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From about 1900 until 1930 eighteenth-century British portraits were in vogue among American collectors. The market for the pictures was fostered by the art-dealing firms of Duveen Brothers and M. Knoedler and Company. The elegance of the sitters, relatively large scale of the canvases, and undemanding iconography suited the houses of the new moneyed classes. The Frick Collection embodies the style of the era. Perhaps for this reason it has long been general museum practice to hang British portraits in period rooms—the public equivalent of private dining or drawing rooms. Such installations also suggest the habits of the original owners, who lived surrounded by images of their spouses, offspring, and ancestors. At the Metropolitan Museum British portraits are displayed not only in the main galleries and in period rooms but also in other areas, some of which are not open to the public. This Bulletin, which includes paintings from the sixteenth century through the Georgian era, affords an opportunity to appreciate a collection that is widely dispersed throughout the building.

At the Museum, as elsewhere in this country, British portraiture is well represented by comparison with landscapes, genre, or sporting subjects. (The Yale Center for British Art, in New Haven, is an exception.) We have splendid likenesses by most of the leading painters from Hans Holbein to Thomas Lawrence, but our display of British art cannot do justice to the works of William Hogarth, George Stubbs, J. M. W. Turner, Richard Wilson, or Joseph Wright of Derby, among others. A few major portraitists are also absent, notably the Scottish artist Allan Ramsay and the German-born Johann Zoffany, who was patronized by King George III and Queen Charlotte.

Of the twenty-eight paintings illustrated, only two were purchased: Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales, by Robert Peake the Elder, in 1944, and Richard Humphreys, by John Hoppner, in 1953. The first to enter the collection was The Honorable Henry Fane with His Guardians, by Joshua Reynolds, the gift of Junius S. Morgan in 1887. The balance (of twenty-five pictures) was given or bequeathed by eighteen different donors, including several trustees as well as major benefactors of the Museum: Jules Bache, Mrs. Harry Payne Bingham, Mr. and Mrs. Edward S. Harkness, Henry G. Marquand, Colonel Jacob Ruppert, and William K. Vanderbilt. The Museum also has assembled a significant holding of British portrait miniatures. Of the thirteen illustrated here, three of the most important (two by Nicholas Hilliard and John Hoskins’s Dr. Brian Walton) once belonged to the distinguished collection formed by J. Pierpont Morgan.

The text of this Bulletin is by Katharine Baetjer, curator of European Paintings, who is also the author of European Paintings in The Metropolitan Museum of Art, a summary catalogue of our permanent collection. Her enthusiasm for the topic and her meticulous research are evident here as she discusses the subjects of the portraits and the lives and works of the artists who painted them.

Philippe de Montebello, Director
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INTRODUCTION

Portraiture has played a unique role in Great Britain and especially in England, dominating the arts of painting and sculpture since the Renaissance. The sixteenth century saw the arts brought into the service of the ascendant Tudors, declaiming their legitimacy and power, while at the same time the Reformation caused a drastic decline in commissions for religious images. A relatively stable monarchy in concert with a powerful landed aristocracy provided continuity, together with the patronage that fueled a growing market.

The portrait miniature flourished in Great Britain. Reproductions of portraits conceived in other media and caricatures accounted for a significant percentage of the prints made for sale or as book illustrations. Ceramics, reverse paintings on glass, silhouettes, coins, medals, and needlework bore likenesses. London’s National Portrait Gallery was the first of its kind. Such images in exceptionally large numbers figured prominently in English interiors, where they were arranged to convey domestic as well as political and dynastic messages.

There is much written and visual evidence to show that by the eighteenth century the practices associated with portraiture had been gradually codified, in terms described briefly below. Custom dictated that the sitter visit the artist in the studio, which by preference was in an accessible, fashionable London location. Often there was also a gallery where finished works were displayed to prospective clients. Artist’s houses were meeting places for celebrities from all classes of society. Portraitists of the first rank were very busy men (or women, but of the latter there were few). To sustain their popularity, they had to be available on demand, working long hours. Many who would have preferred other genres—such as history painting or landscape—were forced to turn to portraiture to make a living.

Portrait painters assembled collections of drawings and prints, materials that were a source of inspiration and, more specifically, provided a repertory from which motifs could be selected by artist or client. Agreement had to be reached on the size of the picture, the costume, perhaps the setting, and the price. The most common practice, for which several meetings were typically required, was for the artist to paint a sketch of the head from life. As sittings are tedious, an artist who could converse with and entertain his client meanwhile may have had greater success. A drawing of the head with color notes, which could be completed in a much shorter time, sometimes served the purpose instead. An influential painter might have a role in determining the costume to be worn. In the case of an exceptionally prominent or busy client, the clothes and jewels might be lent to the studio. Assistants or models often posed for secondary parts of a picture, and assistants were also employed in painting drapery, still lifes, and backgrounds. Replicas and variants were not regarded as they are today; as a corollary, neither was the primacy of the original invention. Portraits were sometimes retained by the artist in anticipation of the need to multiply the image or were borrowed back for the same purpose.

A portrait was generally understood to be a likeness of an individual in his or her own guise (as opposed to a biblical, mythological, or some other context) and an expression of
character. The whole was greater than the sum of its parts: accurately transcribing the sitter’s features was not necessarily more important than suggesting characteristics appropriate to his or her age, sex, political role, or social position. A degree of compliance was expected of the artist, as the client’s vanity might dictate certain flattering adjustments. There were many judges: the individual portrayed, family, friends, and, in the eighteenth century, the press and populace attending the exhibitions where works of art were displayed.

To modern eyes the stiff, bulky Elizabethan costumes may seem to overwhelm the courtier who wore them. In the Stuart era standards of beauty were so strictly adhered to that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish one aristocratic woman from another. By contrast, Georgian portraiture often conveyed the ephemeral (a fleeting glance, a silk skirt trailing over the grass) while engaging the observer. Although intended for public display, Lawrence’s *Elizabeth Farren* (cover) is perhaps more intimate than a family photograph.
Drawing on works in the Metropolitan Museum’s permanent collection, this Bulletin addresses the evolution of portrait painting in England over three centuries. The phrase “portrait painting in England” is used advisedly because in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries many portraitists who worked there were not native born. During the reign of Henry VIII (1509–47) the most distinguished artist in London was Hans Holbein the Younger, a native of Augsburg who matured in Basel as a painter, draftsman, and designer of prints. In the late summer or early autumn of 1526, impelled by economic necessity, Holbein arrived in London bearing a letter of introduction from the Swiss philosopher Desiderius Erasmus to the scholar and statesman Sir Thomas More, who commissioned a half-length portrait of himself (Frick Collection, New York) and a group portrait of the members of his household, which unfortunately has not survived. Sir Thomas was an exceptionally well placed patron: He served successively as a privy councillor, as speaker of the House of Commons, and from 1529 as lord chancellor. Later, however, for his refusal to recognize Henry VIII as head of the Church of England, More, a Roman Catholic, was convicted of treason and executed in 1535.

By August 1528 Holbein returned to his family in Basel. Having bought a house, he set to work on commissions left unfinished. Despite strenuous efforts on the part of the city council to keep him there, he was back in England by the summer of 1532. Holbein made one more visit to Basel, in 1538, and died in London in November 1543. Many of the patrons of Holbein’s first English period were disgraced or had died by the time he
HANS HOLBEIN THE YOUNGER

William Roper (1493/94–1578) and Margaret More (1505–1544), Mrs. Roper

Vellum on card (the latter a playing card), diam. (each) 1 3/4 in. (45 mm)

Inscribed (respectively, in gold):

\( \text{AN ETATIS SVE} \cdot \text{XLII} \)

\( \text{A ETATIS XXX} \)

Rogers Fund, 1950 (50.69.1, 2)

returned. Among his most important new clients were the German merchants of the Hanseatic League, for whom he painted a number of grave and richly informative portraits, two of which (acc. nos. 49.7.29 and 50.135.4) are in the Museum’s collection. As the royal accounts for the 1530s are incomplete, it is not known when Holbein entered Henry VIII’s service. In 1536 he was first recorded as one of the king’s painters, and in 1537 he completed a mural in Whitehall Palace celebrating the ascendancy of the Tudor dynasty. This wall painting showed Henry VIII, lifesize and full-length, with his wife Jane Seymour and his parents, Henry VII and Elizabeth of York. Though the mural was destroyed when Whitehall burned in 1698, the design survives in two copies, as does the portrait of the king in the form of Holbein’s original cartoon (National Portrait Gallery, London, p. 10).

Holbein demonstrated a gift for characterization while still in his teens. By 1526 he had achieved unparalleled mastery of the means by which to create the illusion of the physical presence of the sitter. He was familiar with German, north Italian, French, and Netherlandish art: his small portrait roundels in oils must have been inspired also by medals and antique coins. The Museum’s roundel bears Henry VIII’s monogram, H[enricus] [Rex (?)], and was probably painted in the mid-1530s (p. 3). From an early age Holbein’s practice was to begin with a head-and-shoulders drawing of his subject from life. The features and hair were fully worked up, while only the outlines of the costume were indicated. The drawings often included color notes in addition to details of jewelry and drapery. Holbein’s habits as a draftsman led him to make large preparatory sketches for
even the miniatures that date to his final decade in London. He learned this highly specialized art form from Lucas Hornebolte (1490/95?–1544) of Ghent, one of the inventors of the genre, who was painting miniatures at Henry VIII’s court as early as 1525.

The unknown sitter for the roundel in oils wears a doublet bearing the monogram H[R?] in black with gold stitching, indicating that he was in service to the king. Though the picture is worn, the elaborate gold calligraphy serves as a reminder of Holbein’s skill as a print designer. The collar of the man’s shirt, measuring no more than an inch across, is embroidered with a repeating pattern of leaves and dots in two rows; its ruffled edge is bound, and it is loosely fastened with black and white strings, the ends of which are unraveled. Under magnification the individual threads can be counted. The sitter’s eyebrows are thick; his broad cheek, double chin, and neck show the gray shadow of a beard. Nonetheless the abundant detail does not detract from our sense of the man, his heavy body, and intent expression.

This portrait is on wood, its carved gilt frame forming an integral part. The black back is scored with three concentric circles. The reverse and the edge show wear due to handling, while a projecting rim, cut by hand, must have been intended to receive a now-lost lid. There is a precedent for this format: a roundel of the same size representing the German theologian and reformer Philipp Melanchthon, with a decorative lid that is painted and inscribed on the inside by Holbein (Niedersächsisches Landesgalerie, Hannover). Additionally, Holbein’s portraits of an older court official and his wife (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) seem to have been paired originally as the elements of a slightly larger round box. The sitter for the male portrait in Vienna wears a coat embroidered with the letters HR in full; both were painted in 1534, which suggests an approximate date for our picture.

The format, scale, and solid blue background of the Man in a Red Cap relate it to portrait miniatures. Small pictures in closing boxes, like miniatures, were intended to be portable and not meant for permanent display. While it is possible that Holbein saw Hornebolte’s miniatures during his first visit to London, he did not then try his hand at them. Of some fourteen such works confidently attributed to him, none can be securely dated before 1535. The Roper miniatures (opposite), which are among the earliest, demonstrate the assurance with which he handled the new medium, adapting the convincing naturalism of his style in oils to minute depictions in watercolor and gouache.

Margaret Roper was the eldest and favorite child of Sir Thomas More. Holbein inscribed her age as thirty. In 1521 she had married the Kentish landowner and lawyer William Roper, shown here at forty-two. He was to write More’s biography.

Holbein painted Margaret and her husband between October 1535 and October 1536, not long after Sir Thomas More’s death on July 7, 1535. Roper is soberly dressed in a cloak with a fur collar over a tunic. His wife wears a gown with turned-back cuffs and a fur tippet. Her hair is concealed by crossed bands, an embroidered undercap, and a hood of black velvet with a stiffened brocaded damask frame. This elaborate headgear draws attention to her thin, sorrowful face. Her hollow eyes bear witness to the suffering she endured in the long months of her father’s imprisonment and at the time of his execution. Margaret Roper reveals herself to the viewer in the role of the daughter of a martyr, the guise in which, perhaps, she wished to be remembered.

During the reign of Queen Elizabeth I (1558–1603), Holbein was succeeded by Nicholas Hilliard, an exceptionally gifted miniaturist. However, until Anthony van Dyck arrived at the court of James I in 1620, no painter could match Holbein’s achievements.
Nicholas Hilliard (1547–1619)

Portrait of a Young Man, Probably Robert Devereux (1566–1600), Second Earl of Essex
Vellum laid on card, 1 7/8 x 1 1/2 in. (40 x 33 mm)
Dated and inscribed (edge, in gold):
Ano ∙ Dni ∙ 1588 ∙ Ætatis Sue ∙ 22 ∙
Fletcher Fund, 1935 (35.89.4)

Robert Devereux was born in 1566, and his age, twenty-two, accords with the miniature’s date. Thirty years younger than Queen Elizabeth I, he was for many years her favorite, but he overstepped his bounds, attempted to raise a rebellion, and was executed as a traitor in 1601. Hilliard was largely self-taught. He claimed to have been influenced by Holbein, but his restrained modeling and avoidance of shadows give his miniatures a very different effect. He advocated copying the engravings of Albrecht Dürer (1471–1528), whose tensile line he adapted to decorative purposes. Hilliard brought clarity, elegance, and grace to miniature painting, imbuing his work with the poetry and gallantry of the Elizabethan era.

Nicholas Hilliard

Portrait of a Woman
Vellum, 1 7/8 x 1 1/2 in. (47 x 39 mm)
Dated (left edge, in gold): 1597:
Fletcher Fund, 1935 (35.89.2)

In the precision and finesse of its handling the miniature bears witness to Hilliard’s training as a goldsmith. The white pigment describing the starched threads of the lace ruff can be seen under magnification to project in relief. The bodice and sleeves are embroidered in blue and green and sprinkled with gold tags, and the sitter wears an abundance of jewels. Her pallor would have been fashionable at Queen Elizabeth’s court and was perhaps cosmetically enhanced, but her broad cheeks, double chin, and the mole above her lip are uniquely her own.
The first of the Stuart monarchs to ascend the English throne was James VI of Scotland, who succeeded as James I at the death of Queen Elizabeth I in 1603. The visual arts under the Tudors had been devoted primarily to the enhancement of kingship, and James I, who was not much interested in painting, retained various artists in service for the same purpose, thus preserving an iconic tradition of representation that was extremely old-fashioned by Continental standards.

Robert Peake the Elder was established as a portraitist by the end of the 1580s. He became principal painter to James’s son Henry Frederick, prince of Wales, in 1604 and enjoyed a brief period of importance as image maker to the brilliant and precocious Henry until the prince’s untimely death at eighteen in 1612. The double portrait of Henry with Sir John Harington (above) includes not only the date 1603 but also the sitters’ ages (nine and eleven, respectively), which Peake painted as if carved on the tree trunk at left and the branch in the upper right corner. The prince’s coat of arms is suspended from a twig above his sword arm, while Sir John’s hangs above his left shoulder.

On April 23, 1603, in the course of his...
royal progress from Scotland, James I visited Sir John Harington’s father and was entertained by him with an afternoon of stag hunting. After the coronation, which took place in July, the king’s daughter, Princess Elizabeth, was brought to England and entrusted to the care of the same Lord and Lady Harington, with whom she lived at Coombe Abbey, near Coventry, from August 1603 until 1608. Since no payments for the double portrait nor for a companion picture representing Princess Elizabeth (National Maritime Museum, Greenwich) have been found in the royal accounts, it is likely that the commissions came from the Haringtons, who thus commemorated their charge of the princess and the close friendship then being formed between their son and the prince of Wales.

The rider mastering his horse is a symbol of rulership, and the dismounted equestrian portrait, of which this is an early example, would endure over the centuries as a popular type in English art (see p. 32). The specific source, however, is Turbervile’s Booke of Hunting, published in 1576 in an English translation. Henry possessed in abundance the equine and hunting skills expected of a Renaissance prince. The stag was the noblest of quarries, and in England the hunt, according to Turbervile’s translator, concluded with the ritual illustrated here:

The deare being layd upon his backe, the Prince, chiefe, or such as they shall appoint, commes to it: And the chiefe huntsman (kneeling, if it be to a prince) doth holde the Deare by the forefoote, whiles the Prince or chief, cut a slyt drawn alongst the brysket.…. This is done to see the goodnesse of the flesh, and howe thicke it is.

Allowing for the sheathing of the sword, the prince’s bold pose reflects the pattern devised by Holbein in 1537 for Henry VIII’s portrait in the Whitehall mural (right) and employed by his followers for portraits of Henry’s successor, Edward VI. The patchwork of bright colors and the skeins of lace-like gold and silver-gilt embroidery cling insistently to the surface of the canvas, and the flat figures, which are devoid of modeling, resemble those on playing cards. The use of a verdant and quite naturalistic landscape background is, by contrast, innovative, demonstrating the continuing influence of Netherlandish art. A year or two later Peake painted a slightly updated version of this double portrait, in which Prince Henry is attended instead by Robert Devereux, third earl of Essex (Royal Collection).

In recent years the close study of sixteenth-century English portraits has made possible a number of reattributions, among which is another Peake (opposite), formerly ascribed in error to Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger (1561–1636), a native of Bruges trained in the Flemish tradition in London. The sitter, who had been falsely identified as Queen Elizabeth I in a later inscription that
ROBERT PEAKE THE ELDER

*Princess Elizabeth* (1596–1662),
*Later Queen of Bohemia*

Oil on canvas, 60 3/4 × 31 3/4 in.  
(154.3 × 79.4 cm)

Inscribed (on book):

No Tablet
For thy brest
Thy Christ.jian mo
ther gives hir
Dattere What
Jewell Fits hir
best A boke not
big but yet ther
in Some hidden
Vertu is So christ
So christ Procur. you
grace with
God And
Give you
endles

Gift of Kate T. Davison, in memory of her husband, Henry Pomeroy Davison, 1951 (51.194.1)

Opposite:

HANS HOLBEIN THE YOUNGER

*Henry VIII and Henry VII*, 1537

Fragment of a cartoon for the Whitehall mural

By courtesy of the National Portrait Gallery, London
was mostly removed, is Elizabeth, the younger sister of Prince Henry and of the future Charles I. The presumption that she was painted at about ten, while still in the care of Lord and Lady Harington, is perhaps strengthened by the fact that, like the portrait of her brother, this one remained with their descendants at Wroxton Abbey until 1914. Removal of later repainting has revealed the same delicately shaped face and rather poignant expression that characterize miniatures of her by Nicholas Hilliard and Isaac Oliver (ca. 1563–1617). The twining branches of leaves and flowers on her dress are duplicated in a tighter pattern on a rare Jacobean linen jacket embroidered with silk (Victoria and Albert Museum, London), which was reportedly worn in the years 1610–20. The young princess holds a book in her right hand (above). The painted text begins with a reference to a “tablet,” which would have been understood to refer to a flat, or table-cut, jewel. The chain around her bodice is entirely composed of diamonds of this sort. The lines of verse suggest that instead of a jewel the Roman Catholic Queen Anne had offered her absent daughter a blessing in the form of a devotional text.

Princess Elizabeth was married with great ceremony in 1613 to Frederick V (1596–1632), elector palatine, the most eligible Protestant in continental Europe, and departed with her husband for Heidelberg. In 1619 Frederick was elected king of Bohemia; in 1620 the Bohemians were defeated by the armies of Emperor Ferdinand II, and Frederick and Elizabeth, having lost both the kingdom and the Palatinate, became royal refugees. After the Restoration of Charles II to the throne in 1660 Elizabeth, the so-called Winter Queen, returned to England, where she died in 1662.
Van Dyck, born in Antwerp, was registered as a master in the painters' guild there in 1618, and Rubens, writing in the same year, described him as his best pupil. From October 1620 until February 1621 Van Dyck was in England. Later he worked for long periods in Antwerp and Genoa and traveled widely in Italy. Despite his success at home he moved to London by April 1632. Knighted by Charles I in July, Van Dyck was named his principal painter. He was on the Continent in 1634–35 and in 1640–41, but his second English sojourn was the most settled of his life. He died in London at forty-two.

Van Dyck was high-strung, restive, brilliant, and a man of great personal refinement. Trained in the studio of Rubens and by the example of Titian, he was in a sense too precocious to be other than self-taught. Although mainly active as a portraitist, he also painted religious and mythological pictures, and the few drawings and watercolors of landscapes and plants that survive are fresh and closely observed. Van Dyck’s autograph portraits—penetrating, suave, elegant, and assured in handling—stand apart in eloquent witness to the age of the Baroque. Admiration for his work never dimmed. He inspired generations of English portraitists, notably Lely (see pp. 17, 21) and Gainsborough (see p. 36).

James Stuart, duke of Lennox (opposite), descended from an ancient family closely allied politically and by blood ties to the Scottish monarchs. His great-grandfather was younger brother to Lord Darnley, husband of Mary Queen of Scots and father of James VI, later James I of England. Stuart, born in London in 1612, succeeded as duke of Lennox in 1624 and was created duke of Richmond in 1641. At Charles I’s accession in 1625 he was appointed a gentleman of the Bedchamber, and in 1630 he was knighted. After studying at Cambridge and traveling abroad, Stuart returned to court in 1633, was chosen a privy councillor, and elected to the Order of the Garter. Either his election on April 18 or his installation on November 6 is likely to have occasioned the commission for the portrait. It is wholly autograph and, if the circumstantial evidence is correct, was probably completed early in 1634 before Van Dyck departed for Antwerp.

From his personal fortune the duke of Richmond and Lennox supported Charles I financially as well as politically during the civil war (1642–45). He lost three of his four brothers on the battlefield in the early 1640s, was present at the king’s execution in 1649, and was a mourner at his funeral. Reportedly, he “lived and died with the good liking of all, and without the hate of any.”

The composition was inspired by Titian’s standing full-length portrait of the emperor Charles V with his hound (Prado, Madrid), which had been given to Charles I by Philip IV of Spain in 1623. Charles I himself had sat for Van Dyck in 1632 for a half-length in which he wore the costume of a knight of the Garter. In the duke’s portrait as well as the king’s, the palette and pose were determined by the fact that the embroidered star with radiating silver beams of the Order of the Garter was worn upon the left part of the black cloak below the shoulder. Here the abundant embroidered black silk drapery is relieved by the sitter’s pale green silk stockings and by the jade green ribbon, from which a jewel, the lesser George, is suspended. One cannot resist looking to this portrait for just such confirmation of the sitter’s character as it seems to provide. The duke of Lennox was a cousin of Charles I, educated, urbane, wealthy, a courtier but not a soldier. His coloring is fair, his stance assured, and his expression impassive. The great dog is as elegant and as dedicated to his master as the man was to his king.
SIR ANTHONY VAN DYCK (1599–1641)

James Stuart (1612–1655), Duke of Richmond and Lennox
Oil on canvas, 85 × 50⅓ in.
(215.9 × 127.6 cm)
Marquand Collection, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1889
(89.15.16)
JOHN HOSKINS (active ca. 1615, died 1665)

Dr. Brian Walton (ca. 1600–1661)

Vellum on card, 2 ¾ × 2 ¼ in. (72 × 58 mm)

Signed and dated (upper left, in gold):

i657 / i H

Fletcher Fund, 1935 (35.89.3)

John Hoskins’s style developed under the influence of the miniaturists Nicholas Hilliard and Isaac Oliver (ca. 1565–1617) and of the painters Daniel Mijtens (ca. 1590–1647) and Anthony van Dyck. In this fresh and vivid image, a product of Hoskins’s old age, the sitter seems to lean toward the viewer, his ribbed jacket stretched tightly over his broad chest. The learned Dr. Walton became bishop of Chester in 1660.

SAMUEL COOPER (1608–1672)

Henry Carey (1596–1661),
Second Earl of Monmouth

Vellum on prepared card, 2 ½ × 2 in. (64 × 52 mm)

Signed and dated (left, in gold): s.c. / 1649

Rogers Fund, 1949 (49.33)

Orphaned as a child, Cooper was brought up and trained by his uncle John Hoskins, whose partner he became. Cooper was the most important miniaturist of the Commonwealth and Restoration periods and numbered both Oliver Cromwell and Charles II among his sitters. His portrait of the scholarly and retiring earl of Monmouth is broadly brushed in tribute to the example of Van Dyck. The restrained palette, the angle of the head, and the arrangement of the drapery suggest that the artist was inspired by portrait medals.
SIR PETER LEly (1618–1680)
Mary Capel (1630–1715), Later Duchess of Beaufort, and Her Sister Elizabth (1633–1678), Countess of Carnarvon
Oil on canvas, 51 ¼ × 67 in. (130.2 × 170.2 cm)
Signed and inscribed:
(lower left, on parapet) PL. [monogram];
(on flower painting) E. Carnarvon / fecit
Bequest of Jacob Ruppert, 1939 (39.65.3)

Lely was among the most distinguished of the foreign artists nurtured in seventeenth-century England. Born in Soest, Westphalia, he was of Dutch origin. His family name was Van der Faes. In 1637 he appeared in the minutes of the painters’ guild in Haarlem as a pupil of Frans de Grebber (1573–1643). Lely arrived in England during the civil war, settling in Covent Garden by 1650. He tried landscapes with figures as well as history painting before turning to portraiture, the genre most in demand. He secured the steady patronage of a group of influential nobles who had remained in London, gained access to their private collections, and in this way was able to study the paintings of Van Dyck. By 1660, when Charles II was restored to the throne, Lely’s style was fully mature. His work displays richness of color, depth of tone, skillful articulation of the human form, and a sensual elegance learned from Van Dyck. His portraits evoke the Restoration court with an authority equivalent to that of Holbein at the court of Henry VIII.

In 1661 Lely was granted an annual stipend as principal painter to Charles II. He
was naturalized in 1662 and became a wealthy man of property. A connoisseur, Lely formed a distinguished personal collection of works of the major Continental schools. In the great drawings cabinets, his distinctive mark may be found on sheets by Leonardo, the Carracci, Rubens, and Van Dyck. In January 1680 he was knighted; at the end of the year he died at his easel. Lely was a fine draftsman, initially providing his clients with chalk drawings that defined the proposed composition. In the sitter’s presence, he painted only the head and laid in the overall design. Lely was exceptionally prolific, and while his autograph portraits were admired, his studio practice occasioned negative comment among his contemporaries because he so frequently depended upon assistants not only to finish drapery but also to devise still lifes and backgrounds.

The Capels were among the important royalists who patronized Lely during the Commonwealth. Arthur, second Baron Capel and later first earl of Essex, commissioned from Lely a number of family portraits, which were certainly begun in the 1650s. By 1731, and possibly much earlier, they were installed in the library at Cassiobury Park, in Hertfordshire, the Capels’ great English Baroque house. George Vertue, who was preparing a history of the arts in England, described the eight Capel portraits by Lely as his finest set:

6 half lengths...of ye family. some Ladies...&...some of them Men, with antique Busts. 2 others double half lengths. 2 Ladies, a Lady & Gentleman...of the best and highest perfection that ever I saw painted by S'. P. Lelly especially so many & so compleat together.

The painter had probably been introduced to the family by the earl of Northumberland, whose daughter Lady Elizabeth Percy married Arthur Capel in 1653; they are the “Lady & Gentleman” of the double half-length portrait mentioned above. Last recorded at auction in 1981, that picture,
which has the dark palette of grays and browns that Lely favored until the 1650s, may have been the earliest of the set. The “2 Ladies” (p. 17) are Lord Capel’s sisters, Mary at left, the eldest, and Elizabeth at right, wife of the second earl of Carnarvon. Their identity is secured by the fact that the countess, an amateur artist, displays a painting of a tulip bearing her signature surmounted by a coronet (p. 18). Mary Capel’s first husband died in 1654, and it is likely, given the absence here of a widow’s veil, that she was painted after her second marriage in 1657 to Henry Somerset, Lord Seymour, later first duke of Beaufort. The delicate modeling of the faces, the elasticity of line, and the reflective brilliance of Lely’s drapery painting are marks of the best work of his early maturity.

Also belonging to the Museum, and still in its original frame, is one of the single portraits, which represents Arthur Capel’s younger brother Henry, later Baron Capel of Tewkesbury (opposite). This canvas and the “2 Ladies,” together with other Lelys, a Van Dyck, and a Reynolds, were long installed in the Cassiobury library. The Museum’s portraits were lots 707 and 708, respectively, in the sale of the contents of the house on June 15, 1922. When lot 707 was bequeathed to the Museum in 1939, it looked rather different: Henry Capel’s hand rested awkwardly on a ledge in the left-hand corner of the picture. In 1949 it was suggested that the marble bust of the 1922 sale catalogue description might be lurking under recent repainting. An X-radiograph was made, the portrait was cleaned, and the female bust emerged. Henry Capel, born 1638, was married in 1659 to Dorothy Bennett of Kew Green, Surrey.

Since his gesture has been interpreted as the plighting of his troth, the canvas may have been painted in celebration of their marriage. The photograph of the Cassiobury library in the 1922 catalogue shows the half-length of Henry Capel hanging to the right of the mantel. The second of Vertue’s “Men, with antique Busts” is at the opposite side and again represents Arthur Capel, with a bust-length sculpture of a man on a pedestal or ledge behind him. The whereabouts of the four half-length portraits of women, in addition to those of Arthur Capel with and without his wife, are unknown.

Arthur, first Baron Capel, the family patriarch, who had fought valiantly in the civil war, was beheaded shortly after Charles I in 1649. Chiefly famous among their contemporaries for their support of the royalist cause, the Capels are now remembered as patrons of the art of portraiture and for their interest in botany and gardening. The countess of Carnarvon was a competent flower painter; the duchess of Beaufort commissioned botanical watercolors; and Henry Capel contributed to the development of what eventually became the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew.
SIR PETER LE LY
Sir Henry Capel (1638–1696)
Oil on canvas, $49\frac{3}{4} \times 40\frac{1}{2}$ in. ($126.4 \times 102.9$ cm)
Signed (on column base): PL [monogram]
Bequest of Jacob Ruppert, 1939 (39.65.6)
his father was the chief surveyor. He studied mathematics at Leiden and painting in Amsterdam before traveling to Venice and Rome, where he is said to have been impressed by the sculptures of Gian Lorenzo Bernini (1598–1680) and the canvases of Carlo Maratta (1625–1713). His worldly background and diligence equipped him well for service at the English court, where he served in succession Charles II, James II, William and Mary, and Queen Anne. He was principal painter to the crown from 1691 until his death. Kneller pioneered and specialized in the half-length, lifesize portrait. His prices were high, and he managed an efficient, productive studio. He worked rapidly, often sketching in pen and ink. In contrast to Lely’s, Kneller’s reputation was founded upon his well-known ability to capture a likeness.

The portrait illustrated here is signed in monogram by Kneller. The sitter is identified in the inscription as Charles Beauclaire [sic], Baron Heddington, earl of Burford. Charles Beauclerk, born 1670, was the illegitimate son of Charles II by Eleanor (usually known as Nell) Gwyn, who began her career selling oranges near the Drury Lane Theatre and took to the stage at fifteen. Her son was elevated to the dukedom of St. Albans in 1684; in 1694 he married Lady Diana de Vere, heiress of the last earl of Oxford. She sat for Kneller as a child and also at the time of her marriage, though the latter portrait is known only from a reproductive mezzotint. Inscriptions of the kind found on the Museum’s portrait are generally of later date and are usually, but not always, reliable. This one is open to question, particularly as the sitter’s title is incomplete and the picture seems not to have been engraved. On grounds of style the portrait can be dated to about 1690. It is a spirited performance, bold in coloring and painted directly with the rapidity and assurance that are hallmarks of Kneller’s most personal manner.

In the late 1670s James Scott, duke of Monmouth, Charles II’s illegitimate son, promoted the king’s interest in Kneller, who had only recently arrived in London. As Charles had agreed to a request from his brother, the duke of York, for a portrait by Lely, to save time the king sat for the two artists simultaneously.

Kneller was born Gottfried Kniller in the Baltic Hanseatic port city of Lübeck, where
THOMAS FORSTER (active ca. 1690–1713)
*Portrait of a Man* and *Portrait of a Woman*
Graphite on vellum, 4 ⅜ × 3 ⅞ in. (112 × 92 mm); 4 ⅜ × 3 ½ in. (112 × 90 mm)
Rogers Fund, 1944 (44.36.2, 5)

Nothing is known of Forster beyond the fact that for twenty years or more he made portraits from life drawn with meticulous precision in graphite on vellum. The two images are probably a pair, as they are very close in size and similarly signed and dated. Curiously, in 1700 fashion dictated simple, rather natural dress and hairstyles for women but full wigs and elaborate costumes for men.

ROSALBA CARRIERA (1675–1757)
*Portrait of a Man*, ca. 1710
Ivory, 3 × 2 ¼ in. (76 × 59 mm)
Rogers Fund, 1949 (49.122.2)

The influence of the Venetian artist Rosalba Carriera was widespread. The first to use ivory as a support for miniatures, she achieved effects of exceptional luminosity and brilliance. Although Carriera never visited England, she is included here because she painted many portraits that were carried home by English travelers on the grand tour. The sitter is unidentified. The bluing of the armor and its reflective quality are suggested with characteristic finesse.
CHRISTIAN FRIEDRICH ZINCKE
(1683/85–1767)
*Portrait of a Young Man*, ca. 1745
Enamel, 1 ¼ × 1 ½ in. (45 × 36 mm)
Bequest of Catherine D. Wentworth, 1948
(48.187.495)

The son of a German goldsmith, Zincke settled in England in his early twenties and studied enameling there with the Swedish master Charles Boit (1662–1727). Zincke employed the demanding technique of painting in vitreous glazes on copper for portraits seemingly from life. This lively image with its smooth, glossy surface is in a contemporary frame that could be original.

SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS (1723–1792)
*Anne Dashwood (1743–1830), Later Countess of Galloway*
Oil on canvas, 52 ½ × 46 ¼ in. (133.4 × 118.7 cm), with 7 ⅞ in. (18.1 cm) strip folded over the top stretcher bar
Signed and dated (right, above bas-relief):
Reynolds 1764 pinxit
Gift of Lillian S. Timken, 1950 (50.238.2)

Reynolds, the son of a schoolmaster, was born at Plympton, Devon. From 1740 until 1743 he was apprenticed to the painter Thomas Hudson (1701–1779) in London and afterward worked in the west country. In 1749 he departed for Italy and by April 1750 had settled for two years in Rome. Reynolds visited Naples, Florence, Bologna, Venice, and Paris, returning to London in 1753, shortly before his thirtieth birthday. By the late 1750s he was scheduling five or six sittings daily, including Sunday, had raised his rates by a multiple of five, and counted among his sitters the writer Dr. Samuel Johnson; Lady Caroline Fox, wife of the politician Henry Fox and daughter of the second duke of Richmond; and the prince of Wales, later George III. Reynolds moved to a large house in fashionable Leicester Fields in 1760 and that same year sent four portraits to London’s first major public exhibition at the Society of Artists. By then he was unquestionably the chief painter in London.

In December 1768 the Royal Academy was founded with Reynolds as president. In January of the following year he gave the first of his Discourses on Art (1769–90), and in April he was knighted. Reynolds traveled to Paris in 1768 and 1771, to the Netherlands in 1781, and to Brussels, Antwerp, and Ghent in 1785. He was honored abroad in 1775 with membership in the Florence Academy. After the publication in 1778 of the first Discourses, he also achieved recognition as a man of letters. He was named principal painter to George III in 1784 and, despite two strokes and diminishing sight, continued to exhibit as many as a dozen pictures annually at the Royal Academy until 1790.

Reynolds was a student of antique sculpture as well as of old-master painting, a
voracious and discerning collector (he owned Poussin’s *Blind Orion*, acc. no. 24.45.1), and a sometime picture dealer. He worked in various genres but, keenly practical and ambitious, he willingly both fed the demand and met the need for portraits, espousing a grand classicizing style enhanced with learned references to the art of the past as well as to the work of his contemporaries. He overcame an inadequate grasp of anatomy and perspective and a flawed technique, acknowledged both by himself and by many of his colleagues, with impetuous handling, sonorous color, and a profound understanding of Baroque composition and of the rhetorical possibilities of pose and gesture.

Almost without exception Reynolds’s clients came to his painting room at Leicester Square. He noted in a letter of 1777 that three sessions of about an hour and a half each were generally required for the face and observed that the rest could be completed without troubling the sitter. In such cases he used models and lay figures and occasionally borrowed jewelry and clothing. He is also known to have engaged the services of his assistants for the
secondary passages. Reynolds responded to the open expressions and ebullient behavior of children. When painting young women, he conveyed sensibility, elegance, and good breeding, and he affirmed male virtue in a style that is the visual equivalent of eloquent public oratory.

Anne Dashwood (p. 25) sat for Reynolds three times in the month before her marriage on June 13, 1764, to John Stewart, Lord Garlies, later seventh earl of Galloway. She was the eldest daughter of Sir James Dashwood, a wealthy landowner, bon vivant, and member of Parliament for Oxford, whose 1737 portrait by Enoch Seeman belongs to the Museum (acc. no. 56.190). Lord Garlies, also a member of Parliament, was a young widower, having lost his infant son and his wife of nine months a little more than a year before. The future countess of Galloway, by contrast, would bear eight sons and eight daughters in the course of a union that lasted more than forty years and would live to the great age of eighty-seven.

Reynolds presents Anne Dashwood in the traditional guise of a shepherdess, wearing an updated interpretation of Renaissance peasant costume, but with rubies, ribbons entwined with pearls, and a gold-trimmed gauze scarf. Her attributes are a crook and a spring nosegay of pinks and honeysuckle. The subject presupposes sheep. On June 13, 1859, Christie’s sold as lot 161 a fragment showing two lambs, said to have been cut from the landscape in this picture. The presence of a seven-inch strip of original canvas, now folded over at the top, supports the argument, because Reynolds would have been unlikely to miscalculate the central placement of the figure. However, the lambs are lost, and as this portrait was not engraved until 1863 nor exhibited until 1911, its original size and appearance will probably never be known. Even in its somewhat diminished state Miss Dashwood’s portrait is rich with allusion and mood. For the relief at the lower right, which depicts a nymph touched by an arrow held by a winged figure, Reynolds, who was famously learned, quotes a motif from the Medici Vase, a notable antique, of which he had made a careful drawing in Rome in 1750. The metal gray sky provides a foil for the sitter’s pastel costume and pale coloring (which is even paler than it was originally, on account of fading) and attracts the viewer’s attention to the delicate silhouette of her inclined head and to her deeply pensive expression.

About 1725 there came into vogue a genre favored by both the British aristocracy and the rising middle classes: the conversation piece. A conversation, as it was then called, was a group portrait of relatives or friends at home and at leisure, inside or outside, often enjoying the pleasures of country life. The genre evolved from Dutch cabinet pictures of the seventeenth century and from contemporary French painting. Conversation pieces were available for anyone who could afford them at relatively modest prices and were, in general, of medium size to accommodate standing figures twelve to fifteen inches high. Artists often began working on this scale in country towns, but many found the practice insufficiently profitable. Those who could moved on to London and to lifesize portraiture. Gainsborough began his career painting small whole-lengths and groups;
Reynolds did not, but he may, on the other hand, lay claim to what is arguably the largest of all eighteenth-century conversation pieces, *The Honorable Henry Fane with His Guardians, Inigo Jones and Charles Blair* (pp. 28–29).

Henry Fane was the younger of two sons of Thomas Fane, an attorney and clerk to the Society of Merchant Venturers of Bristol, who descended from the third son of the first earl of Westmorland. In 1757 Thomas Fane’s elder brother died, and in 1762 he consequently succeeded a distant cousin as the eighth earl. But even in the position to which the young Henry then rose, this painting presents a puzzle: while his father could anticipate being wealthy enough to have afforded such an immense canvas, a younger son should not have been important enough in dynastic terms to have been its subject. Reynolds had the triple portrait in hand in November 1761, and he recorded a payment of two hundred pounds in February 1766. During the same years Henry’s father and elder brother sat for Reynolds for standing full-lengths. These must have been dwarfed by comparison when, as in 1854, all three were displayed together at Apethorpe, the Westmorland family seat.

In this gathering of convivial gentlemen a subsidiary role is played by the older man, Inigo Jones, who rests his arm on the table,
SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS

The Honorable Henry Fane (1739–1802) with His Guardians, Inigo Jones and Charles Blair

Oil on canvas, 100 1/4 × 142 in. (254.6 × 360.7 cm)

Inscribed (bottom edge, beneath figures): INIGO · IONES · ESQ' · THE · HONble · HENRY · FANE · ESQ' · CHARLES · BLAIR · ESQ'·

Gift of Junius S. Morgan, 1887 (87.16)
bottle in hand. Fane and Jones, a relative of the celebrated architect, were neighbors in the country, at Fulbeck, in Lincolnshire. More nearly Fane’s equal in pictorial terms is Charles Blair, who wears a red coat and riding boots. Blair was reportedly married to Fane’s sister Mary. Henry Fane himself is silhouetted against an arbor, from which, rather incongruously, a sculpture of a male caryatid emerges above his head. His silver-gray embroidered coat, britches, and stockings are the lightest passage in tone and draw the viewer’s attention to his languid posture, while the corded neck of his greyhound invites comparison with his own muscular calves and well-turned ankles. Reynolds’s principal rival at the time was Francis Cotes (see p. 34), and their palettes here have much in common.

In 1782 Reynolds raised his prices for the seventh and final time, thereafter charging two hundred guineas for a full-length. He recorded an unusually large total of sixteen appointments between February 9 and April 10 of that year with Captain George Coussmaker (p. 32), plus two or more appointments for the captain’s horse. Coussmaker had joined the First Regiment of Foot Guards with the lowest commissioned rank of ensign and lieutenant in 1776, was promoted to captain and lieutenant colonel in 1778, and retired in 1795, never having seen active service. Reynolds shows a young man with a mild, inexpressive face. Coussmaker can be imagined in the artist’s studio leaning comfortably on a pedestal—replaced in the painting by the butt of the sawn-off tree limb. Vigorous Rubensian brushwork is combined with a pose so informal and relaxed as to have suggested comparison with Gainsborough’s style of the same date. The horse with its lowered head is very like the horse in Reynolds’s 1756 portrait of Captain Robert Orme (National Gallery, London), who as aide to General Braddock was wounded in the American Revolutionary War. (Orme’s portrait evidently was not commissioned, and the artist had displayed it in his gallery until 1777.) While painting Coussmaker, Reynolds was also occupied with a full-length of another officer who had fought in America, General Sir Banastre Tarleton (National Gallery, London), whom he showed in a dramatic pose amid the smoke and wind of the battlefield. Coussmaker’s likeness may be a good one, but by comparison with more authentically military subjects, the sitter’s self-satisfied look must not have fired the artist’s imagination.

Reynolds recorded the partial loss of sight in one eye in July 1789. In autumn 1790 he ceased to paint, and in February 1792 he died. Two more-or-less identical half-lengths representing the Honorable Mrs. Lewis Thomas Watson (see p. 33) are among his latest works. For the first, 105 pounds was paid in equal installments in March and July 1789, and for the second, the same amount in May and July of that year. As the earlier of the two was shown at the Royal Academy and mentioned in print on April 28, it was completed before the second was begun. In 1785 Mary Elizabeth Milles had married Watson, later second Baron Sondes, of Lees Court, Kent, and Rockingham Castle, Northampton. She was the only daughter and heiress of Richard Milles, of North Elmham, Norfolk, and Nackington, Kent, to whom the second version, probably the Museum’s, was delivered. She had been painted in the year of her marriage by Gainsborough.

The young and wealthy Mrs. Watson’s costume would have been a fashion statement. Dress for elegant Englishwomen had undergone a sea change in the early 1780s, when they adopted the fine white muslin chemise with a wide, falling collar first popularized in France by Marie-Antoinette. The softer, ampler, and more natural look was thought to have been enhanced, as here, by a
starched fichu and a skirt tuckd at the waist. Correspondingly, height was sacrificed to width in the dressing of a lady’s hair, which, frizzled and softly powdered, often supported an enormous beribboned hat—black was a popular accessory color—such as the one framing Mrs. Watson’s face. It seems likely that this modern style would have been favored by Reynolds, who had painted women in classically inspired white bedgowns long before white was de rigueur for ladies in society. For Marie-Antoinette’s portraitist, Élisabeth Vigée-Lebrun, as for Reynolds, Gainsborough, and their successors, young women in white dresses were eminently paintable.
Francis Cotes (1726–1770)  
Admiral Harry Paulet (1720–1794), Sixth Duke of Bolton  
Oil on canvas, 50 x 40 in. (127 x 101.6 cm)  
Bequest of Jacob Ruppert, 1939 (39.65.5)

Cotes, born in London, was the son of an apothecary and the brother of the miniaturist Samuel Cotes (1734–1818). Francis was apprenticed in his teens to George Knapp (1698–1778), with whom he studied both oil painting and drawing in crayons, as pastels were then called. Skilled in the materials and techniques of pastel and a fine colorist, Cotes was one of England’s most gifted practitioners of this intimate, spontaneous medium. He was well established by the early 1750s, commissioning and selling prints after his pastels of well-known sitters.

Late in the same decade Cotes began to paint more frequently in oils. From 1760 through 1768 he exhibited annually at the Society of Artists, where Sir Joshua Reynolds held sway. Cotes strove to compete with Reynolds (sometimes adopting Reynolds’s portrait formats), and by 1763 he was successful enough to lease a large house in fashionable Cavendish Square. In 1766–67 several members of the royal family sat for him, and in 1768 he was one of four petitioners who brought before George III the proposal—which the king promptly accepted—to establish the Royal Academy. Although Cotes’s sitters’ book has never been found, a 1768 bill indicates that his prices then were between those of Reynolds and Gainsborough. He had shown eighteen portraits at the first two Academy exhibits and was at the peak of his fame when, in 1770, he took a potion that, instead of curing him of kidney or gallstones, resulted in his death. Cotes was neither as inventive as Reynolds nor as intuitive as Gainsborough. However, his face painting is incisive, and he had a feeling for ornamental detail and the play of line as well as for color.

Ninety years ago, when British portraiture came into fashion here, his work had been forgotten; his reputation had suffered because of the many indifferent pictures then misattributed to him that flooded the market.

Although Cotes underpainted but never completed the face in the Museum’s canvas (opposite), the sitter must nevertheless have accepted his portrait because it descend subsequently to his granddaughter. Lord Harry Paulet, vice admiral of the White Fleet, was married a second time in April 1765 to Katharine, sister of the first earl of Lonsdale, and two months later, on the premature death of his brother, succeeded to the dukedom of Bolton. Either event might have occasioned the commission for the portrait, which on grounds of style is unlikely to be earlier than 1762. In that year James Watson’s engraving after Reynolds’s 1761 portrait of Rear Admiral George Brydges Rodney, which seems to have inspired the composition, was exhibited at the Society of Artists. Cotes’s imposing image reads well from a distance because of the dominance of bright colors and tone, which are carried over from his practice in pastel. Typical also is the legibility and fine detailing of the gold-braid–bedecked blue-and-ivory costume.

It is tempting to interpret Paulet’s air as one of pretension in light of his reputation among his contemporaries. In August 1733 he had entered the navy as a scholar at the academy at Portsmouth Dockyard. Promoted in 1740 to captain, he reached the rank of admiral of the White in 1775, but he had, meanwhile, been involved in various courts-martial and had been admonished for his conduct. His reputation was tarnished, and after 1755 he was assigned no further duty at sea, although he served as a member of Parliament. Paulet was unflatteringly depicted in the character of Captain Whipple in Tobias Smollett’s 1748 novel, The Adventures of Roderick Random. Thirty years later the writer Horace Walpole called him “a silly, brutal, proud man.”
Gainsborough was in London during the early 1740s, working with the French engraver Hubert Gravelot (1699–1773) and perhaps also assisting the painter Francis Hayman (1708–1776) in the decoration of the pavilions for the pleasure gardens at Vauxhall. English artists may be divided between those who came from or visited continental Europe and those who did not: while Gainsborough was one of the latter, from an early age he studied the French Rococo style and also the work of Jacob van Ruisdael and his seventeenth-century Dutch contemporaries. Had landscape painting been more profitable, Gainsborough would perhaps have made a career working only in that genre. Failing at this alternative, he returned to Sudbury from London in 1748 and then moved to Ipswich in search of a clientele for small full-length portraits. In the constantly changing society of the spa town of Bath, where he relocated in 1759, he achieved success as a painter of large portraits and, gaining access to distinguished private collections, came under the influence of the work of Sir Anthony van Dyck.

Gainsborough exhibited in London at the Society of Artists beginning in 1761 and was a founder-member of the Royal Academy. He finally moved permanently to London in 1774, settling with his family at Schomberg House in Pall Mall, where he lived until his death in 1788.

Although Gainsborough cannot have had much formal schooling, his letters are witty and cultivated, and he must have been possessed of great personal charm. Passionately interested in music, he was a good amateur performer. Gainsborough had a natural gift for drawing and painting and a highly sophisticated artistic education. He was a fine colorist with a fluid and assured technique.
and produced not only portraits and landscapes but also modern moral subjects. In sum, it was, and in general still is, acknowledged that he and Reynolds were the most gifted painters of late Georgian England.

During the Bath and London years Gainsborough’s eye for female beauty and capacity to capture it on canvas were legendary, as was his instinct for dealing with notable and notorious clients. Socially and professionally he was very up-to-date. He approached the painted fabric of his portraits as a seamless whole, worked quickly, and only rarely employed his nephew as a drapery painter. In an engaging letter written from Bath in 1771 Gainsborough outlined his views on sitters’ attire: “I am very well aware of the Objection to modern dresses in Pictures, that they are soon out of fashion & look awkward; but as that misfortune cannot be helped we must set it against the unlikelihood of fancied dresses taking away Likenesses, the principal beauty and intention of a Portrait.” His assertions can be tested against a much-admired whole-length of a woman in a modern dress shown at the Royal Academy in April 1778 (p. 36). Only members of the royal family and well-known public figures were customarily identified by name in the early Academy exhibition catalogues. However, the artist’s friend Henry Bate, editor of the London Morning Post, called this sitter “the beautiful Mrs. E.,” and his avidly curious readership knew her to be Grace Dalrymple Elliott.

In 1771 Miss Dalrymple, then said to be seventeen, entered into what soon proved an ill-fated union with a thirty-five-year-old physician, John Elliott, who by 1774 had sufficient evidence of her brief affair with Lord Valentia to apply to the various criminal and ecclesiastical courts and to the House of Lords for a divorce. All found in his favor, and in 1776 he obtained the divorce with damages. By then the newspapers were reporting on his former wife’s liaison with Lord Cholmondeley, who must have commissioned the portrait; not long thereafter the prince of Wales admired it on a visit to Houghton, Cholmondeley’s family seat, where it remained until sometime after 1885. Grace Elliott meanwhile had become one of London’s better-known demimondaines and the mother of a daughter fathered either by Cholmondeley or, as she claimed, by the prince himself.

Inspired by Van Dyck, Gainsborough demonstrated that the lifesize formal portrait afforded scope for invention. Grace Elliott’s yellow robe is of a color favored by both artists, and the format, in which the background is given over half and half to landscape and a rather blank architectural shell that supports the figure, is one the Flemish artist had earlier perfected. The sitter’s physical attributes reportedly included exceptional height and a very fair complexion. She displayed style rather than beauty as well as a seemingly artless sensuality. Gainsborough accentuates these traits, presenting her in reedlike three-quarter profile. She is “in powder,” her face painted in a feathery technique and her hair dressed artificially high in the style of the late 1770s. She is corseted—her tight, pointed bodice worn over a divided skirt, lavishly flounced and tasseled with gold and silver lace—but is without the awkward hooped panniers worn at court, although by then otherwise going out of fashion. Her torso and hips are partially shielded by her train, which is raised by a delicate hand in a gesture that suggests vulnerability. As the artist worked downward from the white face, the handling grew looser, terminating in folds of drapery, zigzags of ocher and yellow strokes applied over the brown ground.

Exhibits at the Royal Academy were intended for the public, and Gainsborough’s portrait of Grace Elliott was as famous as the lady herself in 1778. However, there are
many other portraits that were not exhibited within the lifetimes of either artist or sitter. A half-length canvas of Charles Rousseau Burney (above) first came to light only in 1930, when it was removed from the paneling of an old house at Woburn Sands and consigned by one of Burney’s descendants to Christie’s. C. R. Burney was the nephew, student, and son-in-law of the celebrated musicologist Dr. Charles Burney, whose eldest daughter he married in 1770. The diarist Fanny Burney, Madame d’Arblay, was his sister-in-law. Both C. R. Burney and his wife, Ester, who was two years his junior, were noted harpsichordists. Writing from his house in St. Martin’s Street, Leicester Square, in 1775, Dr. Burney reports that “we had all the great Volk here on Sunday to nothing but Harpd Lessons & duets,” and his daughter Fanny adds that the guest of honor was the Russian Count Orlov, lover of Catherine the Great, who “came to hear M’ Burney & my sister in a Duet before he left England.”

It is probable that artist and sitter were acquainted; given Gainsborough’s interest in music, they would in any event have had much in common. Burney’s expression is serious and intent, his brow slightly furrowed. He wears the lightly powdered hair and costume of about 1780 and displays a score, attribute of the musician and composer. The breezy fluency of handling is especially appropriate to Gainsborough’s characterization of this evidently gentle and agreeable man.
RICHARD COSWAY (1742–1821)

Self-Portrait, ca. 1775
Ivory, 2 × 1 ⅜ in. (50 × 42 mm)
Gift of Charlotte Guilford Muhlhofer, 1962 (62.49)

The precocious and gifted Cosway was among London’s most successful miniaturists from the early 1780s until the close of the Regency era (1820). He was admitted to the Royal Academy in 1771 and about 1786 was appointed miniature painter to the prince of Wales, later George IV. Cosway and his wife, Maria, were conspicuous figures in fashionable society. The contour of his powdered wig serves to draw attention to his fine profile. He wears a foppish brocaded coat embellished with ermine and lace.

RICHARD COSWAY

Portrait of a Woman, Said to Be Mrs. Bates, as Flora, ca. 1775
Ivory, diam. 1 ¾ in. (45 mm)
The Moses Lazarus Collection, Gift of Josephine and Sarah Lazarus, in memory of their father, 1888–95 (95.14.9)

Miniatures are subject to fading but this one, protected by the hinged lid of the gold box in which it is set, must look more or less as it did when it was painted. The sitter is perhaps the young concert singer Sarah Harrop Bates (1755–1811). The garland of pink and white flowers identifies her as Flora, the personification of spring. The composition is cleverly adapted to the circular format.
George Engleheart (1750/53–1829)
Mrs. Peter De Lancey (1720–1784),
probably painted December 23, 1783
Ivory, 1 3/8 x 1 1/8 in. (34 x 28 mm)
Fletcher Fund, 1938 (38.146.16)

Engleheart, who was of German descent, was employed in Joshua Reynolds’s studio and trained by making miniature copies of Reynolds’s portraits. During a career of forty years he painted nearly five thousand miniatures, working always to a high standard of quality. The sitter here, Elizabeth Colden De Lancey, was a native of New York whose father and brother-in-law had been lieutenant governors and British loyalists. This sober portrait may be the one mentioned in Engleheart’s sitters’ book on December 23, 1783; if so, it was painted in London nine months before Mrs. De Lancey’s death. She returned to her estate, Spring Hill, near Flushing, Long Island, where she died on September 22, 1784.

Angelica Kauffmann (1741–1807)
Edward Smith Stanley (1752–1834), Twelfth Earl of Derby, with His First Wife (Lady Elizabeth Hamilton, 1733–1797) and Their Son Edward (1775–1851)
Oil on canvas, 50 x 40 in. (127 x 101.6 cm)
Gift of Bernard M. Baruch, in memory of his wife, Annie Griffen Baruch, 1939 (39.189.2)

Kauffmann, the daughter of an itinerant Swiss painter-decorator, was born at Chur. A child prodigy, she accepted commissions for portraits while still in her teens. Between 1762 and 1766 she worked in Florence, Rome, Naples, and Venice and visited Paris before settling in London. Owing not only to her natural talent but also perhaps to the admiring following she had developed on the Continent—as well as to her skill as a linguist and her congeniality—she was an immediate success. A protégée of Reynolds, Kauffmann was one of two women honored in 1768 with founder membership in the Royal Academy. (The other was the still-life painter Mary Moser [1744–1819].) She worked with both Robert Adam and William Chambers, England’s most important Neoclassical architects, providing various designs for Adam’s interiors and in the late 1770s supplying four allegories for Chambers’s new rooms for the Royal Academy at Somerset House. The most popular and prolific exponent of Neoclassical history painting in England, Kauffmann exhibited there until the 1790s, long after she had settled in Rome, where she died in 1807.

In 1773, the year he came of age, Edward Stanley, heir to the earl of Derby, gave what Horace Walpole described as a very expensive party for Lady Elizabeth Hamilton. When in the following year they became engaged, Stanley staged an even more elaborate fancy-dress entertainment, to which the couple wore Van Dyck–style costumes. They were married on June 23, 1774, and their son, pictured here (opposite), was born on April 21, 1775. The marriage was not a happy one:
Shortly after Lord Derby, as he was by then, went to Winchester in 1778 to join the militia, his wife left him for the duke of Dorset. The three children of the marriage remained with their father, a divorce was never granted, and the countess became a chronic invalid, dying of tuberculosis in 1797. The Museum’s picture, one of two autograph variants, must date to late 1775 or 1776. It was probably commissioned by or given to Lady Derby’s mother, the duchess of Hamilton and Argyll, in whose husband’s family it descended.

Group portraiture is a demanding sub-genre. It is difficult to deploy a number of frontal or three-quarter faces and figures while keeping each face in view, and at the same time assigning each player an appropriate role in a carefully calculated scenario such
as this one. Kauffmann was experienced, but her portrait of the Derby family is not wholly successful beyond giving effective expression to dynastic considerations. The countess looks toward the viewer in a disconcertingly aloof and remote fashion, while the earl’s downward glance fails to encompass his child, a handsome Raphaelesque baby propped up on a cushion awkwardly suspended between two couches all’antica, upon which his parents sit. The countess’s draperies, embellished with seed pearls and gauze veils, allude to the antique and are also in the latest and most elegant fashion. The earl wears a splendid lace-collared-and-cuffed Van Dyck doublet in red slashed to blue over tight britches of the same hue. While the costumes may seem slightly outlandish, the portraiture, to judge by the young earl’s receding hairline and short stature, recorded in other likenesses, is honest enough. The canvas illustrates the degree to which the artist, obliged to work within the conventions dictated by her aristocratic patrons, substituted suavity for the direct, tough-minded naturalism of her earlier Continental style.

GEORGE ROMNEY (1734–1802)
Lady Elizabeth Hamilton (1753–1797), Countess of Derby
Oil on canvas, 90 x 40 in. (277 x 101.6 cm)
The Jules Bache Collection, 1949 (49.7.57)

Initially, Romney’s career followed a typical provincial course. Born in Lancashire, in the northwest of England, he left school at an early age to work with his father, a cabinetmaker. In 1755 he was indentured for two years to an itinerant portraitist, Christopher Steele (1733–1767), and afterward he established his own practice in Kendal, painting small full-lengths in the tight, neat style of his teacher. Romney moved to London in 1762, and from 1763 he exhibited annually, but in venues other than the Royal Academy, which he was never invited to join. Despite his apparent natural ability as a face painter, Romney had broader aspirations, as was indicated by the fact that his 1763 exhibit at the Society of Arts, which won a modest prize, depicted a subject from modern British history, The Death of General Wolfe (untraced). A long-standing interest in the antique and perhaps also a growing awareness of the inadequacy of his education led him to risk losing his established clientele to travel in Italy from 1773 until 1775. Thereafter his style as both painter and draftsman was marked by a new directness of attack and breadth of handling.

Upon his return to London, having leased an expensive house that had belonged to Francis Cotes, he became one of the city’s busiest, most successful portraitists, a position that, despite his misanthropic disposition, he maintained for twenty years. He is generally ranked third after Reynolds and Gainsborough among the portraitists of the late eighteenth century. He was more productive than either of them, and his prices, though lower, rose from fifteen guineas for a head and shoulders in 1776 to thirty-five in 1793. With the exception of that for the year 1785, Romney’s diaries from March 27, 1776, to December 31, 1795, survive. They indicate
that in the 1780s he sometimes had as many as six sittings on a weekday; he worked on Saturday and occasionally also on Sunday. From April 1 through July 18, 1788, for example, he did not take a day off, and given this staggering pace, it is not surprising that his work is uneven in quality.

Romney never abandoned his ambition to succeed in a realm other than that of portraiture. Emma Lyon, called Emma Hart, later the wife of Sir William Hamilton and the mistress of Lord Nelson, first visited his studio in 1781 with Romney’s friend the Honorable Charles Francis Greville (1749–1809). She became Romney’s muse. Various described as vivacious, audacious, and histrionic, she was the model for many of his mythological and allegorical subjects. These were as popular with
his contemporaries as they were early in this century with wealthy American collectors such as Henry Clay Frick. Since the 1930s, as for much of the nineteenth century, Romney has been out of favor, his pretty female faces judged vapid, his elegant draperies vacant. But there is no stronger advocate than success, and Romney was undoubtedly exceptionally gifted at capturing a likeness.

There are few more gracious and engaging society portraits than the canvas for which the countess of Derby first sat for Romney on November 27, 1776 (p. 45), shortly after he settled in Cavendish Square. In comparison with Angelica Kauffmann’s portrait (p. 43), this one is unpretentious; it might have been an engagement picture, so young does the sitter appear. In fact, Lady Derby was twenty-three, married two and a half years, and the mother of at least the one boy, then seventeen months old. She returned to Cavendish Square five times in the winter of 1777 and five more in the winter of 1778. By her last appearance, on May 4, 1778, she was preparing to abandon not only her husband but the formidable social role that she had briefly played.

Romney’s best portraits of women give comfort to the eye: he preferred quiet contours and plenty of smooth, softly modeled curves. He introduced the occasional pedestal and innumerable hats but omitted attributes of rank. Most of his sitters are in white, which must have been his preference as well as theirs, and few, if any, wear jewelry. His landscape settings, of a highly generalized, rather romantic nature, contribute to the atmosphere rather than to the iconography of his pictures. Here the surface has a silky liquidity, without any pentimenti visible to the naked eye, while Lady Derby’s pose and expression suggest a tranquillity of mind that she must not have possessed. Between 1774 and 1778 the countess was painted—alone or in a group—not only by Romney but by Reynolds (who had also portrayed her as a child in a wonderful costume piece now in the National Gallery, Washington, D.C.), by the German-born Johann Zoffany (1733–1810), and three times by Angelica Kauffmann. Reynolds’s portrait, exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1777 but now known only from a print of the same year, was destroyed by the earl, its unhappy owner. The Museum’s canvas may well have been abandoned in Romney’s studio, where it would have been available to John Dean, whose reproductive mezzotint was not published until August 24, 1780.

Although Romney’s style has been judged ill suited to the portrayal of men, there are exceptions, among which is a head-and-shoulders portrait (p. 48) traditionally thought to be that of Charles Francis Greville. Greville, younger brother of the second earl of Warwick, was a sometime politician and a friend of the artist. He is better known as the second of four lovers of the infamous Emma, who left her husband and Greville’s uncle, Sir William Hamilton, for Lord Nelson. Greville is the subject of an 1810 mezzotint by Henry Meyer (p. 48), who showed him with deep-set eyes under thick brows and a slightly hooked, more pointed nose. The print was evidently based on a Romney portrait that Greville himself, writing in 1788, reported having sent to Sir William Hamilton in Naples. Of the several versions, the most likely source is a canvas that descended in the Greville family until 1943. Our sitter, who is
not the same man and whose name we shall probably never know, is young, with a broader, less angular face. Either he wears a wig or his hair is neatly dressed and powdered to resemble one. His costume—a white linen shirt, cravat, and vest under a brown coat trimmed with gold braid and closed with gilt buttons—suggests a date of about 1780. The rather perfunctory treatment of the arms is typical of Romney’s work in this format. The mottled background suggests a darkening sky and gives this sympathetic portrait an elegiac tone.

Romney, fiercely competitive, indicated something of his own unforgiving character in his self-portraits. The best known is an unfinished three-quarter-length of 1782 in which he appears seated, with folded arms, furrowed brow, and tousled hair, challenging the viewer with a quizzical frown (National Portrait Gallery, London). In the 1780s he was still working at a furious pace and boasted that he had received both the influential politician Charles James Fox and the prince of Wales, later George IV, who would sit for him. However, by then his powers may already have been on the wane, as many of his portraits were delivered late or left unfinished. The Museum’s self-portrait (opposite), painted when the artist was sixty, seems to confirm that he was beset by the illness and depression that clouded his last years. His expression is furtive and unsettling. In 1799 Romney returned to the north of England, where he died in 1802.
GEORGE ROMNEY

Self-Portrait

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

Bequest of Maria DeWitt Jesup, from the
collection of her husband, Morris K. Jesup, 1914
(15.30.37)
JOHN HOPPNER (1758–1810)

Richard Humphreys, the Boxer

Oil on canvas, 55 ¼ × 44 ¼ in. (141.6 × 112.4 cm)
The Alfred N. Punnett Endowment Fund, 1953
(53.113)

Of Bavarian descent, Hoppner was born in London. When Hoppner was a choirboy in the Chapel Royal, George III noticed his ability with the pencil, and he was provided with an allowance and sent to live with the keeper of the king’s drawings. In 1775 the artist entered the Royal Academy Schools. He won the Academy’s silver medal for life drawing in 1778, began exhibiting there regularly in 1780, and two years later was awarded the gold medal for history painting. In 1781 he married Phoebe, the daughter of the American sculptress Patience Wright (1725–1786), and the young couple soon moved to Charles Street, St. James’s Square, a fashionable address. At first influenced by Zoffany, Hoppner made his mark with genre subjects. When he turned to portraits, he modeled his style on that of Reynolds. His maturing skills as a portraitist were shown to advantage in the likenesses of the king’s three youngest daughters that he exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1785 (Royal Collection). By the time he was elected to full membership in 1795, he had already been appointed principal painter to the prince of Wales, the future George IV. Hoppner was a devoted academician. He had a violent temper and as a writer could be harshly critical of his fellow artists, but his advice was much valued by students at the Academy Schools. In poor health from 1800, he died ten years later at fifty-one.

Hoppner’s work was tremendously popular in the late 1780s and 1790s, and he was thought by his many patrons, as well as by others among his contemporaries, to have been especially skilled in making a truthful portrait. Despite his early training as a draftsman, he favored color over design, and he was indebted for his broad brushwork and palette to the example of Venetian Renais-
sance painting. During much of his career, England was plagued by war and by political and economic turmoil—a period that he, unlike Lawrence, did not survive—and perhaps as a consequence his work is marked by a certain sobriety. It is not entirely clear why his reputation plummeted so quickly after his death, but he has unquestionably been ill served by the art market, as his supposed oeuvre is burdened with misattributions. He was a fine and occasionally gifted painter who is represented here by two works of exceptional quality and interest.

The annals of British boxing were marked in the late 1780s by the brief but glorious pugilistic career of Richard Humphreys (opposite), known for the distinction of his looks and manners as the “gentleman boxer.” On May 3, 1786, in the presence of the prince of Wales, the duke of York, the duc d’Orléans, members of the British public, and such of the French nobility as were then in England, Humphreys defeated Samuel Martin, the so-called Bath Butcher, at Newmarket. The price of admission was a guinea; some forty thousand pounds in bets is reported to have changed hands. The best-publicized match of Humphreys’s career was held at Odiham, Hampshire, on January 9, 1788, where he triumphed over his former pupil and friend Daniel Mendoza, winning four hundred guineas. In anticipation of this contest John Young’s mezzotint after the Museum’s painting was published jointly by painter and engraver on January 3. A print by Joseph Grozer after J. Einsle of the contenders in the ring at Odiham, which appeared in May 1788, shows Humphreys in the same characteristic pose. Further meetings between the two rivals—with Mendoza the victor—seem to have taken place at Stilton in 1789 and at Doncaster in 1790. It was reported that afterward Humphreys lived several years as a reputable coal merchant in the Strand.

This portrait belongs to the realm of eighteenth-century sport. The first of the boxing amphitheaters opened in Oxford Road, London, in 1743, and there a code of
rules was drawn up for the regulation of the ring. Later the principal establishment was the Fives Court in James Street, Haymarket, where professionals mingled with titled sportsmen. Boxing drew audiences from all classes of British society and for a century or more was as popular in the country as in town. The prince of Wales himself trained “with the gloves.” He was such an avid patron that years later three famous pugilists were among the guests he invited to his coronation.

Hoppner has taken account of Richard Humphreys’s distinctive guard in the ring: the young boxer leads with his right hand and stops with his left in a style that is said to have confused his opponents. He is naked to the waist with his fists clenched (gloves were not then worn) and neck muscles taut. Such a degree of nudity was rare in eighteenth-century portraiture, and as a demonstration of athleticism it would not, as has been pointed out, be inappropriate to compare it to the equine equivalent, the racehorse at full stretch. Humphreys is reported to have worn the fine flannel trousers, white silk stockings, and pumps with black ribbons that Hoppner depicts. He stands upon the turf before a darkening, turbulent sky, which sets off his fair, muscular figure. The unspecified setting takes the form of a grid of diagonals, which, together with the low horizon, tighten the focus on the boxer’s tense silhouette. The suppression of detail and the sweeping handling were perhaps calculated for ease of transfer to the reproductive print. The inscription on the mezzotint informed the buyers that Hoppner’s original painting was in the possession of Wilson Braddyll, the boxer’s manager and promoter, who certainly must have commissioned it. There is other evidence of the association between the two: Mrs. Braddyll sat for Hoppner for a portrait exhibited at the Royal Academy in spring 1788, and in the summer Braddyll stood as godfather to one of the Hoppner children.

Eight years later, probably in June 1796, Hoppner was at Knole, the ancestral home of the Sackvilles, to paint the children of the third duke of Dorset (opposite): three-year-old George John Frederick, Lord Middlesex (1793–1815); his older sister, Mary (1792–1864); and his younger sister, Elizabeth (1795–1870). Their father must have commissioned the picture, for which he paid 105 pounds, and the following spring it was exhibited at the Royal Academy under the title Portrait of a Nobleman’s Children. John Frederick Sackville, third duke of Dorset, the wealthy, extravagant ambassador to the French court on the eve of the Revolution, had been a notable rōé, and, in fact, it was he who had ruined the young countess of Derby (see p. 43). In 1790, when he finally married, he was in his mid-forties and already declining. Hoppner found him morbid, irascible, and a difficult partner at cards. His imperious young duchess held their largely silent children in tight control.

The painter, father of five, whose youngest son was the same age as Lady Elizabeth Sackville, was apparently undeterred by these circumstances. He had some experience with, and had shown a particular gift for, group portraits of siblings. In the Sackville heir’s commanding stance—which brings to mind Henry VIII of Holbein’s Whitehall mural (see p. 10)—and in the girls’ downcast
eyes Hoppner maps the familial and social roles of his sitters, despite which they are still most childlike and natural looking. The boy’s forthright stare and forward-thrust foot summon the viewer. His black pumps and bottle green jacket, into which his trousers are buttoned, are the dominant color accents. The comma-shaped strokes defining his hair together with the wiggly contours of his collar suggest an inquisitive, lively character. His sisters, whose roles are both literally and figuratively parenthetical, wear identical dresses of striped muslin white work. Nevertheless, Hoppner responds with the intuitive sympathy of a parent to the wistful Elizabeth, standing like a crane on one bare foot, her petticoat drooping.

Lord Middlesex’s pose illustrates the way in which the oeuvre of Reynolds functioned as a lens through which Hoppner perceived the old masters. In 1776 Sir Joshua had shown his portrait of John Crewe under the title Portrait of a Boy in the Character of Henry the Eighth at the annual exhibition of the Royal Academy. John Raphael Smith’s reproductive engraving in mezzotint (opposite) had been published on January 23, in advance of the opening. As a student at the Academy Schools Hoppner must certainly have seen both. Given his early association with the court, he may also have recalled Reynolds’s ultimate source, a copy by Remigius van Leemput after Holbein’s famous Whitehall mural of 1537. The copy of the mural, which had been destroyed by
fire in 1698, had been commissioned by Charles II in 1667. It was later engraved and has remained in the Royal Collection. Such an allusion would have been appropriate, as the Sackvilles were of ancient lineage and connected by marriage to Anne Boleyn, the second wife of Henry VIII and the mother of Queen Elizabeth I.

Readers of Victoria Sackville-West (particularly *Knole and the Sackvilles*, London, 1949) and visitors to Knole Park, the Sackvilles’ great Tudor mansion, know also that they are a romantic family whose weak bloodlines suffered the blows of primogeniture. George John Frederick Sackville was no exception. He succeeded to the dukedom of Dorset in 1799, when he was five; was educated at Harrow, where he was a schoolmate of Lord Byron, and matriculated at Oxford. At twenty-one, during a visit to Ireland, he went to Lord Powerscourt’s to hunt and was killed in a fall from his horse. His sister Mary, later countess of Plymouth and Countess Amherst, died childless in 1864. Elizabeth, Countess De La Warr, left Knole to her younger sons, one of whom was Sackville-West’s grandfather. The Hoppner portrait was sold from the house in 1929, in partial payment of succession duties upon the death of her father.
Beechey was born at Burford, near Oxford. He entered the Royal Academy Schools in 1772 and first exhibited at the Academy in 1776. His small-scale early portraits and conversation pieces betray the influence of Zoffany, while his later work owes much to Reynolds. In 1793 he was named portrait painter to Queen Charlotte. He was elected to full membership in the Academy in 1798 and knighted by George III. Later he was principal portrait painter to William IV. Beechey's career was distinguished by its length: with few exceptions he showed annually in London from 1776 until the year before his death. The patronage of the Hanoverian monarchs, while often a key to contemporary success, was, however, no guarantor of posthumous reputations, and Beechey, whose work was uneven, has been forgotten for more than a century.

From 1782 until 1787 Beechey abandoned the metropolis for Norwich, in Norfolk, where for a time he resided at 4 Market Place. The miniaturist Edward Miles (opposite), meanwhile, was established by 1782 at 7 Market Place. Their careers followed a parallel course. Miles had moved from Norfolk to London in 1771 and entered the Academy Schools in 1772. He exhibited at the Academy from 1775 to 1797. Beechey's portrait is signed, dated, and inscribed with the sitter's name and his age, thirty-two, and must therefore have been painted in Norwich between January 1 and October 13, 1785. Miles's later life was more exotic than Beechey's. From 1797 he was in St. Petersburg as court painter to Alexander I, emperor of Russia, and in 1807 he settled in Philadelphia, where he was a founding member of the American Society of Artists.

The miniaturist's expression, his double chin, hunched shoulders, and delicate hands suggest a mild character. The striped vest, crisp linen cravat and shirt frill, and large metal coat buttons are stylish, as is his loosely dressed and lightly powdered hair. The head, slender hands, and the coat collar, tie, and ruffle are closely observed.

Beechey was a year younger than Miles. They studied together and exhibited in the same venue. This sympathetic portrait and the circumstances of its painting suggest that they were friends. Perhaps Miles encouraged Beechey to set up a studio in his native Norfolk. Both were drawing masters and both enjoyed the patronage of the royal family during the subsequent period, as Miles was miniaturist to Queen Charlotte from 1794 until he went to Russia.
Raeburn was born at Stockbridge, just outside Edinburgh, where he spent nearly all his life and where he died. He is the only Scottish portrait painter represented in the collection (unfortunately, we have nothing by his gifted predecessor Allan Ramsay). Raeburn’s parents died when he was a child, but he was supported by his older brother and sent to a local school from 1765 until 1772. Thereafter he was indentured to a jeweler. It is thought that he was working as a painter by the late 1770s. In 1779 or 1780 he married Ann Leslie, a wealthy widow and mother of three who was eleven years his senior. By July 1784 he was preparing to leave her and their two sons for Rome, where he remained until spring 1786. Visits to London en route are also assumed. By late summer of 1787 he was settled in Edinburgh and painting the lord president of Scotland’s highest court, the Court of Session. Working first in his George Street studio and from 1798/99 at York Place, where his painting rooms are still preserved, he quickly established himself as the leading portraitist of the Scottish Enlightenment. Raeburn was elected to the Royal Academy in 1815; in the year before his death he was knighted by George IV and named king’s limner in Scotland.

Raeburn’s career is surprisingly little documented. He never trained for a sustained period with another artist and was largely self-taught, though his early work shows the influence of Reynolds. In contrast, however, to that of Reynolds, Raeburn’s approach to his sitters, like Ramsay’s before him, is disarmingly direct. He is engaged with their appearance under controlled lighting
conditions. As he had not received any instruction in academic draftsmanship, it is not surprising that Raeburn’s knowledge of anatomy was weak. He was very much more concerned with the character of his sitters than with grasping the disposition of their limbs. Raeburn, a natural painter, attacked the canvas directly: his modeling is broad, his shadows are bold, and he had a confident, intuitive understanding of painterly possibilities.

On April 23, 1793, Lucy Johnstone (opposite) married Richard Alexander Oswald of Auchencruive, in the county of Ayr. A couple of years later she was found to be suffering from pulmonary consumption and, having left Scotland for a warmer climate, died at Lisbon in 1798, when she was not much more than thirty. The style of Raeburn’s portrait of
Mrs. Oswald accords with his works of the early 1790s, suggesting a date consistent with what little is known of her life. Evidently, she was both beautiful and engaging. In a letter of May 1795 the Scottish poet Robert Burns called her “that incomparable woman”; he also honored her with the words to a song in which she is described as fair in form and true of heart. Raeburn’s portrait of Mrs. Oswald was still in the family house at Auchencruive when it was engraved by H. T. Ryall as an illustration to the second volume of The Works of Robert Burns, published in 1844.

In the portrait of Mrs. Oswald, as in a number of Raeburn’s of the time, the coloring of the hills, trees, and sky is limited to shades ranging from russet to pale amber. The background palette relates tonally to the slight flush of the sitter’s face and acts as a foil for her muslin dress. While her features and the soft clouds of her powdered hair are painted with smooth refinement, passages in the drapery are heavily worked in open patterns of almost pure white silhouetted against a brown ground, and the shadows cast by her ribbons and the book she holds are a rich chocolate brown. The sitter’s quiet mood, the dominant note of the picture, is enhanced by her downward glance, by the absence of contrasting local color, and by the luminous transparency of the woodland setting.

Given the place and time in which he lived, it is not surprising that Raeburn numbered among his sitters many older Scots of intellectual distinction in the fields of education, physical sciences, and law. They are often shown lifesize, seated in three-quarter view against a solid ground—which brings the figure forward and gives prominence to the face and hands. The sitter here, William Robertson (p. 59), was born on December 15, 1753. He was the eldest son of the clergyman and historian of the same name, who was for thirty-one years chancellor of the University of Edinburgh and who sat for Raeburn in 1792. The younger Robertson belonged from 1770 until 1799 to the Speculative Society, a debating club in which the members’ oratorical skills were honed at gatherings held every Friday during the meetings of the Court of Session. He 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 of the Church of Scotland. On November 14, 1805, just before his fifty-second birthday, William Robertson took his seat as a judge on the Scottish bench with the title Lord Robertson. He resigned in 1826 and died in 1835.

As Raeburn in general neither signed nor dated his pictures, it is fortunate that in this case an inscription on the reverse of the original canvas was recorded prior to relining: “Taken Hf Length July 05.” It was therefore painted after Robertson’s appointment but before he was seated on the bench. He seems well suited to his impending role, as his deep-set eyes and firm jawline suggest natural dignity and a forthright, determined character. The bewigged Robertson wears white bands with the gray-and-crimson gown of a lord of Session. (By the turn of the century in Scotland men wore their own hair, but the wig was compulsory for judges.) Dark colors grow darker with time, and it is probable that some parts of the picture were originally more legible. Even so, Raeburn would not have described the sitter’s black collar, britches, and hose or the fall of the skirt of his robe at the lower left with any degree of precision. Little can be seen of the ill-proportioned chair, which the artist left largely to the viewer’s imagination. In contrast, a sharp light illuminates wig and brow, throwing the sitter’s nose into relief while carving out the bony structure of the right side of his face with deep shadow. Raeburn attacks the drapery and ribbons with a flurry of varicolored strokes—red, salmon, white, and pure black—which suggest the dense textures, pliability, and brilliance of the materials. In the abstractions of his patterns as well as the sensuous qualities of his pigment, Raeburn was ahead of his time.

One of the great difficulties in group portraiture, whether of adults or children, is
to preserve a natural arrangement of the figures. In the case of the Drummond children (above), Raeburn was assisted by circumstance because George Drummond (1802–1851), shown here astride a fat pony, was at the time an only son. The pony is saddled and bridled but the child’s foot is loose from the stirrup. His face seems to betray a coy self-consciousness and an awareness of his own importance. His elevation with respect to the others, their upward glances, and the aureole of light around his head leave the viewer in no doubt as to the picture’s focus. Raeburn made changes to ensure the boy’s centrality: He widened the right sleeve to reduce the size of the highlight on the hip and eliminated some leaves that projected toward the center beside the jacket flap. The creamy paint has
become more transparent, so that the green now shines through. The deferential older boy has been called George’s foster brother. His body is hidden from shoulder to knees by the pony’s forelegs and neck; he may be leading the animal or holding it in check. The little girl is said to be George’s sister Margaret. Her dress hitched up over her trousers, her sunbonnet dangling from its ribbons, she plays her secondary part with spirited insouciance. The dense foliage, tree trunk, creeper, and rock are artfully arranged to support the composition.

George Drummond’s branch of the family was Scottish but settled primarily in England, where, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, his forebear had established the banking house of Drummonds of Charing Cross, London. His father, who was called Harley, lost both parents before he was five and succeeded to estates and wealth, which he shortly began to squander. In February 1801, just after his seventeenth birthday, Harley Drummond married Margo Munroe of Glasgow. She gave birth to George Harley Drummond, the subject of this picture, in February 1802, and as he appears to be six or seven, the portrait is usually dated 1808 or 1809. Harley Drummond left his wife by 1821, and the property not secured to George was sold by the time the boy reached his majority. George Drummond’s grandson, who sold the picture in 1925, identified the other sitters. It has been suggested that the Drummond children when young might have been reared in a related family, to which the older boy belonged.
ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON (1765–1835)
Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723–1792),
painted between 1786 and 1791
Ivory, 3 × 2 ½ in. (75 × 60 mm)
Bequest of Geraldine Winslow Goddard, 1923 (24.21)

Robertson, a Scot, was trained in Edinburgh until 1786 and then in London. The miniature was bequeathed to the Museum by his granddaughter, and therefore he must have brought it with him to New York when he emigrated in 1791. It is a copy of the 1773 self-portrait in doctoral robes that Reynolds painted after he was awarded an honorary Doctorate of Civil Law by the University of Oxford.

HENRY BONE (1755–1834), after Sir Thomas Lawrence
George IV (1762–1830) as Prince Regent
Enamel, 2 ½ × 2 in. (64 × 49 mm)
Signed (left): HB [monogram]; and dated in the inscription (reverse): 1816
Bequest of Collis P. Huntington, 1900 (26.168.61)

Bone specialized in enameled copies of old-master and contemporary paintings, which he exhibited regularly at the Royal Academy from 1781 until his death. The prince regent wears a black cravat with the red uniform jacket of a field marshal. Bone follows Lawrence in flattering the prince: he appears younger and thinner than in fact he was.

Opposite:
SIR THOMAS LAWRENCE (1769–1830)
Elizabeth Farren (ca. 1759–1829),
Later Countess of Derby
Oil on canvas, 94 × 57 ½ in. (238.8 × 146.1 cm)
Bequest of Edward S. Harkness, 1940 (50.135.5)
Lawrence was born in Bristol. At the age of ten he showed untutored skill in making pencil likenesses that won public notice. Shortly thereafter his family settled in Bath, where by 1783 he was accepting commissions for pastel portraits, charging the then considerable sum of three guineas each. While both his formal education and his instruction in the arts were largely neglected, he profited from the independent study of old-master paintings and prints (and was later to form a fine collection of old-master drawings). Lawrence moved to London in 1787 and there observed in a forthright letter to his mother: “To any but my own family I certainly should not say this; but, excepting Sir Joshua, for the painting of a head, I would risk my reputation with any painter [here].” His assessment was not ill founded. At twenty he was honored with a commission for a full-length portrait of Queen Charlotte (National Gallery, London), which, together with that of Elizabeth Farren (p. 65), he exhibited to acclaim at the Royal Academy in 1790.

In 1792 Lawrence succeeded Reynolds as principal painter to George III. He was elected to full membership in the Academy in 1794. Despite personal and financial reverses, his practice expanded continuously in the following years. At the behest of the prince regent, later George IV, his main patron from 1814, Lawrence, who was knighted in 1815, began work on a series of some twenty portraits of European heads of state, diplomats, and soldiers who had been allied with Britain in the defeat of Napoleon. He was thus established as the leading portraitist in Europe, and his term as president of the Royal Academy, to which he was elected in 1820, was also distinguished by success. When he died ten years later at sixty-one, he was buried with pomp in St. Paul’s Cathedral, the final exponent of a tradition reaching back to Sir Anthony van Dyck.

Lawrence was reportedly generous but thoughtless, hardworking but impulsive and disorganized, ambitious but so unbusinesslike as to have been at risk of bankruptcy. He trained no followers. While his natural gifts were exceptional and acclaim came easily and early, like so many other skilled portraitists he failed as a history painter. Although Lawrence had no practice in landscape, the outdoor settings for his portraits are accomplished, and he had a fine sense of both color and texture. Lawrence’s vivid, increasingly romantic portraits reflect his affinity with the theater and are characterized by flawless technique and an unstudied brilliance and fluidity of handling.

It is curious that the two most beautiful British women (see pp. 43, 45, 65) pictured in the Museum’s permanent collection were wives to the same man, the twelfth earl of Derby. Having refused a divorce to his first wife, Lord Derby suffered separation in silence while serving his country in Parliament and distracting himself at the race-course, the cockpit, and the theater. In 1777 Elizabeth Farren, a young Irishwoman of modest birth with a distinguished future as a comic actress, was introduced to the London stage in Oliver Goldsmith’s She Stoops to Conquer. Her career flourished from the start, while for more than a decade the earl escorted her from the theater, dined with her, and played cards under the watchful eye of her mother. When Miss Farren triumphed in the role of Lady Teazle in Richard Sheridan’s School for Scandal, the earl paid her the public compliment of naming a promising colt Sir Peter Teazle. As a three-year-old in 1787 the horse had a banner year, winning the Derby, which the earl had founded. Lord Derby’s estranged wife died on March 14, 1797, and in April, again in the role of Lady Teazle, Miss Farren gave her last performance. She was thirty-eight and Lord Derby was forty-five when they married in May. She gave birth to three children in quick succession, and they lived happily together until her death in 1829.

Lawrence’s portrait of Elizabeth Farren was shown at the Academy in 1790 under the title Portrait of an Actress. At the same exhibition Reynolds’s most important canvas, Portrait of Celebrated Figure—representing
the singer Mrs. Billington in the guise of Saint Cecilia (Beaverbrook Art Gallery, Fredericton, New Brunswick)—was found wanting in comparison. Sir Joshua was gracious in defeat. The press judged Lawrence’s picture natural, spirited, and engaging, and the public was pleased but Miss Farren—whose identity was immediately obvious—was not. She had expected to be shown in her private role and was offended by the use of the term “actress,”
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which, as Lawrence noted in his apology, was applicable to the lowliest stage performer. (Questionable morality was also implied, though her reputation was blameless.) The picture remained in the artist’s hands.

Lord Derby still meant to purchase the painting. However, in 1792 Elizabeth Farren objected on his behalf that the original price had been sixty guineas and refused Lawrence’s offer to sell at one hundred. Given the artist’s youth and the fact that at the time two hundred pounds was Reynolds’s highest fee, the argument was perhaps well founded, but the earl capitulated. After the portrait came into his possession, the sitter lamented that her friends thought she looked too thin and bent in the middle. Her appearance is well documented, as she was painted and drawn by various artists and frequently lampooned in the press: her face, nose, and neck were long, her shoulders and hips unfashionably narrow. Lawrence rather cleverly disguised certain of these traits, and the visual evidence suggests that he never took the canvas back to correct what owner or sitter perceived to be its defects.

The picture has been admired ever since it was first exhibited. Lawrence, an amateur orator and actor, brought to Elizabeth Farren’s likeness the implication of motion and speech and an awareness of the role of the viewer in the imagined dialogue. The slight torsion of her upper body and her sidelong glance suggest collusion between the observer and the observed. The saturated coloring of the landscape background and the low horizon line draw attention to her quirky pose and the delicate powdery hues reserved for her face and elegant figure. She advances toward, rather than occupying, the center of the picture field, her torso sharply foreshortened, as if seen near at hand and from below. Her skirt trails off the canvas in the foreground. The slight formal imbalance confers vitality, and the surface, too, is animated by the energetic and flexible handling of the medium—a combination of veils of transparent tone, highlights and details modeled in trails and globs of pigment, and raking strokes made with the bristles of a dry brush.

Lawrence is also represented in the collection by three late works, painted between 1823 and 1825, when he was at the zenith of his career. In July 1823, on the advice of the engraver F. C. Lewis, Mrs. Charles Biggs Calmady of Langdon Hall, Devon, brought her daughters Emily (1818–1906) and Laura Anne (1820–1894) to the artist’s Russell Square studio. Lewis had quite correctly suggested that if Lawrence saw them, he would
want to paint them on any terms. Although his regular charge then was 250 guineas, he asked 200; and when Mrs. Calmady still looked despairing, he suggested 150 pounds. He began work on a chalk drawing of the children the next morning. Between sittings he played with them, read to them, and sometimes entertained them at dinner. When the double
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portrait (p. 67) was finished, Lawrence declared it his best picture of the kind; and when he sent it to the Royal Academy in spring 1824, the critics joined him in praising its execution and sentiment. The following year he showed the canvas privately in Paris. Prints circulated widely in France as well as in England.

For all its naturalism the picture is highly sophisticated. It is curious that Lawrence’s contemporaries failed to notice that the composition, the pose of the younger girl, and the tondo format reveal the influence of both Michelangelo and Raphael. Its heightened emotive quality may owe something to Guido Reni. While the animation of early childhood is embodied in the smingly active Laura—her knees and elbow projecting from the swirling folds of her muslin dress—her pale sister, Emily, bears the weight of pre-Victorian sentiment. The glassy mauve shadows and the white pinpoints of light in the eyes are disturbingly artificial, while Lawrence’s facility betrays him also in the rather flaccid landscape. The picture is, however, unique in expressing the kinetic energy of the very young, which must be one of the reasons for its enduring popularity.

Elizabeth, Marchioness Conyngham, was the last favorite of the regent (see p. 64), who finally succeeded as George IV in 1820. Shrewd and venal but capable of kindliness, she triumphed at court in 1819 and was constantly at his side. In 1823 Lady Conyngham sat for Lawrence for a large canvas that hung in the king’s bedroom at St. James’s Palace. A portrait by Lawrence of her second son, Francis, was exhibited at the Royal Academy in the same year. Next in age was a daughter, Elizabeth, whose likeness he completed in 1824. Presumably neither the king nor the marchioness would have tolerated delay, and it is probable that the final work in the group, representing Lady Maria Conyngham (p. 69), was completed in that year or the following one, when it, too, was installed in the bedroom at St. James’s. Mother and daughters have fair skin and dark hair; all are shown in three-quarter-length, dressed in fashionable white. The fingers of Maria’s clasped hands are of disproportionate lengths but the cast shadows are accomplished, and the row of even white teeth between bowed, parted lips contributes to her vivid smile.

For much of his professional life Lawrence benefited from the patronage, friendship, and financial acumen of John Julius Angerstein, the collector and financier who founded Lloyd’s in its modern form. A half-length of Angerstein in retirement, painted not long after his eightieth birthday, belongs now to Lloyd’s and was among the artist’s exhibits at the 1816 Royal Academy. Some months after Angerstein’s death on January 22, 1823, George IV ordered a replica, and on December 3 Lawrence wrote the sitter’s son asking to borrow the original. This replica, which was paid for in 1824 but not delivered until 1828, was presented to London’s new National Gallery by William IV in 1836. It is reasonable to suppose that the canvas illustrated here (opposite) was painted between 1824 and 1828, perhaps for another member of the Angerstein family. The persuasive characterization and suave fluidity of handling suggest that it must be largely, if not wholly, autograph.

In March 1824 J. J. Angerstein’s entire collection of fifty-four old-master paintings, which had been amassed with the advice of Lawrence, was bought by the British government. Among the pictures secured for the nation were major works by Raphael, Sebastiano del Piombo, Rembrandt, Rubens, and Van Dyck; five Claude Lorrains; and six Hogarths constituting the series entitled Mariage à la Mode. Angerstein’s house in Pall Mall was leased from his executors, and the National Gallery opened its doors to the public on May 10, 1824. Six years later, when William IV succeeded to the throne and the future Queen Victoria celebrated her eleventh birthday, the Georgian era had entered its final decade.
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- Madame X (Madame Pierre Gautreau) (graphite on off-white wove paper, 1970.47) (1883–84), 15, 17
- Madame X (Madame Pierre Gautreau) (graphite on off-white wove paper, 31.43.2) (1883–84), 15, 56, 57
- Madame X (Madame Pierre Gautreau) (oil on canvas) (1883–84), 16, 17; detail, front cover
- Man and Pool, Florida (1917), 44, 47; detail, back cover
- Man with Red Drapery (after 1900), 58, 59
- Man Standing, Hands on Head (1890–1910), 30, 56
- Men Hauling Lifeboats onto Beach (1876), 10
- Moorish Buildings on a Cloudy Day (1879–80), 10, 11
- Mountain Stream (ca. 1912–14), 50, 52
- Mr. and Mrs. I. N. Phelps Stokes (1897), 25, 27, 57
- Mrs. Henry G. Marquand (1897), 25
- Mrs. Hugh Hammerly (1892), 22, 23, 60–61; detail, 3
- Oyster Gatherers of Cancale (1878), 10, 11
- Pater Sebastiani (ca. 1904–6), 36, 49; detail, inside back cover
- Palmettos (1917), 44, 47
- Paul Manship (January 30, 1921), 60
- Reapers Resting in a Wheat Field (1885), 18
- Rushing Brook (ca. 1904–11), 40, 41
- Schreckblom, Eiseem (1870), 6, 7
- Siesta on a Boat (1876), 10
- Sirnione (ca. 1913), 40, 41
- Sketch of Santa Sofia (1891), 34
- Spanish Fountain (1912), 50, 51
- Terrace at Vizcaya (1917), 44, 46
- Tommies Bathing (1918), 32, 33
- Two Girls with Parasols at Pladbury (1889), 20, 21
- Tyrolean Interior (1915), 36, 39, 50
- Venetian Canal (ca. 1913), 42
- Venetian Passageway (ca. 1905), 42, 43
- William M. Chase, N.A. (1902), 28
- The Wyndham Sisters: Lady Elcho, Mrs. Adeane, and Mrs. Tennant (1899), 23, 24, 25, 61
- Young Woman in Black Skirt (ca. 1880–82), 13

Sargent, Violet Ormond (photograph of) (ca. 1930), 56, 58

“Sargent’s Career as Seen Through the Metropolitan’s Collection,” 5–44

“Student Years in Paris and Early Career, 1874–1889,” 8–23


“Africa, Oceania, and the Americas,” Julie Jones, Eric P. Kjellgren, Alisa LaGamma, 70–73
cross, processional (Ethiopia, Tigray region, 1500), 70 housepost (Papua New Guinea, Ramu River, ca. 1930–40), 73.png
(Chile, Mapuche, early 20th cent.), 72
Rakotoannanana, Martin: mantle (lamba Mpanjaka; detail) (Madagascar [Jemsel], 1998), 72–73
trumpet (Mangbetu, Democratic Republic of the Congo [Uele region], early 20th cent.), 71

“Ancient World,” Joan Aruz, Seán Hemingway, Joan R. Mertens, Diana Craig Patch, Carlos A. Picón, 6–9
amphoriskos (two-handled jar) (Greek, Attic, end of 5th cen. a.C.), 8, 9
Andokides: black-figure amphora jar (Greek, Attic, ca. 540 B.C.), 8
bust, of bearded man, Roman (Antonine, ca. A.D. 150–175), 9

cometic box, decorated (Egyptian, Dyn. 26–early Ptolemaic Per.), 7

figure, female, standing (South Arabian, ca. 3rd–early 2nd millennium B.C.), 6
tave, in form of male genitals (East Greek, ca. 550 B.C.), 7

“Islam,” Stefano Carboni, Marie Lukens Sweitochowski, Daniel Walker, 10–13

Abb.-sfi, Shaft: Fowers, Butterflies, and Insects, Iran (Safavid per., dated 1059 A.H./A.D.), 12

bowl, lidded (pyxis) (Syria, 2nd half of 11th cen.), 10

box, writing cabinet (India [Mughal or Deccani], mid-17th cent.), 11

detail, 11

coat, with embroidered decoration (prob. northern Turkmenistan [Chodor or Yomud tribe], mid-19th cen. or earlier), 13

tile, with arabesque decoration (Turkey [Bursa], early 15th cent.), 10–11

“Asia,” Joyce Denney, Steven M. Kossak, Donald J. LaRocca, Denise Parry Leidy, Martin Lerner, J. Kenneth Moore, Miyeko Murase, Suzanne G. Valenstein, James C. Y. Watt, 74–83

Avalokiteshvara, four-armed, standing (Thai, pre-Angkor, style of Prakhan Chai, 8th–early 9th cen.), 83
box: lid, with incised figural decoration (India [Andhra Pradesh or West Bengal], ca. 3rd–4th cen.), 80–81; detail, 80; traveling (Chinese [Ming]), 77

Buddha, seated, and attendants, section from frieze (India, Uttar Pradesh, Mathura, Kushan per., ca. 2nd–3rd cen.), 80

Bunrin, Shochikawa: Li Bo s Visit to Mount Omei (one pair of six-fold screens) (Japanese [Meiji]), 79

cup, stem (Chinese [Tang]), 75
dish: Chinese (Northern Zhou), 75; with elephant surrounded by clouds (Vietnamese, 15–16th cen.), 82