’s robe is glazed with red over silver and the young woman’s with brown over silver, and in the small areas where the surface is well preserved—for example, at the top of the full sleeve of her dress—the effect is splendid. The colors have darkened significantly overall.

1. The results of EDS elemental analysis conducted by Mark Wytpski of the Museum’s Department of Scientific Research, reported in 1991, confirm the presence of glazing over silver leaf.


5. For Webb, see W. R. Lethaby, Philip Webb and His Work, pp. 41; for the entry in the Burne-Jones catalog, see Wildman and Christian, 1998, p. 75.

6. The drawing is unlocated. The corrections in ink to the woman’s draperies seem to have been carried over to the Fitzwilliam sheet, while the figures were slightly separated from each other.


8. Another, slightly drawing of figures seated at a table that has been related to the genesis of the composition of The Backgammon Players is at the Tate (A00018). See www.tate.org.uk (accessed December 9, 2004).
Briton Riviere

Born London, August 14, 1840; died London, April 20, 1920

The Rivieres were a family of artists of Huguenot descent. In 1851 William Riviere, Briton’s father, became the drawing master at Cheltenham College, and Briton was educated there until 1859, when he moved with his parents to Oxford, where his father set up an art school. Briton Riviere took a B.A. in 1866 from Oxford and an M.A. in 1873; he received private tuition in preference to attending university lectures, so that his training as a painter would not be interrupted. In the 1860s, introduced into Pre-Raphaelite circles, he was influenced by both Millais and Leighton. As a child, Briton Riviere had made drawings at the London zoological gardens, and in 1851 he had sent a picture of a kitten to the British Institution. When, by about 1870, his career still was not going well, he reverted to painting animals and became a successor to Landseer.

Riviere was elected an associate of the Royal Academy in 1878 and a full member in 1880. His most popular exhibits showed either biblical or classical subjects in which animals featured prominently. In 1896 he came close to being elected president of the Royal Academy. The waning popularity of academic themes eventually forced Riviere to turn to portraiture to support his large family, and he also painted landscapes in later life. He maintained studios at various addresses in London, where he died at the age of seventy-nine.

Selected References

140. Pallas Athena and the Herdsman’s Dogs

Oil on canvas, 44¼ x 70¼ in. (112.1 x 178.1 cm)
Signed and dated (lower left): B. Riviere 1876–93–4

Ex coll.: Edmund Crompton Potter, Rusholme House, near Manchester (until 1884; his estate sale, Christie’s, London, March 22, 1884, no. 50, for £997.10.0 to Agnew for Henderson); Sir Alexander Henderson, 1st Baronet, later Lord Faringdon, London (1884–d. 1934; his estate sale, Sotheby’s, London, June 13, 1934, no. 125, for £116 to Agnew); [Agnew, London, 1934, sold to the Maharajah of Tagore]; the Maharajah of Tagore (from 1934; sold to Miles); [Roy Miles, London, until 1980; sold to Manney]; Richard Manney, New York (1980)

Selected Exhibitions: Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1876, no. 496 (as Pallas Athene and the herdsman’s dogs); Glasgow, International Exhibition
of Industry, Science, and Art, 1888, Fine Arts Section, no. 177 (as Pallas Athenae, lent by Alexander Henderson); Borough of West Ham, London, “Sixth Annual Free Picture Exhibition,” opened April 9, 1900, no. 147 (lent by Alex. Henderson)


When exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1876, the painting was accompanied by the following verses from book 16 of the Odyssey:

Then drew she nigh, in shape a stately dame,
Graced with all noble gifts of womanhood:
None save Odysseus saw her; for too few
Of mortal birth the gods reveal themselves.
But the dogs knew her coming, and with whine
And whimpering crouched aloof.

While Riviere’s work elicited an enthusiastic response from the writer for the 1876 Art Journal, another “well-known” contemporary critic described it scathingly as “an utterly mistaken composition.” What they saw was significantly different from what we see today: Walter Shaw-Sparrow, in 1892, noted that Athena “glides” over the arid plain, and so she appeared (in reverse to the picture) in an engraving published three years earlier in the Art Journal (fig. 218). While the surface affords no evidence of the change (fig. 219), the figure of the goddess that was originally there emerges clearly in an X-radiograph (fig. 220). This figure must have been reworked and the background modified while the canvas belonged to Lord Faringdon, in 1893–94, as indicated by the inscribed date. The repainted Athena would seem to illustrate Joseph Kestner’s analysis of Riviere’s females as fierce and retributive.

1. See Armstrong 1891, p. 16.
2. The X-radiograph was made by conservator Charlotte Hale in 2009.
3. This reading was suggested to me by associate conservator Cynthia Moyer in 2009.
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