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Abstract

This thesis examines the city of Rome as a primary context of British sociability and portrait identity during the period from 1740 to 1830. Part I considers the work of the portrait painter Pompeo Batoni. It examines the pictorial record of grand tourist sociability at Rome in the 1750s, questioning the complex articulation of nationality among British visitors, and the introduction of overt references to antiquity in the portraiture of Pompeo Batoni. It subsequently interrogates Batoni’s use of the partially nude Vatican Ariadne sculpture in five portraits of male grand tourists, dating from Charles John Crowle in 1762, to Thomas William Coke in 1774. Part II of this thesis considers the realities of viewing the sculpted body at Rome, recreating the studios of sculptors Christopher Hewetson and Antonio Canova. It posits the studio space as a locus of sociability for British visitors to Rome, drawing on the feminine gaze in the form of the early nineteenth-century writings of Charlotte Eaton and Lady Murray. The final chapter moves from the focus on British sitters to examine sculpture by Antonio Canova, framing it within a wider discourse of masculinity and propriety. The reception of Canova’s nude portrait sculpture of Napoleon Bonaparte and Pauline Borghese is considered as indicative of cultural anxieties stemming from new conceptions of gender.
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Introduction

I do not think that any body who has not been abroad can have an idea of how very much English people depend upon each other for society or how very intimate they grow.¹

From grand tour portraiture by Pompeo Batoni to nude portrait sculpture by Antonio Canova, this thesis will interrogate painted and sculpted portraiture within the context of its creation: the city of Rome. This geographical focus allows for a methodology which considers the portrait in the studio as an essential thread in the visual tapestry experienced by visitors to Rome. The process of commissioning portraiture was a crucial element of elite European sociability in the long eighteenth century, involving a complex process of viewing, commissioning, sitting, creation and display. At Rome, viewing activities could range from viewing artists' studios to viewing the most famous antiquities of the long eighteenth century. The portrait objects discussed in this thesis reveal how the sitter's engagement with classical sculpture, and subsequent articulation of that engagement in forming a visual presentation of the self, was a complex process which impacted on the institution of the grand tour, and the conceptualisation of the self as art. This thesis examines innovative trends in portraiture which occurred over the course of the second half of the long eighteenth century. Each of the four chronologically arranged chapters consists of a case study, dating from 1740 to 1830, and employs detailed visual analysis of the portraiture discussed.

The narrative which emerges from interrogation of these portrait objects argues for a more nuanced understanding of portraiture commissioned by visitors to the melting-pot of Rome, revealing the potential of portrait imagery as a source of information on cultural trends and national bias, and showcasing the importance of the portrait within the field of art history. This thesis interrogates the realities of the sitter's interaction with classical sculpture at Rome, the demands of sociability abroad, and the cultural concerns governing the act of commissioning portraiture. It offers a fresh perspective on portraiture which has not been fully unpacked by the scholarly community, positing the studio at Rome as a primary context of display which needs to be reassessed as an important locus of aesthetic engagement.

¹ Correspondence of Lady Louisa Conolly, Lady Sarah Napier and Emily Bunbury (née Napier, 1783-1832), National Library of Ireland, MS 40,242 (27), Accession No. 5348, Letter from Emily Napier to Anne, Calais, August 14th 1814.
Structure

This thesis examines painted and sculpted portraiture commissioned by visitors to Rome from 1740 to 1830, with a primary focus on visitors of British nationality. Structurally, the thesis is divided into four chapters in chronological order. Two chapters concerning painted portraiture by Pompeo Batoni are grouped together as Part I, and two chapters concerning sculpted portraiture, by sculptors Christopher Hewetson and Antonio Canova, comprise Part II. This division into parts facilitates the transition from painting to sculpture, while allowing a change in focus in Part II towards the female visitor to Rome, a figure which sheds light on networks of mixed-gender sociability which fell outside the traditional patron-artist relationship. Broadly speaking, Part I focuses on the male grand tourists whose self-fashioning and portrait commissions led to the creation and development of Batoni’s grand tour portraits from 1740 to 1775, while Part II concerns the sculpted portrait within the context of changes in sociability, viewing practices, and the articulation of gender identity from 1778 to 1830. A focus on the viewing of classical sculpture at Rome is evident throughout, as the social aspect of viewing activities is considered a key, and often overlooked, concept underlying the creation of portrait imagery.

The first three chapters will present the city of Rome as a key locus of British sociability and identity formation. This will allow for an investigation of how the British understanding of classical antiquity, and the impact of viewing sculpture at Rome, was integrated into the production of imagery showcasing a British portrait identity. In-depth case studies of both sculpted and painted portraiture will expose the extent to which British society at Rome in the second half of the long eighteenth century revolved around sculpture, sociability and the gaze. In the fourth and final chapter, the British reaction is placed into context through examination of more cosmopolitan sitters: Pauline Borghese and her brother, Napoleon Bonaparte. As members of the Bonaparte family, the self-fashioning of these sitters was a

---

2 By 'British' is meant English, Irish, Scottish and Welsh. This thesis employs the term 'British' as a collective noun, recognising the disparate cultural circumstances of travellers to Rome from the four nations of Britain, but considering that many of the sitters discussed in this thesis endeavoured to portray themselves as part of the 'English' elite. The term 'British' recognises this collective identity, while acknowledging that many of the figures under discussion were not English. Several scholars, including Irish scholar Sergio Benedetti, in *The Milltowns: A Family Reunion*, (National Gallery of Ireland 1997): 37, employ the term 'British' in conjunction with the term 'Irish', appreciating the constant rebellion which eventually resulted in the political separation of Ireland from Britain. Edgar Peters Bowron employs both terms in *Pompeo Batoni: A Complete Catalogue of his Paintings*, (Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, 2016), but indicates in his Preface that both groups would be titled 'milordi inglesi' at Rome. Given the focus of this thesis on the British and Irish at Rome, this thesis employs the term 'British' for both groups for the sake of brevity, unless further clarification is necessary.
matter of international interest in the early nineteenth century. By seeking not only to reference classical antiquity, but to mirror the portrait methodology of ancient Romans in matching veristic portrait heads with ideal bodies, the Bonapartes exposed the potential for impropriety and gender-based anxieties which complicated the British interaction with classical sculpted bodies.

Part I

In Part I of this thesis, Pompeo Batoni’s painted portraits of visitors to Rome will be established as nuanced and deliberate representations of the self, part of a wider process of self-fashioning which underpinned polite society. This idea of portrait imagery as complex in composition and meaning will then be applied to portraits which reference classical sculpture in an attempt to unpack further layers of meaning. The traditional approach to Batoni’s oeuvre of grand tourist portraits beyond the field of art history has been dismissive, with some historians employing his works as no more than illustrations. This thesis has benefitted greatly from the work of Anthony Clark and Edgar Peters Bowron, who published catalogues of Pompeo Batoni’s work in 1985 and 2016. Anthony Clark first argued for the re-assessment of the Italian school of painting in the 1970s, and was instrumental in bringing Pompeo Batoni to the attention of art historians. His catalogue of Batoni’s oeuvre was edited and published by Edgar Peters Bowron in 1985. Edgar Peters Bowron recently published his own catalogue of Batoni’s paintings, which has been referenced throughout this thesis as the most comprehensive catalogue of Pompeo Batoni’s work currently available.

---

3 The concept of self-fashioning is discussed below, p.19.
4 This is symptomatic of a wider trend, particularly with regard to grand tour studies by scholars based in disciplines other than art history and classics, for example, historian Jeremy Black includes the portrait of Lord Charlemont discussed in Chapter One of this thesis in Italy and the Grand Tour, (Yale University Press, 2003): 88, Fig. 23, apparently in reference to the sentence (p.88), 'An increasing number of tourists took longer voyages as part of their tour to Italy, although this number remained a distinct minority.'
7 Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, 2016, contains comprehensive publication and display histories for nearly all of the painted portraits discussed in this thesis.
Despite the widespread acknowledgement of the importance of Batoni’s portraits as art objects in their own right, and as primary sources of information on visitors to Rome in the second half of the long eighteenth century, there has been little in-depth or thematic-based scholarship focussed solely on his portraiture. The 2008 monograph *Pompeo Batoni: Prince of Painters in Eighteenth-Century Rome* by Edgar Peters Bowron and Peter Bjorn Kerber ably demonstrated the significance of Batoni's œuvre, from the range of his works to the social import of his sitters, who included royalty from across Europe. *Prince of Painters* attempts to treat Batoni's portraits as sources of cultural information. Although Bowron and Kerber note instances of portrait commissions inspired by friendships or familial relations, their focus is on achieving an overview by grouping Batoni's works according to subject matter.

The authors framed their understanding of Batoni's portraiture as an essential element of the self-fashioning of the tourist at Rome, particularly by the 1760s and 1770s, within a wider discussion focussing on Batoni's merits as a painter. They understandably did not have the scope to question the self-fashioning of the sitters whose portraits reveal the emergence of the pictorial formula which was varied and repeated to such great success by Batoni and his sitters. This formula, featuring the sitter in fine dress and depicted with a symbol either of the Roman landscape, or of the classical collections at Rome, was not unique to or invented by Batoni. However, it was popularised by him and his early sitters to the extent that his studio was visited by hundreds of British visitors to Rome over the course of his career.

Chapter One of this thesis, entitled *Identity Formation on the Grand Tour: the Pictorial Record of Grand Tourism at Rome, 1744-1755*, explores the pictorial record of grand tourism.
tourism in 1750s Rome, examining the earliest examples of a newly fashioned pictorial identity of the figure of the grand tourist, and caricature depicting collective British sociability at Rome. The chapter focuses on three sitters of Irish nationality whose commissioning activities were influential, serving to popularise Pompeo Batoni as a portrait painter, to record informal grand tourist sociability at Rome in caricature form, and to pioneer Batoni's use of a symbol of the classical Roman landscape within the portrait space. Tracing the development of Batoni's grand tourist formula reveals how the painted portrait could function as a complex and nuanced depiction of the self, referencing multiple aspects of the grand tour experience, and even, in the case of the portrait of Joseph Henry discussed in Chapter One, highlighting key character traits of the sitter.

The focus on sitters of Irish nationality substantiates the idea of Rome as a nexus of British sociability, in which life-long links were established which would have been socially or geographically unlikely in Britain. Through identifying Irish sitters as crucial in the development of a British pictorial identity subsequently employed by roughly 150 English sitters to Batoni, the importance of Rome as a locus for the articulation of British culture is established. The pictorial record of 1751 indicates that four-nation nationality could be a source of humour, not tension, among grand tourists, whose primary objective was to present themselves as the elite of England, or the British Empire. Through a combination of caricature, Batoni's portraits and written sources, the process of commissioning portraiture for these sitters is shown to have been part of self-fashioning as engaged with antiquity: a crucial element of British grand tourist sociability at Rome.

The portrait imagery examined in Chapter One was chosen because of the actions of the sitter, for example, a demonstrable interest in self-fashioning or viewing antiquity. This approach is commonly employed among those art historians who have considered Batoni's portraits in detail, in particular Anthony Clark, Edgar Peters Bowron, Peter Bjorn Kerber, Christopher M.S. Johns and Michael Yonan, who all tend to ascribe value to a portrait, and

---

13 In order, the sitters are: Joseph Leeson, (1711-83), created Baron Russborough in 1756, Viscount Russborough in 1760 and Earl of Milltown in 1763; Joseph Henry, 1727-96, 2nd son of Hugh Henry of Lodge Park, Straffan, County Kildare; James Caulfield (sometimes Caulfeild, 1728-99), succeeded his father as the 4th Viscount of Charlemont in 1734, created the Earl of Charlemont in 1763.

14 Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, Preface.

15 This is not to suggest that nationalistic tensions should not be examined: this thesis engages with several Irish grand tourists but does not focus solely on Irish grand tourism. For Scottish grand tourists, see Viccy Coltman, forthcoming, Scots in Europe: Later Eighteenth-Century Portraiture and the Grand Tour.
the detail of its composition, based on the identity of the sitter.\textsuperscript{16} This methodology, although useful, results in a hierarchy of portraiture, where it is assumed that only the portraits of the most important or unique sitters can sustain in-depth analysis of every detail.

The assumption, which is logical given the degree of repetition in Batoni's works, is that some sitters simply requested a portrait and did not trouble themselves with the meaning or impact of any additional detail beyond pose and dress. This is likely true to an extent, but when framed within the context of viewing Rome, is here argued to be accurate in far fewer portraits than is generally assumed. In the years before Batoni became fashionable, portraits of his early sitters can be assumed to be a result of detailed dialogue between painter and sitter. Once a Batoni portrait had become a desired symbol of British grand tourism, those portraits which engaged with the physical materials of Rome, for example in the form of sculpture, can still be assumed to hold personal meaning to the sitter, demonstrating their learning and taste at a minimum. The unrealised value of interrogating Batoni's specific use of antiquity is argued in Chapter Two of this thesis, which reveals the significant use of one classical sculpture across a variety of portraits and sitters.

Chapter Two is entitled \textit{The Allure of the Antique: Pompeo Batoni and the Vatican Ariadne in Grand Tour Portraiture, 1760-1775}. Having established the grand tour portrait by Batoni as a source of social information on British visitors to Rome, this chapter moves to pin down the intricacies of the male grand tourist gaze, questioning the propriety of viewing classical sculpture by examining Batoni's use of the \textit{Vatican Ariadne}. The sculpture appeared in five different portraits by Batoni.\textsuperscript{17} The \textit{Vatican Ariadne} was a source of debate in terms of its characterisation, the preferred option being Cleopatra, and in depicting an unconscious mortal woman, offered a different viewing experience to the fully aware divine nudity of the \textit{Medici Venus}. The chapter argues for a reading of the sculpture as a visual shorthand, adding layers of meaning to the portrait which were only accessible to grand tourist viewers, with the potential to reference not only a collective viewing experience, but also the sexual liberties of travel. This is an innovative argument which pushes the boundaries of existing scholarship on the meaning of antiquity within the portrait, with particular reference to the

\textsuperscript{16} In 1982 Bowron commented that Batoni's varied use of antiquity '...surely suggests that Batoni's approach to antiquity was more thoughtful than has been suggested.' See Bowron, ed., \textit{Pompeo Batoni and his British Patrons}, 15. This comment inspired Christopher M.S. Johns to write his article "Portraiture and the Making of Cultural Identity", \textit{Art History}, (1st June, 2004).

\textsuperscript{17} The portraits which include a version of the \textit{Vatican Ariadne} are: Charles John Crowle (1761-2), Thomas Dundas, later 1st Baron Dundas (1764), William Weddell (1765-6), Count Kirill Grigorjewitsch Razumovsky (1766), and Thomas William Coke, later 1st Earl of Leicester of the Second Creation (1774).
grand tour portrait, and is predicated on an approach which frames detailed discussion of the portrait within an investigation of the realities of viewing classical sculpture during the heyday of male sociability on the grand tour.

The idea of considering the materiality of the sculpted object within the space of the painted portrait is inspired by the work of Michael Yonan, who has argued persuasively for the benefits of an inter-disciplinary methodology, bringing together art history and material culture studies. The use of sustained visual analysis is commonly employed in relation to classical sculpture within the field of classical studies, where secondary sources are lacking. Yonan applied this methodology, also employed in material culture studies, to a discussion of a portrait by Pompeo Batoni. His approach resulted in new revelations about the imagery, suggesting that the self-fashioning of the royal sitters was deliberately curtailed by Empress Maria Theresa by changing the identity of the sculpture within her copy of the portrait. Part I of this thesis takes Yonan's methodology further, arguing for detailed visual analysis to be employed in relation to the majority of Batoni's portraits, particularly those discussed in Chapter Two which reference classical antiquity in an innovative way, regardless of the importance of the sitter.

Part II

Part II of this thesis will build on the idea of recreating the experience of British engagement with art, in order to establish the studio space as a key element of the viewing experience at Rome, and a primary display context of portraiture. Through examination of written sources by visitors to Rome in the early nineteenth century, particularly Lady Murray and Charlotte Eaton, whose accounts of viewing Rome have largely been overlooked in the existing scholarship, the studio will be investigated as a space for contemporary debate, revealing broader social concerns and conceptualisations of gender. Although cultural change

19 Michael Yonan, "Pompeo Batoni Between Rome and Vienna", *Source: Notes in the History of Art*, Vol. 26, (No. 2, Winter 2007, 32-37). The portrait in question is Pompeo Batoni’s *Holy Roman Emperor Joseph II and Grand Duke Leopold of Tuscany in Rome*, 1769, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, discussed in Chapter Two [Fig. 2.3].
20 Yonan, "Pompeo Batoni Between Rome and Vienna", 35.
21 Charlotte Anne Eaton, *Rome in the Nineteenth Century*: containing a complete account of the ruins of the ancient city, the remains of the middle ages, and the monuments of modern times. With remarks on the fine arts, on the state of society, and on the religious ceremonies, manners, and customs of the modern Romans. In a series of letters, written during a residence at Rome in 1817 and 1818,
affected both men and women, for women, publishing their travel accounts amounted to a public act of self-fashioning comparable to the commissioning of a portrait. Their accounts reveal in great detail their engagement with sculpture and experience of mixed-gender sociability at Rome. The chapter explores how conflicting ideas of gendered bodies, acted out in the reception of nude sculpture by Antonio Canova, shed light on how classical sculpture was stripped of much of the historicism which protected it from publicly experiencing prurience. For the majority of the long eighteenth century, the potential impropriety of viewing nude classical sculpture was internalised as part of the male grand tourist viewing experience, and cloaked in scholarly language where disseminated in print or cast form. The methodology employed in Part I demonstrates how in-depth analysis of portraiture can shed new light on the realities of self-fashioning at Rome in the second half of the long eighteenth century. Part of the reality which emerges in Part II reveals the complex biases underpinning the engagement of British visitors with classical sculpture, particularly during the transition from predominantly male to mixed sociability which occurred in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Chapter Three of this thesis, entitled Sociability in the Sculptor's Studio: Christopher Hewetson, Antonio Canova and the Roman Studio, 1778-1830, moves to reconsider the social geography of Rome, emphasising the sculptor's studio as an area of significance for British sociability. The studio space is investigated not only as a site of the production of portrait imagery, but also as a context of display. By applying detailed visual analysis in an investigation of the works of Irish sculptor Christopher Hewetson, it is argued that for this sculptor, the studio acted as the primary display context of his portrait busts. The recent discovery of an inventory of Hewetson's studio contents allows for the recreation of his studio in an unprecedented manner, revealing a variety of works. This variety suggests a higher volume of visitors to the studio than has previously been appreciated, revealing a viewing public of non-patrons who did not commission works. The chapter investigates broader changes in the demographics of visitors to Rome and the ways in which this popularised particular methodologies of viewing classical sculpture, suggesting that viewing sculpture in the studio underwent a similar transition. It engages with the sociability of visitors to Rome of multiple levels of social status, and the emergence of the feminine voice

in travel literature. The studio of Antonio Canova became a key part of viewing Rome during this period, and was redesigned to facilitate large numbers of visitors. This chapter argues that the figure of the artist-guide began to supersede the traditional dealer-guide, as the way in which visitors interacted with sculpture, both classical and contemporary, began to change.

Employing sustained visual analysis in the discussion of portrait busts is an unusual technique. Portrait sculpture as a genre is generally considered in less detail than monumental works, which have benefitted from excellent scholarship which placed them in the context of theatrical narrative. The portrait bust was often assumed to be placed at a height and not viewed in detail in a domestic display context. Yet in the 1790s, the decrease in visitors to Rome owing to the invasion of Italy by the French meant that the bust was often a sculptor's primary source of income. This chapter offers an explanation for Christopher Hewetson's habitual use of minute detail in his portrait busts, which emerges on picturing his studio contents as a whole: his portrait busts functioned to advertise his skills and enhance the experience of viewing his studio. At the turn of the century, owing to increased interest in activities such as viewing by torchlight, and the popularity of Johann Joachim Winckelmann's art historical theories, visitors to Rome were accustomed to inspecting artworks in detail.

The fourth and final chapter of the thesis diverges from the previous focus on British self-fashioning at Rome, yet builds on the idea explored in Chapter Three of the studio as a key aspect of the social geography of Rome, particularly for those visitors who fell outside the traditional eighteenth-century model discussed in Part I, of performing patronage through artistic commissions. Entitled Nineteenth-Century Portrait Nudity: The Reception of Antonio Canova's Venus and Napoleon, 1803-1822, the chapter explores the creation and reception of the Napoleon as Mars the Peacemaker, and the Pauline Borghese as Venus Venetrix by Antonio Canova. This chapter moves to recognise a new genre of portrait sculpture largely neglected by scholars: the full-length nude portrait sculpture of a living sitter. As will be noted in Part I of this thesis, referencing classical sculpture offered a way to self-fashion as engaged with antiquity, however, its impact on the viewer needed to be carefully controlled.

24 For example, Malcom Baker and David Bindman, Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-Century Monument: Sculpture as Theatre, (The Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, Yale University Press, 1995).
25 In the 1790s, tourism to Italy declined drastically owing to the invasion of Italy by France in September 1792, making Italy unsafe, while travelling in France was considered akin to funding the enemy by British citizens. This also impacted on patronage by travellers at Rome, as large commissions sent by ship to Britain risked capture.
In creating portrait sculpture which relied on contemporary understanding of classical sculptural norms, Canova inadvertently exposed his work to an ongoing debate on classical sculpture which was normally curtailed by the historicism and usefulness of classical sculpture as objects of taste.

The chapter posits counter-arguments to Christopher M.S Johns' work, *Antonio Canova and the Politics of Patronage in Revolutionary and Napoleonic Europe*, which employs more of an historical than an art historical approach, with a focus on pinning down the political opinions of the sculptor through his acceptance and refusal of particular commissions.26 One lynchpin of Johns' argument is that Canova's depiction of Napoleon Bonaparte as nude was deliberately subversive. In Chapter Four, the reception of the *Napoleon as Mars the Peacemaker* is placed into a broader discourse of sociability in the studio in order to suggest that subversion would be extremely difficult, given the contemporary status of Canova's studio, as a viewing experience on par with the Vatican.

The reception of Canova's sculpted bodies, both portrait and non-portrait, is reframed in light of a wider discourse of gendered aesthetics and the changing British and French conceptualisation of masculinity at the turn of the century. The transmutability of marble into flesh, an idea prevalent in the eighteenth-century artistic and literary record, was invoked by the actions of Pauline Borghese, who played on the eroticism of her portrait sculpture. Building on the work of Chloe Chard in understanding the gendered appreciation of art and the female performance of antiquity, this chapter examines the most daring examples of the conflation of antiquity and portraiture created at Rome in the early nineteenth century.27

**Explanation of Key Concepts and Overview of Scholarship**

Throughout this thesis there are several key concepts which are employed regularly. Perhaps the most central concepts are self-fashioning and sociability. 'Self-fashioning' is a term which is employed in multiple fields of scholarship, most notably by Stephen Greenblatt in
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his 1980 examination of Renaissance literature, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Greenblatt noted that from the sixteenth century onwards,

...self-fashioning acquires a range of new meanings: it describes the practice of parents and teachers; it is linked to manners or demeanour, particularly that of the elite; it may suggest hypocrisy or deception, an adherence to mere outward ceremony; it suggests representation of one's nature or intention in speech or actions.28

Here, the term self-fashioning is employed in relation to the manners or activities of the elite, for whom self-fashioning formed an important impetus underlying the creation of portrait imagery, much of which is now considered symbolic of the institution of the grand tour itself. Framed within a context of viewing as part of elite life, at musical events, ruins, galleries and so on, the portrait becomes one element of a broader impetus to self-fashion which governed many aspects of eighteenth-century life. Other elements ranged from appropriate dress to the ability to carry on conversations about politics, current events or art. In fashioning a portrait of the self, multiple elements could be referenced simultaneously, creating an image of the sitter as a societal ideal. For visitors to Rome, the act of editing and publishing travel accounts was not dissimilar to the act of commissioning a portrait, in the way it curated or crafted a particular impression of the writer based on its contents.

The concepts of self-fashioning and of sociability are not dissimilar: both involve the performance of certain social customs or characteristics which formed part of polite sensibility in the long eighteenth century.29 Thomas Ahnert and Susan Manning have discussed the intersections between the self, character, and sociability in relation to eighteenth-century Scottish literary and intellectual debate, writing,

As it was discussed in Scotland in the mid-eighteenth century, sociability was the dynamic interaction between self-as-represented and self-as-read; it was performative and critical. If sociability was the projection of self, it was also essential to self-formation. A central question, therefore, was how personal emotions—sentiments, judgments, intentions—might be communicated clearly from one person to another so that natural sensibility could be educated into a sociable and ethical response.30

29 The concept of politeness has been employed by scholars of different disciplines within varied arguments: for an overview see Lawrence E. Klein, "Politeness and the Interpretation of the British Eighteenth Century", *The Historical Journal* 45, (No. 4, 2002): 869-98.
As Viccy Coltman noted in the same volume, the painted portrait of David Hume by Allan Ramsay involved a conflict between the inner and outer self, the noble character and the ignoble appearance famously lampooned by James Caulfield, Lord Charlemont, who is discussed in Chapter One of this thesis. In portraiture commissioned at Rome which borrowed from classical antiquity, the performance of aesthetic judgement, the presentation of the self, the formation of a pictorial identity manifesting the presumed characteristics of the educated traveller, the sociability surrounding viewing activities at Rome: all of these elements were to be distilled into a symbol of the self.

In this thesis, sociability as a term is used to reference conscious self-fashioning in social behaviour and viewing activities, which was portrayed in idealised form in Batoni portraits. While the Batoni portraits discussed in Part I of this thesis tended to reference predominantly male sociability, the sculpted portraiture and published travel accounts explored in Part II are considered as part of changes to the social geography of Rome which rendered spaces like the studio ideal for more diverse forms of sociability, including the enactment of female artistic judgement as described in the journal of Lady Murray. This artistic judgement differed from the previous engagement of both genders with sculpture, in terms of it stemming from an increase in Romantic sensibility, but for women, manifested in written rather than verbal form owing to a cultural tradition of viewing women as less intelligent (or educated) than men, and therefore unable to form independent judgements.

For both male and female visitors to Rome, sociability among peers of their own gender differed from mixed-gender sociability. If the male grand tourists discussed in Chapter One returned to Rome at the turn of the century, they would have found that studios and public collections of sculpture had become sites of mixed sociability, and their favourite statues now sported fig leaves as a result. As Charlotte Eaton noted in an anecdote discussed in Chapter Three, female visitors to Rome deferred to the judgment of male grand tourists in public. Yet Eaton, and others like her, self-fashioned as learned arbiters of classical taste through another medium: the privately printed travel journal.

Self-fashioning could take many forms, as Greenblatt noted. The grand tour constituted a ritualised programme of travel across Western Europe which saw Rome, as the historical capital of the ancient Roman Empire, gain a place in the eighteenth-century imagination as the pinnacle of the classical viewing experience. In 1996, Ian Jenkins and Kim Sloan
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published *Vases and Volcanoes: Sir William Hamilton and his Collection*, which re-engaged with the concept of the British collector of antiquity in Italy, proving it more complicated than the simple appropriation of artefacts. The book marked a new surge in studies over a twenty year period, from overviews of the grand tour as a cultural phenomenon by Jeremy Black and Rosemary Sweet, to John Brewer’s highlighting of consumerism in eighteenth-century Britain. The early modern reception of classical sculpture was explored by classical scholars like Michael Squire and Simon Goldhill, whose inter-disciplinary approaches shed new light on eighteenth and nineteenth-century engagement with antiquity.

A focus on the role of collecting as part of the eighteenth-century fashioning of elite identity led to new studies on the collection of antiquity, and increased appreciation of the grand tour as culturally informative, for example, *The English Prize: The Capture of the Westmorland- An Episode of the Grand Tour* provided a fascinating snapshot of grand tourist purchases. Exhibitions such as *Grand Tour: The Lure of Italy in the Eighteenth Century*, focused on the purchase and transport of art. In *Fabricating the Antique: Neoclassicism in Britain, 1760-1800*, Viccy Coltman argued for the presentation of such collections in Britain as an important facet of self-fashioning. A few studies moved to engage with the realities and materiality of commissioning art abroad, for example, *The Lustrous Trade: Material Culture and the History of Sculpture in England and Italy, c.1700-c.1860*, offered essays exploring the sculpture market in Italy. The majority of these studies provide insight into the phenomenon of the grand tour across Western Europe, or the way in which commissioning and collecting were part of self-fashioning. Portraiture is most often discussed within the context of a wider collection, or as part of a study focused on the itineraries of specific travellers.

This thesis investigates portraiture based on the way in which its creation or reception reflected innovative trends at Rome, which were reflective of broader social change. The methodological approach is inspired by Rosie Dias in *Exhibiting Englishness: John Boydell's Shakespeare Gallery and the Formation of a National Aesthetic*, in which the reception of the paintings commissioned for John Boydell's Shakespeare Gallery in London, particularly the 1789 *Death of Cardinal Beaufort* by Joshua Reynolds, is considered as part of a cultural backlash against the traditional dependence of the Royal Academy on foreign techniques. Dias treats the composition of the painting as significant, with the potential to be read differently, or received differently, to the original intentions of the artist, a useful concept in the consideration of the early nineteenth-century reception of Antonio Canova's sculpture. It also opens up an interesting debate on the extent to which layers of meaning could be imbedded in painted imagery. Dias' work highlights the existence of a late eighteenth-century viewing public which was highly influential as to the contemporary reception of each work, and even as to which works should be viewed at all, yet who achieved this through the medium of printed criticism, not through the traditional methods of patronage. The resultant shift in the process of reputation-making as increasingly dependent on broader cultural trends is also seen at Rome in Part II of this thesis, as the studio became a locus of aesthetic debate.

The chronological parameters of this thesis span the second half of the long eighteenth century, during which period the concept of the grand tour was constantly in flux. The eighteenth-century British grand tour had its cultural roots in seventeenth-century ideas of travel as building on a classical education, which focussed heavily on classical literature. In both art and literature, the focus was on historical, biblical or moral narratives which led to improvement of character and an understanding of virtue. English society inculcated young men with the idea that the British Empire had as its nearest precedent the Republican period of the ancient Roman Empire. By the 1750s, the priorities of many undertaking the grand tour had shifted. The social benefits of travel in an increasingly consumer-driven society began to outweigh the original tenets of the grand tour.

Throughout this thesis, the use of the term 'elite' is employed as a shorthand for those travellers who were wealthy enough to take a grand tour, and whose potential future earnings
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40 See Chapter Four.
41 This concept is discussed in Chapter Two.
and status would be affected by their ability to perform at the highest levels of society.\textsuperscript{43} Appearances, often cemented by the successful collecting and commissioning of art, were central to the social and political aims of British grand tourists, not all of whom were peers of the realm. These grand tourists are to be distinguished from the community of artists and architects who undertook a grand tour for more practical and pecuniary reasons and were often funded by art academy prizes or patrons. Completing a grand tour became a crucial element of elite British culture, furthering the social ambitions of the travellers, and serving to publicly reconcile their social status with the visible attainment of qualities and knowledge commensurate with that status.

The increasing importance of being seen to be educated over the course of the long eighteenth century was noted by historian Linda Colley in her monograph \textit{Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837}, in which she recorded the increased attendance of British males at schools and universities.\textsuperscript{44} She wrote,

\begin{quote}
In 1701, less than 35 per cent of English peers attended Oxford or Cambridge; the proportion of Scottish, Welsh or Irish peers who did so was smaller still... around 1800- over 70 per cent of all English peers received their education at just four public schools, Eton, Westminster, Winchester and Harrow.\textsuperscript{45}
\end{quote}

The influx of young heirs into schools and universities was part of the public performance of status. Marcia Pointon, in \textit{Portrayal and the Search for Identity}, has noted that some of these schools, such as Eton, introduced a custom of requesting portraits from outgoing students which would be displayed in the school.\textsuperscript{46} The practice, lasting from the 1760s to the 1830s, was predicated on an assumption that the portrait would present the sitter as an exemplum to be aspired to, '…the frames identify the subjects not as Eton schoolboys but as the men they later became- politicians, civil servants, ecclesiastics and so on.'\textsuperscript{47} Often Etonians would embark on a grand tour at the same time, reinforcing the bonds of sociability formed by being at the same school.

The work of Nicola Figgis in tracing the networks of sociability inscribed on the landscape of Rome inspired the geographical parameters of this thesis, and the idea of placing the studio visit within the context of the visitor’s viewing experience at Rome. In "Irish Artists and Society in Eighteenth Century Rome", Figgis demonstrated how mapping the

\begin{footnotes}
\item For British travellers, this ranged from becoming an MP to achieving a successful marriage.
\item Colley, \textit{Britons}, 180.
\item Marcia Pointon, \textit{Portrayal and the Search for Identity}, (Reaktion Books, 2013): 87-120.
\item Pointon, \textit{Portrayal}, 90.
\end{footnotes}
accommodation of visitors to Rome, and the studios of artists in residence, reveals the social geography of Rome.48 In mapping the physical locations of visitors to Rome and those resident at Rome, a picture emerges of the extent to which the British experience of Rome was limited to specific areas, and disassociated from native life. The idea of the cicerone or guide to Rome has been well documented, but Figgis' work highlights the extent to which the traveller was dependent on guides. Their daily life was framed in terms of activities, with the Piazza di Spagna as their main hub of sociability.

The approach of focussing on portraiture of sitters at Rome has been previously employed by Sabrina Norlander Eliasson. Her 2009 monograph, Portraiture and Social Identity in Rome in the Eighteenth Century, takes a comparative approach, considering the portraiture of the Roman elite in comparison to that of the British, and questioning why, despite the existence of two groups in the same space with similar social aims, the resulting portraiture was vastly different, particularly in relation to the use of antiquity.49 Eliasson's treatment of Batoni's inclusion of antiquity as significant in several portraits is notable. Her use of the portrait as a valuable source of information on social identity substantiates the methodology of this thesis. Her conclusion is predicated on an understanding of the different cultural priorities of the groups as governing their portrait choices. This thesis focuses on visitors to Rome, and artists who, although resident at Rome, found the majority of their patrons in visitors to Rome. By referencing engagement with the classical past of Rome, and not its eighteenth-century landscape, the British visitor self-fashioned not as engaging with the elite of Rome, but as engaging with their superior ancestors, who colonised Britain.

Portraiture is here considered to be any object or artefact, painted or sculpted, which makes manifest a particular version of the self for presentation to the viewer. This is in accordance with the approach of Marcia Pointon, whose work has established the portrait as a valuable source to art historians, and as significant works of art in their own right.50 Her approach consists of developing thematic case studies in which she addresses different aspects of an overarching argument. Her methodology, awareness of the portrait as a signifier of identity, and her understanding of the studio as a sociable space, have informed this thesis. Her work argues for an understanding of the presentation of the self in every detail, whether through
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attributes or dress, particularly wigs, as potentially meaningful. This thesis assumes the same for the portraiture discussed in Part I, particularly with reference to Pompeo Batoni's use of sculpture in his portraits, which has traditionally been dismissed by scholars.

Marica Pointon and Sabrina Norlander Eliasson both focus on painted portraiture. This thesis is innovative in examining both painted and sculpted portraiture, applying the same technique of in-depth visual analysis to both genres. This technique offers new insights into the level of detail seen in portrait busts of the late eighteenth century. As a medium, sculpture was slower to adapt to the changing tastes of the patron or viewing public, and owing to the expense, often involved the most wealthy patrons at Rome. However, whereas changing tastes were visible in painted portraiture within the space of a year, cultural change affecting viewing became apparent in the reception of sculpture. The commissioning of contemporary sculpture at Rome, particularly from neoclassical sculptor Antonio Canova who is discussed in Part II, saw the visitor enact in the reception of Canova's works the tensions and anxieties suppressed in their viewing of classical sculpture. British visitors in the late eighteenth century began to repudiate the potentially homoerotic appreciation of lissom male beauties such as the Belvedere Antinous. It was not solely the act of viewing that was problematic, but the cultural correlation between seeing and touching, embedded in the British consciousness through the popularity of the cabinet of curiosities, discussed below.

Satish Padiyar discussed Canova and the question of touch in his monograph, Chains: David, Canova, and the Fall of the Public Hero in Postrevolutionary France. He raises interesting questions about the potential eroticism of such well-polished flesh, but his description of the Three Graces as 'monologically cutaneous' contradicts itself. In attributing the same deliberate surface to every aspect of the group; drapery, skin, pillar, he undermined his own reading into the effects of such a sheen on sculpted marble flesh. While accurate in his claim that,

Through Canova, the skin of the re-invented classical sculptural object- its luminous, sensual envelope- becomes the site of an early-nineteenth-century modern subjectivity…,

53 Padiyar, Chains, 125.
Padiyar neglected to realise the significance of Canova’s works as objects which could function as impetuses for the expression and discussion of cultural anxieties affecting the viewing of sculpture. However, Padiyar’s use of the term ‘sensual’ is of interest, and the idea of sensuality is repeated in this thesis to describe the conflict between the object, which challenged eighteenth-century cultural mores, and its associated historicism or artistic value which rendered it art. Although the idea of sensuality is a subjective one, it is clear that in order to judge the success of the sculptor, particularly with regard to portrait sculpture, the viewer invoked the image of real bodies in his or her imagination. The term sensual indicates that the statue held a subtle erotic charge, and could be read on two levels: in terms of its beauty as an art object, and in terms of its potential to attract a prurient, or improper, gaze.

Similarly to how the term sensual indicates a median between the austere and the erotic, the idea of prurience is useful here in considering the polite gaze, which both recognised and suppressed the potential impropriety of viewing sculpted bodies, without resorting to either prudery or bawdy humour. In an anecdote discussed in the Conclusion of this thesis, visitor to Rome Henry Matthews employed the term ‘prurient’ in relation to the use of fig leaves in the Vatican around the time of Charlotte Eaton’s residence, writing,

> Nothing can be more ridiculously prudish. That imagination must be depraved beyond all hope, that can find any prurient gratification in the cold chaste nakedness of an ancient marble. It is the fig-leaf alone that suggests any idea of indecency.

It is notable that in the anecdote, Matthews expresses his opinion to the mixed-gender group viewing the sculpture, and an Italian female viewer whispers her reply privately in his ear. Matthews’ comment indicates his correlation of ‘indecency’ and ‘prurience’, and his understanding that viewers of the sculpture both observed the object before them, and engaged their imagination, occasionally to gratify prurient desire.
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54 Padiyar, Chains, 6.
55 John Berger, Ways of Seeing, (Penguin Press, 1972): 54, ‘A naked body has to be seen as an object in order to become a nude.’
John Brewer, in his seminal 1997 monograph, *The Pleasures of the Imagination*, investigated eighteenth-century English life in a wide-ranging manner, employing various media as sources of information, including paint and print. He wrote,

> For though in theory the pleasures of the imagination provoked by the arts were supposed to be different from the pleasures derived from sexual desire, economic acquisition or social distinction, in practice it was extremely difficult to dissociate them from cupidity, greed and vanity, the giddy pleasures associated with fashionable life in every European city.

The conflict Brewer noted at the heart of European fashionable life was brought to the fore at Rome, where the veneration of antiquity warred with the less highbrow realities of socialising abroad. For the British visitor to Rome, propriety took the form of adherence to strict moral codes and behaviour, and resulted in an elite or scholarly mode of viewing which refused to publicly acknowledge the sensuality of nude sculpted bodies. This concern over the potential erotic dangers of travel abroad was not restricted to viewing sculpture. Eighteenth-century Italian society was considered uncivilised compared to British society, and even the noble families of Rome were thought to be far removed from their ancient Roman ancestors in terms of cultural sophistication. The cultural prioritisation of the acquisition of an elusive sense of taste perfected at Rome remained paramount, and was substantiated by a prevalent rhetoric which claimed that even the most disinterested viewer would appreciate the superiority of the original marbles to the copies more readily available in Britain.

It was only the aesthetic appreciation of male bodies that was dangerous: the trope of the lustful or prurient gaze of the connoisseur was not new, and by the 1790s, was openly explored in relation to classical sculpture by satirical print artist Thomas Rowlandson, among others. This kind of satirical imagery concerning the lewd motives of the connoisseur was part of a British appreciation of bawdy and body-based humour which declined in the nineteenth century. This bodily humour, or prurience, was investigated by Vic Gatrell, whose monograph on the lewd humour permeating every level of British society
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in London makes for illuminating material. His approach made use of satirical prints, examining the unprecedented extent to which society was able to mock the lives and actions of the monarchy in the late eighteenth century. During the early nineteenth century, the British public's understanding of their own bodies changed. Dror Wahrman's *The Making of the Modern Self* reveals a change in thought in the 1780s, from the ascription of gendered activities to either sex, towards a strict understanding of gender as limited to the binary sexes located within the bodily form. Although his framework is largely pinned on ephemeral literary memorabilia, such as plays and anecdotal evidence from a narrow geographical area, his theory sheds light on how the transition from veneration to disapproval of classical antiquity could occur by the mid-nineteenth century.

Alex Potts, in his article *Male Phantasy and Modern Sculpture*, and in his work on the homoerotic tensions underlying the aesthetics of Johann Joachim Winckelmann, considered the various eighteenth-century literary arguments behind the viewing of sculpture. He touches on the pervasive popularity of the Pygmalion legend as typical of the eighteenth-century fetishizing of the sculpted body. In the legend, the male sculptor dissatisfied with lustful women creates a pure beauty, only to find his creation coming to life, marble transmuting into female flesh under his gaze. The popularity of the story indicates the cultural correlation between marble and flesh which Canova’s sensual sculpture would play on in the early nineteenth century. The contrast between the viewing of sculpture and the viewing of painting is well expressed by Potts, who writes,

> As a thing inhabiting the same space as the spectator, it at one level offers him/her the promise of an unmediated experience, one that might momentarily dissolve the distinction between viewing subject and viewed object that the literal frame of the painting constantly reasserts.

As Susan Pearce has demonstrated in her examination of the souvenir market at the battleground of Waterloo, the nineteenth-century imagination prioritised symbols of a collective or shared experience which functioned as tangible links to the past. This altered their understanding of material objects within the painted portrait space, and was brought to
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64 Potts, *Male Phantasy*, 38.
bear even more strongly on objects which transmuted the contemporary body into art. The
imaginary conflation of portraiture and classical antiquity was particularly noticeable when it
came to portrait sculpture, such as that of the Bonapartes discussed in Chapter Four.

On viewing their compatriots in marble, the increased awareness of the sculpted body as
referencing a real body resulted in the correlative effect of weakening the historicism of
classical sculpture. When viewing classical sculpture, the desire to touch stemming from the
eroticism of the object could be subsumed into a greater desire to experience the historicism
of the object. By historicism is meant the sense in which the object belonged to the past,
functioning as a tangible link to an external culture, and thus providing an opportunity to
engage with that culture. In the early nineteenth century, this idea of historical objects as
educational, belonging to a classical narrative from the historical past, no longer achieved the
same effect in excusing the potential impropriety of the work.

The correlation between viewing and touching, or in other words, the haptic viewing
experience, is explored by Constance Classen in *The Deepest Sense: a cultural history of
touch*. Her work includes a number of fascinating anecdotes on the early eighteenth century
correlation between touching and seeing, particularly in relation to private collections and
the cabinet of curiosities. The intimate interaction with the objects in private collections
was mirrored by the intimacy of the sociability performed in the space, for example, Classen
writes,

> When the composer Handel visited Sloane in 1740 he carelessly placed his buttered
> muffin on a precious manuscript, incurring the anger of his host...  

The viewing of the manuscript took place as part of the established social customs of the
home, in this case, the custom of offering a guest or visitor refreshments. Jokes about the
ability to touch sculpture within a private collection are extant within private
correspondence. The young Duke of Richmond wrote in 1755 of his newly purchased
sculpture to a friend, 'I am in love with the Venus and take great pleasure to stroke her bum
and thighs.' In 1773, Lord Charlemont’s copy of the *Medici Venus* was vandalised in an
incident discussed in the *Conclusion* of this thesis. For visitors to Rome accustomed to
touching and handling small objects when viewing private collections, such as cabinets of
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66 See Susan Stewart, *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the
68 Classen, *The Deepest Sense*, 140.
69 Joan Coutu, *Then and Now: Collecting and Classicism in Eighteenth-Century England*, (McGill-
Queen's University Press, 2015): 67. The quotation is cited as Richmond to Henry Fox, 3 May 1755,
quoted in [M.M] Reese, *Goodwood's Oak*, 53, and is further discussed in the *Conclusion* of this thesis.
curiosities, the experience of viewing public collections, including life-sized sculpted nude bodies, thus involved a tension between the desire to touch and the social norms governing their behaviour. By the 1790s, however, as noted above, visitors from London were accustomed to attending public exhibitions at the Royal Academy.

This eighteenth-century rhetoric of haptic responses to classical sculpture is expanded on in Chapter Three. Although well documented by scholars in relation to the objects themselves, the idea of the ‘unmediated experience’ created by the sculpture, as described by Alex Potts above, has not been applied in any depth by art historians to painted representations of classical sculpture, such as those discussed in Chapter Two of this thesis. Where such analysis does occur, it often takes the form of a study of the satirical depiction of the male gaze or in particular, the figure of the connoisseur.70 This figure, invariably male, was often depicted examining erotic or suggestive works, and by the turn of the century had become synonymous with the idea of the potential prurience of viewing nude sculpture.71 This thesis has benefitted greatly from the work of Chloe Chard, whose article "Nakedness and Tourism, Classical Sculpture and the Imaginative Geography of the Grand Tour", influenced the direction of this thesis.72 Her work constantly questions the established paradigms of art historical thinking about sculpture, and the eighteenth and nineteenth-century viewing of sculpture. Her understanding of the importance of gender is evident in "Women who transmute into tourist attractions: spectator and spectacle on the Grand Tour", where she questions the slippage between marble and flesh that is discussed in Chapter Four of this thesis.73

The idea of the gaze employed in this thesis is based on scholarship which largely considers a gender-based binary. The gaze is often interrogated as part of feminist theories of art history. The issue was most memorably articulated by Linda Nochlin in her 1971 article, "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?"74 Nochlin's work opened debate on the traditionally male-orientated focus of art history and touched on the prevalence of the female
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71 See Thom, "Amorous Antiquries", Fig. 21.2, Thomas Rowlandson, *The Sculptor’s Shop*, c. 1785-90, State Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg. The author notes, ‘Both connoisseurs, wearing their typical quizzing glasses, gaze directly at the left-hand figure’s muscular torso and genitals…’.
nude in art collections. This is particularly useful in relation to Part I of this thesis, which considers the male gaze as part of the grand tourist viewing experience at Rome from 1740 to 1775.

Part II of this thesis also engages with the idea of a binary-based gaze. However, the demographics of visitors to Rome did not change from predominantly male to female over the course of the second half of the long eighteenth century. In light of the mixed-gender sociability effecting change in methods of viewing classical sculpture at Rome from 1778 to 1830, the binary employed in Part II is considered as a conflict between the grand tourist and the Romantic gazes, which were roughly, but not necessarily completely, gender-based. The idea of performative gender, or acting in accordance with the socially determined dictates of gendered behaviour, is best engaged with in the work of Judith Butler. Her monograph, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, inspires a better understanding of the convergence of gender, self-fashioning and sociability. The performance of erudition when viewing sculpture was required in a society which eschewed labels. This should not preclude an awareness that even where manners or societal custom dictated a particular gendered response be expressed, other private responses were possible.

Malcolm Baker's work, most recently in *The Marble Index*, touches on the idea of the interaction between the viewer and the marble bust in a way that is relevant to the examination of the sculptor's studio in this thesis. His work focuses on sculpture made in Britain, acknowledging the potential for sculpted portraiture to be innovative and complex, even theatrical. David Bindman, whose most recent monograph concerns Antonio Canova, engaged with the idea of sculpture as causing societal unease, owing to a tension between strict neoclassicism in the style of Bertel Thorvaldsen, and Antonio Canova's sensual approach to classically-inspired sculpture. Bindman's recognition of unease over the sensuality of Canova's figures is useful for the argument in Chapter Four of this thesis. As Carole Paul has noted in relation to the Borghese collection at Rome, and which this thesis emphasises repeatedly throughout, the viewing of art was a social activity. The experience of viewing the truly canonical collections, such as that of the Borghese family or the Vatican, was often performed repeatedly, in order to imprint the details on the mind of the visitor. The act of viewing sculpture by torchlight, recently highlighted by Claudia Mattos, was part of a
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77 David, Bindman, *Warm Flesh, Cold Marble: Canova, Thorvaldsen and their Critics*, (Yale University Press, 2014).
desire to control the viewing experience, creating a personal interaction with the collection. Part of a sociable viewing experience at Rome involved suppressing opinions, particularly if female in a public space, but also in an effort not to offend an Italian host showing his private collection. Other thoughts on aspects of eighteenth or nineteenth-century Italy, such as economic opinions, social opinions, and generally disapproval of every aspect which differed from British life apart from the classical ruins, architecture, and statuary, were voiced only in selective company, or in travel literature. As Richard Wrigley noted in *Regarding Romantic Rome*, the realities of viewing classical sites often involved employing the imagination to ignore the presence of foul stenches, dirty beggars and accumulated dirt on the ruins themselves.

This thesis investigates trends in portraiture which reveal how British visitors to Rome from 1740 to 1830 were amalgamating their imaginary construct of classical Rome, born of their literary education, with their socially-influenced fashioning of themselves as grand tourists. It will take a methodological approach which centres around the sociability surrounding the viewing of art at Rome, in order to inform its understanding of the specific context in which painted and sculpted portraiture was commissioned, created, and viewed. Pompeo Batoni's portraits will be established as visual documents which, when subjected to detailed visual analysis, reveal how the self-fashioning of sitters was grounded in their viewing experience at Rome, to the extent that sculpture in the portrait could act as a readable symbol to viewers. The examination of changes to portrait sculpture will lead to an argument for greater consideration of the studio space as a key locus of cultural and social activity. Antonio Canova's portrait sculpture will be framed within the context of gendered viewing and reception at Rome. Several previously under-utilised sources held at the British Library which reveal the realities of viewing Rome and give insight into the evolving discourse on sculpted nudity in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries will be employed, including the travel journals of Charlotte Eaton and Lady Murray.

---


Part I: Chapter One

Identity Formation on the Grand Tour: the Pictorial Record of Grand Tourism at Rome, 1744-1755

Introduction

No sooner is the grand Tour made, but the young Heir to an overgrown Estate brings Home a Castle in his Head. The Mansion-House of his Ancestors is too Antique, He must have it down and Build another after the Modern way. The Surveyor comes down, finds a better Situation, marks out the Ground upon a finer Prospect, that Travellers may enquire whose Happy Contrivance that was, and save themselves the Labour of a Journey to Italy.82

Traditionally, the term 'grand tour' has been assumed to have been coined in 1670, in Richard Lassels' *Voyage of Italy*, an early precursor of the wealth of travel guides which proliferated during the eighteenth century.83 In 1711, the above newspaper employed the term as a colloquialism, suggesting its frequent use within British society.84 Historian Jeremy Black noted that the use of the term 'grand tour' reflected 'a contemporary desire to distinguish protracted and wide-ranging tourism from shorter trips.'85 This is borne out in the language employed in the newspaper, which, while acknowledging the grand tour as a transformative process, appeared dismissive of the results. The characteristics of the British grand tourist are revealed to be youth, masculinity, wealth, and a position of social influence, such as being the heir to an estate. The intimation was that upon his return the grand tourist disseminated a sense of taste which was accessible only through his travels. In this way he contributed towards the improvement of British society, and reinforced the idea of his social superiority.86 The focus on Italy, emphasised through the use of italics, highlighted the


83 Richard Lassels, *Voyage of Italy*, 1670. The attribution was first noted by Christopher Hibbert, *The Grand Tour*, (London, Methuen, 1987):18, but was recorded as dating to 1760. The error has been cited verbatim e.g. Lisa Colletta ed., *The Legacy of the Grand Tour*, (Fairleigh Dickson University Press, 2015): ix.

84 The use of the term 'British' in this thesis is explained in the *Introduction*. In light of the focus on Irish sitters in this chapter, it is worth reiterating that the term 'British' is here considered the most accurate method of denoting eighteenth-century English, Irish, Scottish and Welsh travellers collectively. The latter terms are employed for clarification where appropriate.


British prioritisation of the art and architecture of the ancient Roman Empire. By 1711 the grand tour was an established social phenomenon in Britain which conferred social cachet, but its individual participants were not beyond scepticism.

As a cultural phenomenon which lasted centuries, the grand tour was subject to change over time. This chapter examines the pictorial record of British grand tourist sociability at Rome from 1744 to 1755, with a focus on three key sitters whose portrait commissioning activities were innovative: Joseph Leeson, later Lord Milltown, his wealthy nephew Joseph Henry of Straffan, and James Caulfield, later Lord Charlemont. All three were Irish, but of varying social status. Joseph Leeson brought the painter Pompeo Batoni (1708-1787) to the attention of the British at Rome as a portraitist, Joseph Henry recorded informal grand tourist sociability in commissioned caricature by Joshua Reynolds (1723-1792) and Pier Leone Ghezzi (1674-1755), and Lord Charlemont appears to have been the first Batoni sitter to be depicted in front of a recognisable Roman landmark. The combined effect on the British at Rome in 1751 was to bring the exercise of self-fashioning to the forefront of the grand tourist experience.

The formation of a British grand tourist identity by visitors to Rome of Irish nationality exposed the centrality of classical antiquity to the pursuit of social aims across the four nations of Britain. However, the priority of this chapter is not to explore the extent to which being Irish impacted on the portraiture of the sitters in question, but to highlight how their influential decisions in self-fashioning resulted in the formation of a British grand

---

87 The popular historical counterpart to Britain in the eighteenth century was the ancient Roman Empire, however the reputation of ancient Greek art was slowly gaining ground and Greece would become a popular destination for grand tourism in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The issue is discussed in Chapter Three.


89 This chapter explores the idea of Irish sitters self-fashioning as part of a British identity. It thus adheres in a limited fashion to a four nation methodology, by which is meant the concept of achieving a more in-depth understanding through referencing sitters from the four nations of eighteenth-century Britain. This approach is promoted by the Four Nations History Network founded by Maggie Scull and Naomi Lloyd-Jones.
tourist pictorial identity, which was so popular that by the 1760s and 1770s it had become a pictorial formula which represented the European grand tourist.

In commissioning individual portrait imagery which conveyed the ideal characteristics of a grand tourist, the activities of visitors to Rome identifying as grand tourists were legitimised. In posing for group portrait imagery, grand tourists from across Britain were partaking in collective expressions of British sociability which highlighted the possibilities of visual forms of self-fashioning. By the 1760s, the portrait would be a near-mandatory method of fashioning the grand tourist self at Rome, a visual demonstration of the traveller as a polished, educated gentleman prepared to return home and engage with elite society. The extent to which the interest of the Leesons, Joseph Henry and Charlemont in pictorial representation stemmed from a self-consciousness borne of their Irish roots is impossible to determine.

The focus in this chapter on the role of Joseph Leeson, Joseph Henry and Lord Charlemont in 1750s Rome is based on their innovative pictorial choices. Other scholars have rightly explored the cultural influence of other Irish grand tourists during this period, hence Francis Russell,

Sir William was one of a group of visitors to Rome which seems to have been dominated by three Irishmen, Leeson, builder of Russborough, Ralph Howard, later first Viscount Wicklow, and James Caulfield, Viscount and subsequently first Earl of Charlemont, all of whom were caricatured by Reynolds. The three were notable connoisseurs and it was natural that Lowther and other English travellers such as Sir Matthew Fetherstonhaugh, whose collection survives at Uppark, were drawn to their circle.

The aim of this chapter is not to claim specific, and potentially anachronistic, nationalistic tendencies on the part of the Irish sitters in question in 1751. Whether deliberate or inadvertent, their heightened profile in the pictorial record offers new insights into the realities of British engagement with antiquity at Rome in the early 1750s.

This chapter will focus on the painted portraiture of Pompeo Batoni, whose works dating from the 1750s were to cement his reputation as the portrait painter to the wealthy for the

---

90 Pompeo Batoni's portraiture from 1760 to 1775 is discussed in the following chapter, entitled The Allure of the Antique: Pompeo Batoni and the Vatican Ariadne in Grand Tour Portraiture 1760-1775.
92 At this point in time, the Kingdom of Ireland, as Toby Barnard has pointed out, was one of few countries to be assigned a Lord Lieutenant, and thus in terms of British politics, was ahead of Scotland. Toby Barnard, Making the Grand Figure: Lives and Possessions in Ireland 1641-1770, (Yale University Press, 2004):1.
rest of his career. The informal nexus of social links between British visitors to Rome during this period was articulated in the form of caricature by Joshua Reynolds and Pier Leone Ghezzi. The visual demonstration of debate and humour over the presentation of disparate nationalistic and class-based groups as united by their being British at Rome reveals the importance of Rome for British sociability. For some sitters, the contrast between portraiture and caricature mirrored a visible division between the formal presentation of the grand tourist self, and the less highbrow realities of viewing Rome. By examining both, this chapter will arrive at a nuanced understanding of the portrait object in 1750s Rome, a period which set the framework for the representation of subsequent grand tourist engagement with Rome.

**Self-Fashioning on the Grand Tour**

The grand tour played an important role in underpinning the stability of British class-based culture, ensuring that wealth was not the only criterion for social prestige. The social differentiation of British citizens had become more difficult to distinguish as wealth increased among the middle classes following the Industrial Revolution. In her monograph, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837*, Linda Colley highlighted the trend for wealthy families to publicly educate their young heirs, sending them to schools like Eton and Westminster, and universities such as Oxford or Cambridge. The acquisition of formal educational qualifications publicly demonstrated their abilities, while the public acquisition of social graces and good taste was demonstrated by continual self-fashioning on the grand tour.

The term self-fashioning is here employed in adherence with the theory first expressed by Stephen Greenblatt concerning the Renaissance practice of identity formation through deliberately nuanced self-presentation. Self-presentation was not restricted to imagery: much of the grand tour depended on the presentation of the traveller in each city, often with letters of introduction describing their character as worthy of attention. The portrait

---

93 Andrew Wilton and Ilaria Bignamini, *Grand Tour: The Lure of Italy in the Eighteenth Century*, (exhibition, Tate Gallery, 1996-1997): 23. ‘...for the privileged, sitting to him [Batoni] for a portrait incorporating a clear reference to the antiquity of Rome became an integral part of their Grand Tour.’

94 Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837*, (Vintage, 1996): 180, 'In 1701, less than 35 per cent of English peers attended Oxford or Cambridge; the proportion of Scottish, Welsh or Irish peers who did so was smaller still... around 1800- over 70 per cent of all English peers received their education at just four public schools, Eton, Westminster, Winchester and Harrow.'

commissioned at Rome offers a unique opportunity to examine how British travellers conceived of the identity of the grand tourist. The focus on identity formation in this chapter is influenced by the concept of personal identity explored by Fiona Stafford. Her work interrogates the writings of David Hume, among other authors, demonstrating the use of portraiture in eighteenth-century literature as an analogy for questioning ideas of identity and self. Her conclusion is that the eighteenth-century portrait was 'a clear assertion of identity', achieving multiple goals, from the establishment of a permanent record of identity to functioning as a status symbol.96

Both processes detailed by Stafford are useful here in the consideration of the formation of identity at Rome. The early 1750s was a period of flux for rituals of grand tourism, sociability, and the understanding of the possibilities in depicting the self. It marked a period of increased access to Europe following the end of the War of Austrian Succession (1740-1748), which saw military action between France, Spain, Naples, Britain and Russia, among other powers. Stafford's understanding of the publicly displayed portrait or memorial sculpture as providing a focal point for a 'collective memory' is here transferred to the portrait at Rome. Batoni's portraits portrayed an ideal grand tourist figure. To categorise them as private imagery is to ignore the context of their creation, their display in the studio, and the value of engaging with the idea of Rome as a key site of pictorial innovation, sociability, and identity formation.

The transformative nature of the grand tour varied according to the interest of the traveller, or the skills of the tutor or bear leader accompanying them. For socially ambitious gentlemen, the grand tour offered access to detailed information on the military and political systems of other nations, as Lord Chesterfield's letters to his son made clear in 1749.97


97 Lord Chesterfield, *Letters to his Son by the Earl of Chesterfield*, Letter LXII, London, January 10, O.S. 1749, 'During your stay at Berlin, I expect that you should inform yourself thoroughly of the present state of the civil, military, and ecclesiastical government of the King of Prussia's dominions; particularly of the military... these military matters are so frequently the subject of conversation....fall within your future profession.' Chesterfield was acquainted with Lord Charlemont, whose lengthy review of the *Letters* is recorded in the Royal Irish Academy, Charlemont MSS, Letter 86: Reply from Lord Charlemont to Lord Bruce, August 1774, Second Series, Volume 1: 12/R/12. A brief quote is useful here: 'They were written to a particular Point, and for the Use and Improvement of a very particular Person, you, my dear Lord, were well enough acquainted with Stanhope to know that his great and real Deficiency was an ungraceful Demeanour, and a total Want of Good Breeding; a natural
Advantages for the less socially ambitious included distance from family, and opportunities for gambling, sexual tourism, and general fecklessness. The majority of grand tourists considered Rome to be the cultural apex of their tour. The winter of 1750-51 followed a Holy Year in which there had been no Carnival, and travellers flocked to Rome under the impression that the year's festivities would be particularly rich. The activities of these men, preserved in the pictorial record, encapsulated the grand tourist experience, which in the 1750s was slowly being formalised into a series of ritualised events and activities. In this chapter, by focussing on the social activities surrounding the creation of a small number of portraits, the portraits reveal more about the realities of enacting cultural and social prestige on the grand tour through the viewing and commissioning of art.

The primary method of visual representation of British travellers to Rome in the second half of the long eighteenth century was the painted portrait, for which Pompeo Batoni became renowned. The painted portrait emphasised individual qualities, such as learning, courtly manners, luxurious surroundings, and delicate finery which was clearly suited to leisure activities only. Each aspect of the portrait was part of the process of self-fashioning, as Marica Pointon has observed,

"Commissions for portraits and commissions for dress both originate in an imagined image of the self and therefore both practices belong to the domain of projection, of what has been called 'self-fashioning'."

Pompeo Batoni’s portrait imagery of finely dressed young men posed within carefully delineated spaces painted during this period came to symbolise grand tourist identity. The

and stubborn Disease, which even these Medicaments, tho' administered with the utmost skill, cou'd never cure... if We consider Lord Chesterfield's Character, punctiliously well bred, and the Vocation for which He intended his Son, that of a foreign Minister, We shall not be surprised at the Anxiety with which He labours its Cure.' Lord Chesterfield had written on August 8th 1746 of 'a young Irish Nobleman of very good Estate who is or soon will be at the Hague', according to Ingamells, Dictionary, 196, cited as HMC 14th Report 9:149. The quotes establish the complexity of the network of sociability among British grand tourists.

98 For the nuances of parental control over sons on the grand tour, see Henry French and Mark Rothery, "'Upon Your Entry into the World': Masculine Values and the Threshold of Adulthood among Landed Elites in England 1680-1800" Social History 33, (No. 4, 2008): 402-22.
idea of the portrait as referencing a collective identity was achieved through the inclusion of geographical features of Rome, or antiquities from the collections of Rome which acted as tangible souvenirs of the viewing experience at Rome. 103

Pompeo Batoni’s Early Career

Batoni’s earliest extant portrait is of Joseph Leeson, later Lord Milltown, dated 1744 [Fig. 1.1], and his first portrait which definitively situated the sitter in Rome was that of James Caulfield, later Lord Charlemont, dated 1753 [Fig. 1.2]. 104 The impact of this latter portrait was pervasive, and the focus it placed on being physically present at Rome revealing, given Charlemont’s extensive travels. Batoni was previously known as a painter of religious and historical paintings. The extent to which a drastic change occurred in the commissioning of portraiture at Rome during the 1750s is evident by briefly observing the trajectory of his career. By the time of his death in 1787 he had painted members of royalty from across Europe, employing a visual formula established during this period. 105

In April of 1732, the Marchese Gabrielli Valletta of Gubbio came across Pompeo Batoni drawing from the antique in the Palazzo dei Conservatori. 106 He was favourably impressed by the young artist’s work and commissioned him to paint an altarpiece portraying the Virgin and Child among beatified members of the Marchese’s family. Completed in August of 1733, the finished work drew acclaim and brought Batoni to the attention of Roman society. 107 By 1742, Batoni was painting works commissioned by Pope Benedict XIV for the Quirinal. 108 Despite the social prestige of papal commissions however, they were infrequent

---

103 One exception, Pompeo Batoni, Portrait of a Gentleman, c. 1758-9, Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, Cat. No. 218, includes a statuette of the Venus de Medici from Florence and is discussed in Chapter Two.

104 Joseph Leeson, 1744, Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, Cat. No. 63, James Caulfield, c. 1753-55, Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, Cat. No. 188.

105 Bowron and Kerber, Prince of Painters, 89, ’Pompeo Batoni stands virtually alone among eighteenth-century painters in being patronised by most of Europe’s major princely courts, including the imperial courts at Vienna and Saint Petersburg, the papal court at Rome, the royal courts at London, Berlin, Warsaw, and Naples, the Elector Palatine’s court at Mannheim, the ducal courts at Stuttgart and Braunschweig, and the margravate of Bayreuth.’

106 Bowron and Kerber, Prince of Painters, 3-4.


and unreliable as a source of income. As Sabrina Eliasson Norlander has argued, the elite of Roman society were not predisposed towards the commissioning of portraiture beyond papal portraits.\textsuperscript{109} Batoni had previously sold his drawings of antiquities to visitors to Rome, and was well equipped to take advantage of the market in foreign commissions.\textsuperscript{110} Joseph Leeson was the first, or one of the first, people to commission a portrait from Batoni, at least six years before the painter's portrait work began to overtake his religious and historical painting in volume.\textsuperscript{111} Batoni would go on to paint portraits of an estimated 300 British sitters, his studio becoming an essential site of sociability at Rome, visited by patrons and non-patrons alike as part of the standardised grand tour itinerary.\textsuperscript{112}

At 135.5 by 98.5cm, Pompeo Batoni's 1744 portrait of Joseph Leeson was an accomplished and luxurious painting [Fig. 1.1].\textsuperscript{113} A comparison of facial likeness can be made with a portrait of Leeson at age 24 in 1735, attributed to Irish artist Anthony Lee [Fig. 1.3].\textsuperscript{114} Lee’s portrait shows him standing in front of a long vista of gardens and horses, identified by Sergio Benedetti as the 'outskirts of the Leeson's town house' on the south side of Stephen's Green in Dublin.\textsuperscript{115} Despite the similarity in features, Lee’s portrait is stiff in comparison to the relaxed arrangement of the Batoni work. The device of portraying Leeson in front of a long vista of land and buildings is less effective in fashioning him as a gentleman than the luxurious arrangement by Batoni. None of the sitter's own hair can be seen in the Batoni portrait, suggesting that his warm fur cap sat atop a bald head. He is shown in three-quarter length view, looking out at the viewer. The sitter's lack of a wig reinforces the impression

\textsuperscript{111} Clark, \textit{Pompeo Batoni}, Cat. No. 87, references an Arthur Rowley, 'Arthur Rowley, another Irishman, is said to have sat to Batoni first, but little is known about him or his travels'. Sergio Benedetti, \textit{The Milltowns: a family reunion}, (National Gallery of Ireland, 1997): 20, records the portrait of Arthur Rowley as dated 1740, located at Summerhill House, County Meath, lost in a fire in 1922. Ingamells, \textit{Dictionary}, 826, has no record of a Rowley before 1765.
\textsuperscript{112} Bowron, \textit{Pompeo Batoni}, Preface, 'Of his approximately three hundred surviving portraits, including autograph replicas and variant portraits of the same sitter, two-thirds depict British and Irish sitters, the "Milordi Inglese". The majority, about one hundred and fifty portraits, represent English sitters, followed by Irish, Scottish, and Welsh.' In addition to his sitters, other grand tourists attended Batoni’s drawing classes, and also his daughters’ musical evenings, regardless of their opinion of his talents as a painter. See Chapter Two.
\textsuperscript{114} Anthony Lee (attrib.), \textit{Portrait of Joseph Leeson, later 1st Earl of Milltown}, 1735, National Gallery of Ireland, Milltown Gift 1902, NGI.698.
\textsuperscript{115} Benedetti, \textit{The Milltowns}, 14. See also Nicola Figgis and Brian Rooney, \textit{Irish Paintings in the National Gallery of Ireland}, Vol. 1, (The National Gallery, 2001): 340, Fig. 45.
that he is casually, though richly, dressed. The deep fur of his hat is continued in the rich trimmings on the gown he sports. One hand bunches up the fabric of the garment, while the other rests outside of the pocket, made visible by its fur lining.

Anthony Clark called the garment 'an unusual déshabillé costume, consisting of a silk gown lined with bulky fur...'.\footnote{Clark, \textit{Pompeo Batoni}, Cat. No. 87.} Gowns of this type can be seen in later portraits by Batoni.\footnote{Matthew M.L Rogan, "Fashion and Identity in Georgian Britain: The Grand Tour Portraits of Pompeo Batoni", MA Diss., (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, May 2015), has examined the Batoni portraits in which sitters wear a fur coat in detail. See also Aileen Ribeiro, "Batoni's Use of Costume" in Edgar Peters Bowron ed., \textit{Pompeo Batoni and his British Patrons}, (exhibition, Greater London Council, The Iveagh Bequest, Kenwood, 8 June- 30 August 1982): 21, 'Englishmen also adopted the Italian taste for fur-lined coats...'.} Aileen Ribeiro has noted that appearance of the fur on the outside of the gown was contrary to British fashion at the time, while the garment itself was synonymous with continental finery.\footnote{Aileen Ribeiro, \textit{The Art of Dress: Fashion in England and France, 1750-1820}, (Yale University Press, 1995): 45.} Leeson's presence abroad was thus ascertained by his costume. The practice of wearing the fashions of each country while travelling occasionally caused dismay among grand tourists. In 1740, young painter James Russel wrote of his visit to France that, “There is no place in the world, where one is more obliged to give way to the furious torrent of Fashion; tho' I should take much more satisfaction in appearing like an English-man: for here is little or no distinction as to habit, between a Valet de chambre, and his Lord; and a man of sense is under a kind of necessity of appearing like a coxcomb.”\footnote{James Russel, \textit{Letters from a Young Painter Abroad to his Friends in England}, (Adorned with Copper Plates, London, Printed for W. Russel, at Horace's Head without Temple-Bar, MDCCXLVIII): 3.}

Russel's concern with dress as an indicator of status is clear. The background of Leeson's 1744 portrait, although unspecific, is an interior scene, with a rich swathe of dark red material framing the sitter, set off by a thick classical fluted column which reinforced the impression of his presence in Italy. The use of subtle details to suggest Leeson's travels, when compared to later portraits which overtly declare the sitter a grand tourist at Rome, forms an important precedent in examining the way in which Batoni's portraiture of grand tourists developed over time.

Joseph Leeson sat to Batoni while on his first trip to Italy from 1744 to 1745. He was the heir to a wealthy Dublin family of brewers, having inherited the estate not long before he began his travels, and was active both in politics and art. At the time of his portrait, Leeson was 33 years of age and actively forming a collection of art for his new home, Russborough...
House, which was under construction. He would later be created first Baron, followed by first Viscount, Russborough, before becoming the first Earl of Milltown.\textsuperscript{120} The Russborough estate and its contents were thus crucial to his political and social ambitions at the time of his portrait.\textsuperscript{121} It was reported that Joseph Leeson spent at least sixty thousand pounds on one shipment of goods intended for Russborough House. However, as Horace Mann noted on March 9th 1745, the ship was seized by the French en route to Ireland,

Tell me if you will have any new ones [statues] by a merchant ship, though the best of those that frequented these parts was lately taken by the French. Her name the \textit{Augustus Caesar}, with £60,000 worth of goods, and many statues, pictures, etc of one Mr Leeson, a rich Irishman.\textsuperscript{122}

Horace Mann described Leeson as a rich Irish man. The distinction appears to have been made only by the British- the majority of Italians employed the word \textit{'Inglese'}, meaning English, to denote travellers from all four nations of Britain.\textsuperscript{123} Leeson's willingness to spend large sums on art at Rome made him a figure of some influence.\textsuperscript{124} Among the artists he discovered on this early trip was Pompeo Batoni, who would enjoy a sudden surge in popularity in 1750, when his patron Leeson returned to Rome.\textsuperscript{125}

On his return to Rome in 1750 Leeson hired a house near the \textit{Piazza di Spagna}, which, as Nicola Figgis has ably demonstrated, was the centre of foreign sociability at Rome.\textsuperscript{126} Cynthia O'Connor went so far as to title Leeson the 'doyen' of the British at Rome during this

\textsuperscript{120} Ingamells, \textit{Dictionary}, 593, Joseph Leeson, (1711-83), MP from 1743-56, created Baron Russborough in 1756, Viscount Russborough in 1760 and Earl of Milltown in 1763.

\textsuperscript{121} The donation of Joseph Leeson's art collection, known as the Milltown Gift, by his descendant in 1902 would form the core collection of the National Gallery of Ireland.


\textsuperscript{123} The confusion over nationalistic terms is evident in the registry of the Florentine Academy: Michael Wynne, "Members from Great Britain and Ireland of the Florentine Accademia del Disegno 1700-1855", \textit{The Burlington Magazine}, Vol. 132, (No. 1049, August 1990, 535-538): 536, 'With regard to the schedule which follows, Inglese included England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales. Scozzese for Scots and Irlandese for Irish are sometimes found; also di Londra occurs a few times, as does d'Inghilterra.'

\textsuperscript{124} Figgis and Rooney, \textit{Irish Paintings}, 339, 'While Russborough was being built, Leeson embarked on the Grand Tour (the first of two visits to Italy), which afforded him not only the opportunity of educating himself and developing sophisticated tastes in the established manner, but also of acquiring works of art with which to adorn his new property in Wicklow. He was a discerning and tenacious collector, though this was assisted in no small manner by his extraordinary affluence.'

\textsuperscript{125} After Leeson's portrait in 1744, Batoni painted only one more portrait commission, now lost, before he turned his hand to portraits in volume in 1750. This consisted of two miniatures of John Chute, dated 1745-46, and a portrait of Chute’s cousin, Francis Whithead. Bowron, \textit{Pompeo Batoni}, Cat. No. 76-7.

period. Leeson's focus on socialising was paralleled by Batoni, who appears to have changed his accommodation to facilitate receiving visitors. Batoni's financial situation had been fairly stable in 1744, although he was supporting two young sons, and his wife had died two years previously. He remarried in 1747, and Leeson's return to Rome in 1750 coincided with the Batoni family moving from rented lodgings to the Via della Croce. By 1759, Batoni lived and worked in a large house on the Via Bocca di Leone, complete with studio, exhibition rooms and enough space to hold a regular evening drawing class.  

Joseph Leeson continued to collect art at Rome. On viewing the Furetti centaurs, he caused widespread comment by immediately offering to buy them. The anecdote is found in a letter from Edward Thomas to Dr Jeremiah Milles, dated January 6th 1751,

> 2 famous Centaurs lately found in ye Villa Adriana... These 2 statues are in black marble & of inestimable value... ye finest things in ye world of ye kind. I fedd [sic] my eyes with them yesterday a full hour & Mr Leeson an Irish Gentleman who was with me offered 2000 pounds sterl. for them, wch [sic] proposal was receiv'd with indignation.  

Leeson's impromptu offer for the Furetti centaurs revealed a lack of understanding of the Vatican-controlled export market which contradicted his otherwise keen judgement in purchases of contemporary works. The shipment lost in 1745 was not the entirety of the material collected during Leeson's first stay at Rome: his portrait by Pompeo Batoni, a painting by Claude Joseph Vernet and four etched views of Rome by Giovanni Battista Piranesi travelled successfully to Dublin. The Irishman’s admiration for the centaurs provides another possible link between him and Batoni, who is known to have previously drawn one of the Centaurs, between their discovery in 1736 and 1738.  

Cynthia O'Connor ascribed this type of aggressive behaviour, or 'bravado', to a cultural deficit on the part of the Irish, particularly those men like Leeson who were in the process of acquiring titles through trade-based wealth. Her argument is as follows:

> Broadly speaking, the Tourists were divided into two groups. The young Englishmen who came from a tradition of Grand Tourism, with the background of England's architectural renaissance, were already well versed in Italian cultural influences and

---

127 O'Connor, *The Pleasing Hours*, 101, 'Leeson, a man of considerable drive and self-importance, was, at the age of forty-nine, the doyen of all the Grand Tourists and on his second visit to Italy.'  
128 Clark, *Pompeo Batoni*, 17, from 1759, Batoni was living in a large house at 25 Via Bocca di Leone in Rome, with a studio, evening drawing class, exhibition rooms and space for his daughters' musical evenings.  
131 Macandrew, "A Group of Batoni Drawings", 137.
the vocabulary, however superficial, of taste and style. The Irish, on the other hand, came almost as pioneers and from a climate of newly-acquired prosperity (a lull in the troubled history of their country), and were in Rome to gather up, perhaps rather too obviously, the trappings of their new-found wealth and power.\textsuperscript{132}

Her argument was contrary to that by historian Toby Barnard, who claimed that, 'As in much else in the elite cultures of the time, Irish experiences of and reactions to travel resembled those of the cultivated and curious from other places.'\textsuperscript{133} Both scholars make generalisations based on nationality, which, as the caricatures discussed later in this chapter indicate, could be subordinated in the context of British sociability at Rome, becoming a source of humour rather than division.

Rather than ascribing the anecdote to either Leeson's poor breeding or Edward Thomas' prejudices, it is worth reframing it within a wider trope of travel during the long eighteenth century: the trope of the poorly behaved traveller whose actions substantiate the legitimacy of the writer's own actions.\textsuperscript{134} Joseph Leeson's behaviour is presented by the writer as though he were, as Cynthia O'Connor has posited, an Irish gentleman of lesser breeding. Both travelled to see the antiquities, and both men appear to have viewed the centaurs for an hour, but Leeson is described as a man 'who was with me', distancing language which diminished the relationship between the two men. The apparent contradiction between Leeson's behaviour according to the anecdote, and his recorded purchases, reveals the importance of the visual record discussed in this chapter.

\textit{Rome in the 1750s: the pictorial record}

In the 1750s, Joseph Leeson's pictorial influence can be assumed to have been limited to his innovative and repeated patronage of Pompeo Batoni. It is evident from the composition of his portrait commissions that his primary concern was the decoration of Russborough House, rather than the potential for innovation in self-fashioning as a grand tourist at Rome. Leeson commissioned a portrait of his son from Pompeo Batoni which was clearly intended as a pendant to his own, created six years prior. The portrait of Joseph Leeson Junior by Batoni,

\textsuperscript{132} O'Connor, \textit{The Pleasing Hours}, 100.
\textsuperscript{134} For example, Charlotte Eaton, whose gender necessitated careful use of language in her account of viewing Rome, places her emotional response to the \textit{Apollo Belvedere} into context by explaining that a French woman literally lost her wits through viewing it, Charlotte Eaton, \textit{Rome in the Nineteenth Century}, Vol. I, Letter XI, 95, discussed in Chapter Three.
dated 1751, is smaller in size, measuring only 99 by 73.5cm [Fig. 1.4]. Orientated in the opposite direction to his father, Leeson Junior looks out of the painting at the viewer, his left hand holding the rich fabric of his garment. Where his father's garment was rich but bulky and sleeveless, Leeson Junior wears a more form fitted version, with long sleeves trimmed with fur. The result is more elegant, creating the impression of a fashionable young man. The deep blue colour adds an air of luxury, while the informality of the unbuttoned cuffs and open neck of the shirt echoes his father's portrait imagery.

His hair is arranged in a manner reminiscent of his father's early portrait by Anthony Lee, with curls at the side and long at the back, suggesting that, aged 21, he was not yet cropping his hair in order to facilitate the wearing of a wig. Despite this, he holds a fur cap in his right hand, similar to the one his father wore. The detail preserves a sense of visual continuity between the portraits of father and son. The background is also similar, but reversed, with a column and swathe of drapery, although in this case the column ends in a square base. It is evident that the portrait was composed with the demonstration of the father-son relationship as a priority, presumably by Joseph Leeson (Senior). His determination to control the imagery of his eldest son and female relatives may have stemmed from his social aspirations: at this point in time, although he was an MP, he was not yet Baron Russborough.

While Leeson Senior’s clothing may have been a deliberate attempt to fashion himself as a man of taste for his portrait, his choice of a fur coat did indicate a keen awareness of social custom. Leeson Junior's younger brother and his friend would later cause comment on the grand tour in 1794, being publicly shamed into adhering to the established modes of self-fashioning,

A disturbance at the opera produced by Mr Brand's appearing in "Dirty dress" with cropped hair. Mr Brand was at this time travelling with Mr Leeson an Irish Gentleman Brother to Lord Milltown; Both thoughtless and Dissipated and both declaring they would go together in future to every Roman Conversazione in the

135 Joseph Leeson, later 2nd Earl of Milltown (1730-1801), 1751, 99 x 73.5cm, National Gallery of Ireland, Milltown Gift, 1902, NGI.702, Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, Cat. No. 137. Leeson also commissioned two paintings of female family members, who do not appear to have travelled to Rome, which echoed each-other in subject matter. These portraits were smaller again at 48 x 38cm and 47 x 36cm. See Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, Lady as Diana, 1751, Cat. No. 139 and Lady as Shepherdess, 1751, Cat. No. 140.

136 Figgis and Rooney, Irish Paintings, 274, 'As Benedetti has pointed out, the pose the sitter adopts is essentially the reverse of that in which his father appears in Batoni's portrait of 1745 [sic], presumably a deliberate attempt on the artist's part to establish the visual as well as familial link between father and son, despite the smaller scale of the later picture.'

137 For a better sense of the differences between the fur-lined coats of father and son, see Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, Cat. No. 132, John Woodyeare, and Cat. No. 135, Thomas Dawson, later 1st Viscount Cremane.
same kind of Dress but they were soon given to understand how much such an appearance would displease Every Englishman as well as the Romans. And therefore they relinquished their intentions and always appeared in a Fur Dress Coat at the Assemblys tho' they could not wear a Bag to their Cropped Hair.\textsuperscript{138}

The anecdote, written by a female visitor to Rome at a time when the era of all-male sociability on the grand tour had ended, indicates the continued necessity for visitors to Rome to dress properly in polite company. The mistake of the young Leeson was in assuming any insult would be restricted to his Roman counterparts. Instead, the self-fashioning of the young Irishman is assumed to be representative of the collective identity of the English at Rome. It is notable that the men changed their clothing to a ‘fur dress coat’, which may have been similar in appearance to those worn by their family members in their Batoni portraits at Leeson’s insistence nearly fifty years previously.

Leeson Junior's cousin Joseph Henry also sat to Pompeo Batoni in 1751. He was financially independent, experimental in his self-fashioning, and a key figure in the British circle at Rome, extending his tour until 1761. Joseph Henry commissioned a similarly sized portrait to that of his cousin, measuring 98 by 72.5cm \textsuperscript{139} Unlike the fashionable but casual outfits of his uncle and his cousin, Joseph Henry is depicted in a fine costume, posing against a pillar. In his right hand he holds a book, marking his place with a finger, and looks out at the viewer as though he has just been disrupted in his reading. The visual device highlights how in viewing Rome, grand tourists were enacting the scenes and sights previously studied as part of a classical education. The reference to a scholarly nature would be repeated in other portrait imagery of Joseph Henry and was evidently considered, or presented as, his most recognisable characteristic. In terms of background, the portrait is similar to Batoni's portraits of the Leesons, in that it is vaguely classical but non-descript. Henry is presented as an erudite gentleman of leisure, but is not definitively situated at Rome. However, a focus on Rome is evident in his later portrait commissions.

A drawing by Pier Leone Ghezzi of Joseph Henry, now at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, is notably similar to this portrait by Batoni, depicting the sitter standing with a book in his

\textsuperscript{138} The anecdote is recorded in Brinsley Ford Archive RBF/1/631- Laurcus to Legard, under the subtitle, Leeson Mr, 'Brother to Lord Milltown', PRO 30/9/43, Journal of Sara Beytham (I), Rome, 23 February 1794. Brinsley Ford notes, with reference to \textit{Burke's Peerage}, that this brother was one of the first Earl's sons by his third marriage in 1763. The second Earl (d. 1801, Leeson Junior) was a son of the first Earl’s marriage in 1729 and therefore considerably older.

\textsuperscript{139} A painting width of at least 70cm seems to have been Batoni's normal choice at this period, when he preferred the three-quarter length format. Bowron, \textit{Pompeo Batoni}, Cat. No. 138. Pompeo Batoni, \textit{Portrait of Joseph Henry of Straffan}, c. 1751, 98 x 72.5cm, The Walters Art Museum, Baltimore, 37.1932.
hands and wearing a similarly fine suit [Fig. 1.6]. He is portrayed among the picturesque ruins of a temple, amidst toppled columns and pieces of architectural rubble. The interplay between the positioning of the book held by Joseph Henry in the two images is striking: in his portrait by Batoni the spine is turned away from the viewer, thus acting as a blank object onto which the individual viewer could ascribe their preferred reading. In the caricature, the viewer is amused by the gaping-mouthed tourist staring in astonishment across the Roman landscape, an image supported by a book entitled Roma Antica visible in his hands. The book is likely Roma Antica by Famiano Nardini, written in 1666, which was notable among other guidebooks to Rome for its focus on antiquity. The idea of Joseph Henry as interested in antiquity is further suggested by the looking glass visible in his left hand. Harry Mount has demonstrated how the eyeglass or monocle was associated with the figure of the connoisseur to the extent that by the late eighteenth century, it symbolised an obsession with detail, to the eventual detriment of the aesthetic appreciation of the object.

Two inscriptions are visible on the caricature, one on the inside border of the image which reads, 'Sr. Gioseppe Henri Henryse huomo assai erudito nelle Antichità e in Letteratura huomo assai...' and another in a larger hand under the image on the mount itself, which records the sitter as 'Cavaliere Inglese dilettante delle Antichità'. The inscriptions clearly indicate the intended characteristics of the depicted man- he is erudite, learned in antiquities and literature, and an English gentleman. In short, he represents in theory the ideal male grand tourist, a figure both presented and gently mocked within the image through the gaping features of a figure who has forgotten to use his looking glass. The nationality of the grand tourist is described as 'inglese', an adjective worth noting given the likelihood of Joseph Henry's involvement in the wording of the inscription. The similarities between Joseph Henry's painted portrait by Batoni and self-commissioned caricature at Rome indicate a high level of interest in self-fashioning and the possibility of deliberate visual interplay between his representation in various media. Richard Marlay would later write to Lord Charlemont,

Is Jo: Henry at Rome now, is he as fine a gentleman as ever, as conceited and full of himself as he was in his native country, or is he more affected since he trod classic ground, seen every court, heard every king declare his royal sense of operas of the fair? What an unaccountable thing it is that a person, who does not want sense

140 Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1973.67. Ghezzi painted many visitors to Rome, some of which are also held at the MMA.

should make himself ridiculous by his vanity or how can vanity and good sense meet in the same person; and yet we find they often do.\textsuperscript{142}

As Cynthia O'Connor points out, Marlay must have been assured that his opinion would not offend Lord Charlemont.\textsuperscript{143} Marlay's apparently contradictory character assessment of Joseph Henry as both a man of good sense and learning, and of vanity, is useful. Robert Adam met Henry in January 1755, and wrote of him that he was 'a clever, sensible fellow; he has seen much of the world to purpose'.\textsuperscript{144} He repeated this opinion in 1757, when he met him at Horace Mann's residence in Florence on May 14th, writing that he had met,

...one Mr. Henry, an Irish gentleman of great estate and esteemed traveller of most taste that has been abroad these many years.\textsuperscript{145}

Whether owing to his learning or his vanity, Henry's reputation as 'the most erudite in classics of the entire Irish and British contingent at that time in Rome', whether justified or not, has been preserved for posterity in the visual record.\textsuperscript{146}

Joseph Henry's most ambitious commission of caricature at Rome was the \textit{Parody of the School of Athens}, by Joshua Reynolds, a painted caricature of Raphael's well known painting dated c. 1511 [Fig. 1.7]. Since the \textit{School of Athens} was one of several murals decorating the Apostolic Palace at the Vatican, it represented in both location and composition the kind of highbrow intellectual discussion expected of grand tourists [Fig. 1.8].\textsuperscript{147} The \textit{Parody} holds a unique position in terms of medium. Although the features of the figures are caricaturised, and their identifications with the original characters of the work are clearly intended to be humorous, the painting must have taken considerable effort to create, for both the sitters and the painter. Sitting for this kind of painting, which does not appear to have been copied, was a self-conscious act, a role-play, placing grand tourist activities into direct comparison with the most famous scholars of the classical past. The correlation drawn between British grand tourists at Rome and the most famous philosophers of antiquity reveals an amused awareness of the shortcomings of visitors to Rome in the second half of the long eighteenth century.

\textsuperscript{142} O'Connor, \textit{The Pleasing Hours}, 102, cited as Royal Irish Academy, 12.R.21, no. 101.  
\textsuperscript{143} O'Connor, \textit{The Pleasing Hours}, 102.  
\textsuperscript{146} Benedetti, \textit{The Milltowsns}, 51.  
\textsuperscript{147} Figgis and Rooney, \textit{Irish Paintings}, 339, note 23, 'The painting was commissioned by Joseph Henry, and provoked much criticism for the manner in which it parodied Raphael's sacrosanct work.'
Sergio Benedetti and Cynthia O'Connor have worked to identify the characters depicted in the *Parody of the School of Athens*, but several of the figures are still disputed. Denys Sutton tracked down two lists of people who appeared to have been caricatured by Joshua Reynolds in 1751, in the artist's own hand. The list verifies the presence of Lord Charlemont, the Leesons and Joseph Henry, as well as 25 other visitors to Rome, including Lord Charlemont's tutor, Edward Murphy. The *Parody* is staged within a building which is Gothic in architectural style. Margery Morgan has pointed to the gothic architecture of the *Parody* as a signifier of the nationality of the sitters, writing, 'The assembly's British identity is asserted in the verticals of the building's Gothic architecture.' In comparison, Sergio Benedetti read the choice as insulting, writing, '...since the use of the word 'gothic' for Italian art theorists was always synonymous with 'barbaric', in that way he [Reynolds] ridiculed the taste and the northern origins of his fellow connoisseurs.' Cynthia O'Connor took a similar stance, claiming the architecture signified 'northern vandalism'. The choice of Gothic rather than neo-classical architecture was clearly intended to be humorous- the intention may

---

149 Sutton, "The Roman Caricatures", 113, 'Fortunately Reynolds has left a record of some, though not all, of the sitters in the series in one of his two Roman sketchbooks, belonging to Mrs. Copland-Griffiths, which reads as follows: "Caricaturas which I did in Rome, 1751: Lord Charlemont, Sir Thomas Kennedy, Mr. Ward, Mr. Phelps, Sir W.A. Lowther, Mr. Leeson Junr., Mr. Turner, Mr. Huet, Lord Bruce, Mr. Ward, Mr. Leeson junr., Mr. Henry, Mr. Cook, Mr. Woodyer, Mr. Turner (ancora), Mr. Drake. P in the Caricaturas of the School of Athens: Mr. Henry, Lord Bruce, Mr. Leeson senr., Mr. Maxwell, Mr. Barret, Mr. Patch, Mr. Virepile, Sir William Lowther, Dr. Erwin, Mr. Bagot, Abbate de Bois, Mr. Bretengam, Mr. Murfey, Mr. Sterling, Mr. Ironmonger, Mr. Dawson, Sir Matthew Featherstone, Lord Charlemont, Mr. Phelps, Sir Thomas Kennedy, Four idea figures." Not all of the spellings of names are accurate, and there appears to be some confusion over the Leesons. As Sutton notes, however, 'What makes the series so fascinating is that the personalities depicted form a representative group of Englishmen in Rome in the 18th century.'
have been to relocate the open-plan academy from the blue skies and classical surroundings of Rome to the grim buildings and grey skies of Britain.

The walls feature several statue niches, from which grotesque figures threaten to emerge. The arrangement of the figures roughly mirrors that of the original, most notably in the isolated figure of Diogenes the Cynic lounging on the steps, played by Joseph Henry [Fig. 1.9]. Henry's recurring depiction as engrossed in literature is here given precedent, as the Raphael painting includes a scroll for the figure to read. The choice of character has the effect of causing Henry's numerous other depictions while reading to reference this identification with Diogenes the Cynic, an ancient Greek philosopher whose most enduring legacy was his tendency to be controversial. At the apex of the scene, Joseph Leeson is suitably doyen-like in the character of Plato, with the stout Sir William Lowther as a disciple at his back, and Leeson Junior as a supporter, a tall figure peering over from the right hand side. Lord Bruce appears as Alexander the Great, a tall figure to the upper left of the painting, holding his hat and some kind of folio [Fig. 1.10]. Lord Charlemont, Sir Thomas Kennedy and Richard Phelps are seen in a Pythagorean group to the lower left [Fig. 1.11].

Lord Charlemont is seated in the centre of the grouping, making his identification most likely Pythagoras, a mathematician who was known to have travelled from his birthplace of Samos to Greece and Egypt. Lord Charlemont, who plays the recorder, had travelled to Egypt and Greece before his return to Rome in 1750.

The overall effect is 'jovial', according to scholar John Kenworthy-Browne, who wrote,

> Batoni's long series of portraits of British Grand Tourists also begins in 1750. But no painting conveys better the jovial heartiness of British visitors than the caricature group by Joshua Reynolds, his Parody of the School of Athens, which he made in 1751. It was a commission by Joseph Henry of Straffan, Dublin, and many of the characters were Irish.

Kenworthy-Browne's interpretation of the Parody reveals his understanding that visitors to Rome from each of the four nations of Britain could present themselves as part of a collective British identity. This is not to argue that nationalistic bias did not exist, but in the imagery of British grand tourism in the 1750s, it appears to have been subsumed into a list of qualities and characteristics which could be subjected to caricature.

---

Although the figures are exaggerated, the caricature was given additional impact through the assumption that the viewer recognised the sitters, and recognised their roles through comparison with the original work located at the Vatican. During his time as President of the Royal Academy at London, Joshua Reynolds would denounce caricature as an inferior artistic medium, writing,

...each person should also have that expression which men of his rank generally exhibit. The joy, or the grief of a character of dignity, is not to be expressed in the same manner as a similar passion in a vulgar face.\textsuperscript{156}

It would be a mistake to assume that the character played by each man in the Parody was a matter of chance. An understanding of ancient Greek philosophy was necessary to fully appreciate the comic effect. Drawing correlations between contemporaries and characters from Roman history was a common trope, as Philip Ayres noted in relation to the British Parliament, where,

Charles James Fox was the English Demosthenes, in whose works he was known to be steeped, William Pitt the Elder was also compared to Demosthenes as well as to Cicero, Richard Brinsley Sheridan was Hyperides (next in rank to Demosthenes) or an improved Tacitus for his 'correct periods'.\textsuperscript{157}

Reynolds completed six smaller caricatures for Joseph Henry in 1751, one of which is entitled \textit{Four Learned Milordi} [Fig. 1.12]. The image shows Thomas Brudenell, Lord Bruce of Tottenham (close friend to Lord Charlemont), John Ward (the only figure not in the Parody of Athens) and Joseph Leeson Junior in the company of Joseph Henry. The image caricatures the physical appearance of the gentlemen in question as they converse, but Henry's absorption in his book, thought to be plans of the Cloaca Maxima, while his companions literally talk over his head, is the main source of amusement.\textsuperscript{158} The joke lies in the fact that the ruins in question were part of the ancient Roman sewage system. Joseph Henry's interest in classical antiquity, which leads him to ignore his companions, adds to the gentle mockery. One of the aspects of caricature fully appreciated by the eighteenth-century viewer was the way in which it presupposed intimate knowledge of the facial features and characters of the men depicted, not only on the part of the artist who chose which features to exaggerate, but also on the part of the sitters, who knew each other well enough to be able to

\textsuperscript{156} Joshua Reynolds, \textit{Discourse IV}, (delivered to the students of the Royal Academy on the distribution of the prizes, December 10th, 1771).

\textsuperscript{157} Ayres, \textit{Classical Culture}, 51.

\textsuperscript{158} Benedetti, \textit{The Milltowns}, 59-60.
easily identify each other in the finished product.\textsuperscript{159} Geoffrey Bagnal Clarke wrote to James Boswell from Milan on August 17th 1765, 

Patch has by this time encanvass'd you, and I dare say made us as ridiculous, as his Genius will admit of. After all tis absurd enough for a Man to sit seriously down to be laugh'd at, in the Copy of his figure, who at the same time wou'd cut one's throat for grinning at the original. I soon expect a letter, which, amongst other good intelligence, will bring me that of the fate of our Caricatura.\textsuperscript{160}

The letter reveals the intimacy of the caricature as a medium, as both men agree to be mocked together. One of the smaller caricatures produced by Reynolds shows Lord Charlemont, Mr. Ward, Sir Thomas Kennedy and Mr. Phelps together as a group [Fig. 1.13].\textsuperscript{161} The caricature, which appears to be a study for the grouping on the left lower side of the \textit{Parody of the School of Athens}, is given a humorous twist through adding the figure of Mr Ward and referencing the nationality of the sitters. The Irish Charlemont is shown seated with a bunch of shamrock in his hat, standing to his left Sir Thomas Kennedy the Scot appears with a blue and white cross of St. Andrew, and to his right the Welsh Mr Phelps's hat is topped with a leek.\textsuperscript{162} Englishman Ward is depicted with the red cross of St. George, standing behind the players with an expression of exasperation on his face. He does not play an instrument: his hand is clearly inserted into his waistcoat in the traditional pose of a gentleman.\textsuperscript{163}

The presentation of the grand tourists as representatives of the four nations of Britain is both deliberate and humorous. The fact that each man plays a different instrument may allude to their own talents, or the fact that Lord Charlemont was briefly involved in the founding of an academy of music at Rome, which Mr Phelps managed.\textsuperscript{164} Mr Ward appears to have been added to the image solely in order to make the joke, and the theatricality of his characterisation suggests not only that the joke concerns the representation of Britishness at Rome, but that through him the English are the butt of the joke: he mocks the playing of his

\textsuperscript{159} Group caricature represented the collective identity being performed by the sitters. At this point in time, caricature was considered informal and amusing. Before satirical imagery became more virulent in London in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the Prince of Wales collected satirical prints of himself, including ones which mocked his debts. See Kate Heard, ed., \textit{High Spirits: The Comic Art of Thomas Rowlandson}, (exhibition, Royal Collection Trust, 2013): 44.

\textsuperscript{160} Brinsley Ford Archive, RBF/1/669- Thomas Patch, cited as Yale ed., \textit{Boswell Correspondence}, 17 August 1765.

\textsuperscript{161} Joshua Reynolds, \textit{Sir Thomas Kennedy, Lord Charlemont, John Ward and Richard Phelps}, 1751, 64 x 49.5cm, National Gallery of Ireland, inv. no. 737.

\textsuperscript{162} O'Connor, \textit{The Pleasing Hours}, 116, sees a rose on Ward's head, but on close inspection it is clearly a cross.


\textsuperscript{164} Ingamells, \textit{Dictionary}, 197.
fellow grand tourists, yet he was excluded from the *Parody*. The idea of wearing national insignia may have stemmed from an established English custom. In 1741 Lady Pomfret described attending a concert in Rome, to which a Mr. Lincoln had invited her with her daughters on St. George's Day,

...when all the English wore red crosses; which when together made a considerable number and looked very pretty.\textsuperscript{165}

The anecdote reveals the desire of the English at Rome to celebrate their collective identity on the patron day of their saint, employing a visual device which must have taken some effort to co-ordinate. The attendees at the concert were immediately distinguishable through a binary between English and foreign. The use of the national symbols in Reynolds’ caricature may have been mocking this practice.

The caricature exposes the self-conscious nature of self-fashioning at Rome, offering a glimpse into the motivation behind uniting to be portrayed as British in the face of different, and generally more liberal, social customs. This explains the apparent conflict between formal portrait imagery and caricature: the latter acted as a private memento of the realities of sociability abroad, where Britishness took priority, while the former was intended to portray the sitter as the idealised figure of the grand tourist on their return home. The importance of humour for travellers in foreign countries has been convincingly posited by Chloe Chard.\textsuperscript{166} Her theory that joking formed an important method of navigating the instability of sightseeing as an activity relates well to the observations on grand tourism found in this chapter. The collective identity of being British on the grand tour, evident in caricature imagery, began to manifest in painted portraiture with the introduction of Rome-specific symbols, first visible in the portrait of Lord Charlemont.\textsuperscript{167}

Lord Charlemont was evidently interested in how best to represent Britain abroad. The intended float of the short-lived musical society of Charlemont and Phelps featured the four men, among others, in a bombastic presentation of Britain as the true home of classical virtues. Planned for the 1751 Carnival at Rome, the enterprise was described by Cynthia O’Connor,

---

\textsuperscript{165} Ingamells, *Dictionary*, 602, Lincoln, cited as Pomfret Correspondence, 3:92, 23 April 1741.
\textsuperscript{167} Lord Charlemont evidently enjoyed caricature and satire, as he commissioned *Piquet: or Virtue in Danger (The Lady’s Last Stake)*, 1759, (914 x 1054 mm, Albright-Knox Art Gallery, Buffalo, New York, Gift of Seymour H. Knox, Jr., 1945), from William Hogarth.
Phelps and Charlemont designed a Triumph of British Liberty—a three-decker car painted with emblems of the House of Hanover and drawn by four horses abreast, carrying nineteen figures in symbolic dress, among them Charlemont as Minerva presiding over the Arts and Sciences; Lord Bruce as Liberty, and Lord Middleton, Ward and Kennedy as Patriotism, Virtue and Truth. Phelps himself played Britannia, 'because', he explained, 'I looked the jolliest of the Company'. The authorities, however, banned the exercise on the grounds that four horses abreast were dangerous in narrow streets.168

The emphasis on the House of Hanover and on British liberty effectively rendered the float a re-enactment of classical triumphal processions, forming a clear statement of cultural possession on the part of the British at Rome.

The presence of Lord Charlemont, Sir Thomas Kennedy, Sir William Lowther and Charles Turner with two other figures, possibly Lord Bruce of Tottenham and Thomas Steavens, in a group painting by an unknown painter indicates an independent interest in group portraiture on the part of Lord Charlemont [Fig. 1.14]. The painting, entitled Connoisseurs in Rome, 1751, has been attributed to Thomas Patch and to Katherine Read.169 The identification of the second figure from left to right as Lord Charlemont appears accurate, and reveals a commission which was separate to the Leesons, Joshua Reynolds, or Joseph Henry. The painting shows the men engaged in conversation in front of the Colosseum and the Arch of Constantine: confirming that for Charlemont, the inclusion of the Colosseum in his individual portrait by Batoni evoked memories of his sociability at Rome.

Lord Charlemont and Pompeo Batoni

The central position of James Caulfield, Lord Charlemont in the narrative of the Parody of the School of Athens reflected his travels, wealth, status and role in many of the activities of the British group at Rome in the early 1750s. Lord Charlemont was the heir to an extremely large fortune which he inherited at a young age. He answered only to his tutor, Edward Murphy, and his stepfather in Dublin. As a child he reputedly ran wild until Murphy introduced him to the joys of reading, which he took to in such great volume that he blamed his teenage years of reading for his later poor eyesight.170 A great scholar by the time of his

168 Cynthia O’Connor, entry in Ingamells, Dictionary, 196-199. See also O’Connor, The Pleasing Hours, 109-112.
169 Benedetti, The Milltowns, 48, attributes it to Thomas Patch, while a new identification of the artist has been suggested by Margery Morgan, "British Connoisseurs in Rome: was it painted by Katherine Read?", The British Art Journal, Vol. 7, (No. 1, Spring/Summer 2006, 40-44).
grand tour, it was nevertheless deemed the appropriate time for travelling by his stepfather and tutor partly because Charlemont had begun to backslide into unsuitable company in Dublin. Charlemont seized the opportunity to go beyond the usual environs of the Grand Tour, and commissioned a ship to take him to Greece, Turkey and Egypt. On his travels Charlemont kept daily journals, now lost, which he used as the basis for several essays, which consisted of classical quotations and observations on the cultures he experienced. His discoveries included the location of ancient Halicarnassus. Yet Charlemont showed no desire to publish his Essays, of which only the two on Greece and Turkey survive. He continued to work on and edit them until late in his life, deleting beyond retrieval certain passages which may have dealt with nudity or political opinions.

Charlemont's known portrait by Batoni was as pioneering as his extended travels. The portrait, one of two commissioned by Lord Charlemont from Batoni, shows the sitter standing in three-quarter length view. He sports a vibrantly coloured suit and leans on a square column base. The pose reduces the formality of the portrait, an impression reinforced by the sitter's untied and dangling necktie. Over his shoulder can clearly be seen the Colosseum, in what is arguably the earliest example of the use of a recognisable landmark in a Batoni portrait, and the earliest use of the Colosseum, which would prove a popular choice among later sitters. The sitter does not gesture to it or acknowledge his

---


172 The question of why Charlemont, who was not the first to travel so far, but who made several key discoveries and later helped fund the research trip of James Stuart and Nicholas Revett, did not publish his findings, apart from two papers he gave to the Royal Irish Academy, remains unanswered. For Charlemont's discoveries abroad, see Michael and Myles Gibbons, "The Discoveries of Lord Charlemont", Archaeology Ireland, Vol. 20, (No. 2, Summer 2006, 30-31 + 33-35).

173 RIA Charlemont MSS, 12/R/5-6.

174 Stanford, "The Manuscripts of Lord Charlemont's Eastern Travels", 70, notes, 'An intriguing feature of both manuscripts is the occurrence of obliterations, varying in length from a single line to over half a page... A few of these are opposite passages in the narrative describing delicate subjects such as the courtesan Phryne, the poetess Sappho, the chastity of Turkish women, and the castration of youths. But other deletions have no such correlation.'

175 Pompeo Batoni, James Caulfield, Lord Charlemont, Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, Cat. No. 188.

176 Other portraits by Batoni to include landmarks are: Portrait of a Gentleman, (Philip Stanhope attrib.), c. 1751, Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, Cat. No. 143, unidentified, possibly a sixth century church on the Palatine Hill; James Stopford, later 2nd Earl of Courtown, c. 1753-4, Cat. No. 172, unidentified structure; William Legge, 2nd Earl of Dartmouth, c. 1752/3-6, Cat. No. 192, unidentified structure. Later uses of the Colosseum after the portrait of Lord Charlemont were: Portrait of a Gentleman,
location, but his direct gaze from the canvas, and the window which effectively places the
Colosseum at eye level results in a pictorial composition which places the sitter’s location at
Rome as paramount. In this innovative portrait which featured the first known inclusion of
the Colosseum in a portrait by Batoni, Lord Charlemont had achieved the visual
manifestation of a desire to acquire classical antiquity which was most succinctly expressed
by Henry Seymour Conway in 1740, 'I would buy the Coliseum if I could.'

The second portrait Charlemont commissioned from Batoni remains untraced, but the double
commission, one three-quarter length and one full-length, reflects the sitter’s interest in
portrait imagery. Edgar Peters Bowron wrote,

   The portrait stands at the beginning of Batoni’s evolution of a specifically "Grand
Tour" formula and is the earliest extant painting in which he employed a view of the
Colosseum. The monument is glimpsed in the background through the open window,
rendered as if it were a small painting, in contrast to the later, more accomplished
use of the motif within the rest of the composition. There is a precedent for the use
of this motif in Trevisani’s portrait earlier in the century of Sir Edward Gascoigne at
Leeds.

This chapter is not suggesting that Batoni’s composition was original, but rather, that its
development into a standardised pictorial formula for grand tourists at Rome can be traced to
the influential and innovative self-fashioning of three men. Beyond that, the complex nexus
of sociability at Rome renders tracing smaller details difficult. For example, the subtler
details of the Batoni portraits of the Leesons, Henry and Charlemont reappear in portraiture
of their fellow grand tourists, most of which does not include a signature offering a definitive
date. Thomas Dawson was painted by Batoni in circa 1751 wearing a fur-lined coat similar
to that worn by Leeson Junior, with thick cuffs on the sleeves [Fig. 1.15].

   (discussed in Chapter Two), Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, Cat. No. 218, c. 1758-9; Francis Russell, Lord
Tavistock, Cat. No. 252, 1762; Henry Ellison, Cat. No. 275, 1764; Viscountess Spencer, Cat. No. 276,
1764; Prince Edward Augustus, Cat. No. 281-84, 1764; William Weddell, Cat. No. 300, 1765-6; Hon.
Colonel Gordon, Cat. No. 350, 1766; Philip Metcalfe, Cat. No. 314, c. 1766-7; Sir Gregory Turner,
Cat. No. 335, 1768-9.

177 Letter from Henry Seymour Conway to Horace Walpole, 23 April 1740, quoted in Andrew Wilton
and Ilaria Bignamini, Grand Tour: The Lure of Italy in the Eighteenth Century, (exhibition, Tate

178 Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, Cat. No. 188, 223. Bowron goes on to note that Alastair Smart has
commented further on the motif of the Colosseum in portraits of the inglesi making their grand tour-
of which ‘there could be no more readable symbol or token of a patron's proud distinction in having
travelled to Italy to drink at the fount of ancient culture and learning...’; cited as Alastair Smart,

179 Pompeo Batoni, Thomas Dawson, later 1st Viscount Cremorne, 95.9 x 71.8cm, private collection.
The image is taken from Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, Cat. No. 135, who accredits the image to the Witt
Library, Courtauld Institute, London. Ingamells, Dictionary, 285, Thomas Dawson (1725-1813), MP
1749-68, created Baron Dartrey in 1770, Viscount Cremorne in 1785, Baron Cremorne 1797.
that of Charlemont, and holds his place in a book in his right hand, a device used in the portrait of Joseph Henry. The existence of a second portrait of Dawson by Batoni similar to the imagery of Sir Matthew Fetherstonhaugh suggests that Dawson was heavily influenced by his compatriots.\(^{180}\)

The subtlety of the similarities in the portrait imagery could reflect discussion amongst the sitters as to the composition of their portrait commissions, viewing the portraiture in progress, or accompanying each other to Batoni's studio for sittings. The idea of small groups socialising in the studio is also suggested by considering the small group paintings by Joshua Reynolds as studies from which the larger composition of the *Parody of the School of Athens* was achieved.\(^{181}\) Owing to the length of his grand tour, Charlemont visited Rome several times. According to Heather Hyde Minor, during his stay in Rome from 1752 to 1753, Charlemont resided in *Via della Croce*, the same street where Anthony Clark recorded Batoni's spacious lodgings.\(^{182}\) The idea of Charlemont as a key figure of sociability at Rome is revealed in the letters of his compatriots. Richard Phelps wrote to John Bouverie concerning Lord Charlemont,

> I do not know if you have heard of that young Nobleman's character but amongst all the men of fashion that I have had the honour of being acquainted with abroad, I know few who have made so great & indeed universal use of their Travels as he has done.\(^{183}\)

Lord Charlemont's choice of a Roman landmark, rather than referencing a recognisable symbol of his more exotic travels, such as an Egyptian obelisk, is striking. It exposes a value judgment which placed more importance on documenting his activities at Rome than translating the drawings of Richard Dalton, his draughtsman on the trip, into portraiture,

---

\(^{180}\) Bowron, *Pompeo Batoni*, Cat. No. 136, Thomas Dawson, later 1st Viscount Cremorne, 95.9 x 71.8cm, private collection. For Sir Matthew Fetherstonhaugh, see Bowron, *Pompeo Batoni*, Cat. No. 145.

\(^{181}\) Benedetti, *The Milltowns*, 58, considers the commissions for the smaller works to predate the *Parody*, 'In staging the *Parody*, Reynolds has evidently tried to make the best use of the three conversation pieces just painted for Leeson.' He points to several aspects of the commission to support his claim, such as the fact that the smaller works are better painted.


\(^{183}\) Quoted by O'Connor, *The Pleasing Hours*, 110-111. Ingamells, *Dictionary*, 593, records that both men, Richard Phelps and John Bouverie, had been acquainted with Joseph Leeson Senior for years. The three men dined together with John Clephane on October 24th, 1745, at Rome. The event was noted by Richard Brinsley Ford in the Rose of Kilravock MSS, GD125/23/10.
despite the burgeoning interest in Greek antiquity during this period.\textsuperscript{184} As one of the few British men of leisure with an interest in antiquity who had travelled to Athens at this point in time, Charlemont's opinion on the debate between the art of Greece and Rome was eagerly sought.\textsuperscript{185} Johann Joachim Winckelmann, whose art historical theories would transform the European understanding of antiquity, wrote of his desire to meet Charlemont, whom he mistakenly believed to be in Italy, in a letter from Rome to Philipp von Stosch, dated 28th October 1757, 

\begin{quote}
...should you have a chance to recommend me to Lord Charlemont who is supposed to be in Florence please do so without me reminding you.\textsuperscript{186}
\end{quote}

Lord Charlemont's grand tour ended in 1754, therefore either Winckelmann was mistaken, or this must have been a later trip which is not recorded by John Ingamells in his 1997 Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy.\textsuperscript{187} Charlemont's desire to be portrayed before the Colosseum is substantiated by a proven interest in classical antiquity. One of the earliest sitters to include an antique bust in their portrait by Batoni was Robert Clements, whose portrait is dated circa 1753-4.\textsuperscript{188} His choice of a bust of the Farnese Homer was based on his appreciation of viewing the original, which he deemed, 

\begin{quote}
...the famous bust of Homer, Antich [sic] & extremely fine.\textsuperscript{189}
\end{quote}

There was no apparent relationship between the two men, but the bust was one which Lord Charlemont also admired. In March of 1754 Charlemont was permitted by the Vatican to

\textsuperscript{184} Charlemont helped fund Stuart and Revett's subsequent trip to Athens: Ingamells, Dictionary, 197, cited as J. Woodside, Antiquities of Athens, 1816, 4: xxiii.

\textsuperscript{185} Ingamells, Dictionary, 197, 'Now a key figure in the developing Graeco-Roman controversy, Charlemont claimed the attention of scholars and antiquarians, Benedict XIV and the Cardinals Passionei and Albani. The doors of the Roman nobility were opened to him, but it was in the company of his fellow grand tourists that he spent his time.'

\textsuperscript{186} Hans Diepolder and Walther Rehm ed.s, Briefe, 8 vols (Berlin, 1952, Vol. i): Letter 193, 310-311, Johann Joachim Winckelmann to Philipp von Stosch. Transcribed and translated by author from printed Germanic script, 'Sollte sich Gelegenheit finden mich dem Mylord Charlemont, welcher in Florenz seyn soll, zu empfehlen, so werden Sie sich meiner ohne Bitte erinnern. Ich brauche Ihnen nicht zu sagen, dass ich dencke, wie ich wolllte von mir gedacht haben und dass kein Bortheil oder irgend eine niedrige Ubsicht Sie hieran erinnert.'

\textsuperscript{187} Diepolder and Rehm, Briefe, note 578, comment that Charlemont’s presence at Florence at the time cannot be proven.

\textsuperscript{188} Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, Cat. No. 166, Robert Clements, c. 1753-4, Hood Museum of Art, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire.

\textsuperscript{189} The earliest example known is the c. 1753-4 portrait of Robert Clements, later 1st Earl of Leitrim, Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, Cat. No. 166, which includes a bust of the Farnese Homer. Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, 192 comments, 'The portrait of Clements is of further significance as one of Batoni's earliest uses of an antique marble to situate a sitter in Rome and to suggest an appreciation on the part of the sitter for the beauty of ancient art...’ The bust was at the Palazzo Farnese. The quote above is cited in Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, 192, as the Killadoon Papers S/I.
export a copy of the *Farnese Homer* bust. Lord Charlemont's portrait imagery is likely to have been influential, as he appears consistently at the heart of academies and schemes thought up by the British at Rome. Denys Sutton records a note preserved by Vertue, which appeared in the *Daily Advertiser*, dated 12 May 1752,

> The English noblemen and Gentlemen now at this Place on their Travelles [sic], having taken into consideration the Disadvantages young students of their Nation in Painting and Sculpture lie under here for want of the Foundation of an Accademy, [sic] with Pensions for encouragement of those whose circumstances will not permit them to prosecute their studies for a sufficient time at their own expense, have begun a generous subscription towards the foundation of an Accademy, [sic] and have appointed *Mr. John Parker* History Painter to be the Receiver and director thereof. The Generous Promoters of this Foundation are the Lords Bruce, Charlemont, Tilney and Kilmurry, Sr. Thomas Kennedy, Bart., Mes. Ward, Iremonger, Lethulliere, Bagot, Scroop, Cook, Lypeat, Murphy, and as all Nations in Europe particularly the French have Accademies [sic] and great Encouragements, 'tis hop'd all Lovers of the Arts will promote this generous design.

The correlation between the sitters for the *Parody of the School of Athens* and the patrons of Charlemont's new Academy for British artists is striking, with at least eight of the above names appearing in the list preserved by Reynolds of his sitters. Sutton notes that the Academy was named the *Academy of English Professors of the Liberal Arts*. This nomenclature emphasised the scholarly aspirations of the British at Rome, and their willingness to collectively entitle themselves English. The Academy lasted until 1755, when it was disbanded owing to fighting among the artists, in particular the caricature artist Thomas Patch. This does not appear to have disturbed Charlemont, who in July of 1755 paid Patch several hundred *zecchini* in relation to works he had commissioned from the artist.

Lord Charlemont played an important role in the British group at Rome. The extent to which his nationality was a factor in his sociability is a difficult question given his later role in the formation of the Irish Volunteers, and subsequently, their fight for Irish independence. His biographer Cynthia O'Connor attempted not to contradict her own assertion that Joseph Leeson's uncultured behaviour was a nationalistic trait by describing a natural polarity between Joseph Leeson and Lord Charlemont as cultured and uncultured Irishmen of different class groups. She claimed that,

---

190 Ingamells, *Dictionary*, 197, cited as Bertolotti, 4:82.
191 Sutton, "Roman Caricatures", 116.
192 Sutton, "Roman Caricatures", 116.
194 See Craig, *The Volunteer Earl*, 159-169. This chapter concerns Charlemont in the 1750s. Regarding Charlemont's early use of the term British, Craig (p.134-5) notes, 'And the 'Empire' was in 1762 a 'British' institution of which Irish Whigs might, even as Irishmen, feel themselves proud.'
Charlemont, without undue snobbery, inclined towards the English group and was totally accepted as one of theirs. At the same time he was on amicable terms with his compatriots or at least with the younger members, who moved under the redoubtable leadership of Joseph Leeson, future 1st Earl of Milltown, a Dublin brewer and banker.\textsuperscript{195}

For the purposes of this chapter, rather than forming theories based on nationality, it is of more interest to observe whether Charlemont's sociability on the grand tour was sustained. One of Pier Leone's Ghezzi's drawings is of particular importance in registering a relationship which is only hinted at in the written record: that of Joseph Leeson Junior and James Caulfield, Lord Charlemont.\textsuperscript{196} In the Ghezzi drawing, the two men are depicted sitting at a small table having tea [Fig. 1.16]. Joseph Leeson Junior, with his distinctive beaked nose, sits on the left. The identification of Charlemont as the figure on the right cutting a slice of bread has been disputed by scholars. Michael Wynne identified the figure on the right as Joseph Henry in 1974, while Cynthia O'Connor, Sergio Benedetti and John Ingamells identified the figure as Lord Charlemont.\textsuperscript{197} Through comparison with the imagery previously examined in this chapter, it is evident that the bushy eyebrows, thick lips and flat forehead of the figure represent Charlemont. The image is unusual in depicting only two figures. The majority of caricature depicted small groups or solitary figures. The resulting impression is of a comfortable and relaxed conversation between the men, whose acquaintance at Rome would have been restricted by the brevity of the Leesons' visit.

Despite the image, the relationship does not seem to have been sustained past the grand tour. Within the extant correspondence of Charlemont, the Leesons are mentioned only once, in relation to Leeson Junior acting in a play being performed at Dublin. In comparison, Charlemont's friendship with the Scottish Lord Bruce produced a volume of letters between the two. The letters were not restricted to personal or political news, but indicated an appreciation for each-other's judgement, such as mutually reviewing the \textit{Letters} of Lord

\textsuperscript{195} O'Connor, \textit{The Pleasing Hours}, 101. O'Connor neglects to mention here that Charlemont's companion on his sea voyage to Egypt and the Levant was the Irishman Francis Pierpoint Burton, whom he financially supported for the duration of the trip. Ingamells, \textit{Dictionary}, 197, Charlemont, and 163, Burton.

\textsuperscript{196} Pier Leone Ghezzi, \textit{Joseph Leeson and James Caulfield}, c. 1751-53, 32.1 x 22.3cm, Philadelphia Museum of Art, Anthony Morris Clark Bequest 1978, 1978-70-290. Richard Marlay reported from Dublin, April 1752 that 'the \textit{Fair Penitent} is to be acted in town by some ladies and gentlemen, Leeson is to play Lothario, they say he will do it very ill...'. Quoted in O'Connor, \textit{The Pleasing Hours}, 123, cited as HMC Rept. 12, App. pt. X, p. 184.

\textsuperscript{197} Michael Wynne, "The Milltouns as Patrons: Particularly concerning the picture-collecting of the first two Earls", \textit{Apollo}, Vol. XCIX, (No. 144, February 1974, 104-111): 109, fig. 13, O'Connor, \textit{The Pleasing Hours}, 114, Benedetti, \textit{The Milltouns}, 42, Ingamells, \textit{Dictionary}, 197, 'During the wet winter and spring of 1750-1, when the craze for caricatura was at its height, Charlemont appeared with Joseph Leeson junior in a drawing by P.L Ghezzi (Philadelphia MA)...'.
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Chesterfield in August of 1774.\(^{198}\) A biography of Charlemont written in 1833 revealed the difficulty he faced in sustaining his grand tour sociability once he left London. The author wrote in the *Dublin Penny Journal*,

> To his native country, Lord Charlemont at length returned, after an absence of nearly nine years. Notwithstanding his protracted sojourn abroad, his character was in some measure established at home. It is certain that he was very generally talked of, and splendid hopes were early entertained of his being one day an ornament to Ireland. Yet it was no small effort of patriotism for a young nobleman, courted as he had been abroad, enamoured of the fine arts, and enjoying abroad and in England the society of those, whose taste and habits were congenial to his own, voluntarily to fix his residence in Ireland, actuated solely by the feeling, that he owed it as a duty to his country. Here too, he had comparatively no friends, or even acquaintances.\(^{199}\)

The idea that Charlemont knew few people in Dublin on his return is possible, given the length of his tour and the disreputable characters he had fallen in with before his departure, but the claim of a country-wide lack of suitable company is hyperbole.\(^{200}\) The biographer later posits Charlemont as a pillar of culture who literally attracted visitors to Dublin, in a manner which reveals the writer's impression of the cultural inferiority of Ireland to England during this period,

> Every foreigner of taste congenial to his own, and every Englishman of rank and talent, who visited Dublin, made it a point to be introduced to him. As Edmund Burke once said of him, 'he was indeed a man of such polished manners, of a mind so truly adorned, and disposed to the adoption of whatever was excellent and praiseworthy, that to see and converse with him should alone induce any one who relished such qualities, to pay a visit to Dublin.'\(^{201}\)

Charlemont is revealed to have been successful on his extended travels, acquiring an excellent sense of taste and learning, and becoming a credit to his native country. The frequency of Lord Charlemont's visits to London, where he was a member of the *Society of Dilettanti*, is not mentioned.\(^{202}\) The biographer presents a narrative in which Charlemont was equivalent in culture and learning to the English, and was praiseworthy for being happy to be based in Ireland, his 'native country' which claimed a hand in the formation of his character.

The resulting (post-revolutionary) rhetoric reveals the author's anxiety over the perceived

---

\(^{198}\) RIA, Charlemont MSS, Letter 86: Reply from Lord Charlemont to Lord Bruce, August 1774, Second Series, Volume 1: 12/R/12.


\(^{200}\) The Leesons were based in Wicklow, not far from Dublin, and Thomas Dawson was based in Monaghan, among others. O'Connor, *The Pleasing Hours*, 178-179, also comments on Charlemont's reluctance to leave London.

\(^{201}\) O'G, "James Calfield, Earl of Charlemont", 262.

\(^{202}\) Ingamells, *Dictionary*, 196, Fellow of the Royal Society and Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries in 1755, created member of the *Society of Dilettanti* in 1756.
The picture which emerges is of a network of correspondence and contacts outside of Ireland, which was founded on grand tourist ideals of taste and learning, and which lasted beyond Charlemont's grand tour.

Conclusion

That individual grand tours were a matter of general interest is evident from an announcement in the *Daily Post*, London, on Wednesday March 31st, 1736, which noted the 'grand Tour of France, Rome and Italy' of John Montagu, the fourth Earl of Sandwich, aged 18. The differentiation between Rome and Italy, which contained more than one nation state, shows the importance of the capital as the cultural highlight of a Grand Tour. The increased emphasis on the public presentation of a particular self in the long eighteenth century, which ranged from purchasing the correct clothing to viewing sites of antiquity, led to innovation in the search for a pictorial identity.

The innovative patronage of Joseph Leeson, Joseph Henry and James Caulfield, Lord Charlemont, at Rome in the 1750s sheds new light on the pictorial record of self-fashioning on the grand tour. The extent to which this innovation stemmed from a social disadvantage bestowed by their Irishness is difficult to judge. Their impact on the visual record of grand tourism, however, is clear. The reputation of Pompeo Batoni as a portrait artist to the British was first established by Joseph Leeson's repeated commissions. The pictorial identity employed in Batoni's portrait of Lord Charlemont would be elaborated on by hundreds of British tourists to Rome over the course of the second half of the long eighteenth century, in portraits by Batoni, and in those of other artists. Joseph Henry's caricature commissions revealed the spirit of collective British sociability at Rome on the grand tour, showcasing some of the humorous aspects of grand tour viewing activities. The contrast between portrait and caricature was suggestive. The formal painted portrait presented the individual accomplishments of the sitter as a grand tourist, while the group caricature satirised the cultural correlation between British grand tourists and ancient philosophers, hinting at the less refined realities of sociability among a large group of wealthy young men abroad.

203 *Daily Post*, Iss. 5163, (Burney Collection, accessed 11/07/2013). It was on the Earls' advice that Lord Charlemont moved from The Hague to Turin, where he enrolled at the Royal Academy in October 1747 for a year, according to Ingamells, *Dictionary*, 196. See also Craig, *Volunteer Earl*, 39.
Commissioning portraiture at Rome was not a private act, regardless of the intended final display context of the finished work. While in Pompeo Batoni's studio, the painted versions of visitors to Rome were subjected to the same scrutiny as the sitters themselves.\(^{204}\) In comparison, the medium of caricature recorded the intangible and informal links between Batoni's sitters, and their appreciation of the nationalistic differences within the British group. The caricature provides insight into the all-male sociability which was synonymous with the grand tour in this period. While the constant visual allusions to classical antiquity are evident, the British anxiety over the value of a grand tour shifting from classical scholarship and learning to social appearances and taste, exposed by the quote at the beginning of this chapter, is somewhat validated by the conscious self-fashioning employed.

The pictorial record of grand tourism at Rome in 1751 portrayed more than the personal whims or scholarly interests of the sitters. It acted as a reflection of the broader reimagining and formulation of British identity as the social advantages of the grand tour began to outweigh the scholarly focus of previous generations. Whether consciously or unconsciously, successful visual methodologies which enhanced the societal impact of the grand tour were being developed by the British at Rome. This was arguably the heyday of British grand tourism, from 1750 to 1770, when the social advantages and possibilities for collecting and commissioning art at Rome were being exploited in new and innovative ways. By the 1770s, the benefits of grand tourist sociability would take priority over the development of taste for some travellers, as the characteristics of visitors to Rome began to diverge from the criteria employed in this chapter.

\(^{204}\) James Martin noted in his diary, May 6th 1764, 'Wt. to Battoni's the Portrait Painter & saw some very strong Likenesses of Lady Spencer, Mrs. Macarthy, Mr. Garrick, Mr. Woodhouse, ac.' Cited in Clark, *Pompeo Batoni*, 293.
Part I: Chapter Two

The Allure of the Antique: Pompeo Batoni and the Vatican Ariadne in Grand Tour Portraiture, 1760-1775

Introduction

The previous chapter of this thesis established Batoni’s portraits as nuanced visual depictions of the ideal grand tourist, created by male visitors to Rome in the 1750s seeking to self-fashion in new and innovative ways. The idea that imagery could be accessible in different ways to those viewers more or less familiar with the viewing experience at Rome, and with the sitters depicted, is further explored in this chapter through examining Batoni’s use of the Vatican Ariadne sculpture in his portraiture. The caricature of 1750s Rome revealed societal bonds not preserved in the written record, and the possibility for figures concerned with formal self-fashioning to simultaneously enjoy humorous visual references to the realities of life at Rome. Similarly, the use of sculpture within the painted portrait could reference the sitter’s experience of visiting Rome on multiple levels.

This chapter examines the primary display and reception of the Vatican Ariadne within the context of the grand tourist viewing experience at Rome, before considering its secondary display in painted portraiture by Pompeo Batoni. The marble was portrayed by Batoni in five portraits, dating from 1761 to 1774. The focus is on British sitters, by which is meant English, Irish, Scottish or Welsh travellers. The majority were English, according to Bowron, Pompeo Batoni: A Complete Catalogue of his Paintings, (Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, 2016).

The rarity of the use of the Vatican Ariadne in Batoni’s oeuvre, the diverse statuses of the sitters involved, and the rich historical, mythological, and sensual associations of the sculpture resulted in complex and multi-layered portrait imagery which has not been fully unpacked by scholars.

---

205 The sitters who included a version of the Vatican Ariadne are: Charles John Crowle (1761-2, Cat. No. 241), Thomas Dundas, later 1st Baron Dundas (1764, Cat. No. 286), William Weddell (1765-6, Cat. No. 299-301), Count Kirill Grigorjewitsch Razumovsky (1766, Cat. No. 306), and Thomas William Coke, later 1st Earl of Leicester of the Second Creation (1774, Cat. No. 384). Count Razumovsky, the only non-British sitter, was an Anglophile whose portrait heavily referenced the earlier portrait of Thomas Dundas. The catalogue numbers employed in this thesis are taken from Edgar Peters Bowron, Pompeo Batoni: A Complete Catalogue of his Paintings, (Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, 2016).

206 The focus is on British sitters, by which is meant English, Irish, Scottish or Welsh travellers. The majority were English, according to Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, Preface. See Introduction for discussion of the term 'British'.
The *Vatican Ariadne* [Fig. 2.1] is an antique marble female figure reclining on a rocky plinth, displayed lengthways at the Vatican Museum, Rome.\(^\text{207}\) Her upper body is propped up higher than her legs, which are crossed at the calves. Her head rests on her left arm, while her right is thrown behind her head at an angle, in the traditional classical pose of a sleeping figure.\(^\text{208}\) Her upper left arm is decorated with a bracelet ending in the head of a snake, often believed to be the asp by which Cleopatra committed suicide. Her lower body is swathed in drapery, which falls over her legs to cover part of the statue base. Her hair is partially veiled, held with a headband, and a heavy fall of drapery down the middle of her chest leaves her breasts exposed. Her nipples are clearly visible. Her face is turned towards the viewer, but she remains unaware of the viewer's gaze.

The *Vatican Ariadne* is neither fully nude nor fully draped, but posits an alluring median to match her associated narratives: as either Ariadne or Cleopatra, this female marble sculpture was identified as a sexually transgressive mortal figure in the texts of an eighteenth-century classical literary education.\(^\text{209}\) Despite her semi-nude appearance and identification as a mortal figure within the narrative of the sculpture, the *Vatican Ariadne* was part of the select group of antiquities known as the canon of the antique in the eighteenth century.\(^\text{210}\) Tracing the sculpture's depiction in Batoni's portraiture reveals how to the eighteenth-century viewer, sculpture acted as a readable object. The original sculpture represented not only the aesthetic taste of the ancient Romans, but also a particular morality or historicism bestowed by its associated narrative. Entering the sculpture into the painted space did not strip it of its associations. The *Vatican Ariadne* was particularly rich in allusive possibilities, referencing multiple aspects of the grand tour in composition, characterisation and history of display.

The potential implications of Pompeo Batoni's use of sculptural inclusions in portraiture have only recently been explored. John Steegman, the first scholar to catalogue Batoni's works, wrote in 1946, 'Meanwhile, there is a separate and fruitful subject for a more specialised study to be found in the objects of classical antiquity, which occur in many of

---

\(^{207}\) The identification of the *Vatican Ariadne* (Vatican Museum, Pio-Clementine Museum, Cat. 548) varied over time. The significance of her various titles will be discussed later in this chapter. For the purpose of clarity, the sculpture will be referred to as the *Vatican Ariadne* throughout.

\(^{208}\) For example, the figure of Endymion is usually shown in this pose, e.g. Antonio Canova, *Sleeping Endymion*, 1822, Chatsworth House.

\(^{209}\) For example, the story of Ariadne was told by Catullus, *Poem 64*, and by Ovid, *Heroides*, while Cleopatra is discussed in Plutarch, *Life of Marc Antony*, and Cassius Dio, *Roman History*.

\(^{210}\) Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny, *Taste and the Antique: the Lure of Classical Sculpture 1500-1900*, (Yale University Press, 1981), trace the development of this canon from the Renaissance, discussing roughly 95 works. See Haskell and Penny, 24, Fig. 96, 184-187, 'Cleopatra', for the *Vatican Ariadne*. 
Batoni’s more elaborate portrait-groups and in some of his simple portraits.’ Yet only a few lines later, he claimed, ‘Some of the portraits, such as Gordon, Tavistock and Eardley, contain more than one of these stock references.’\(^{211}\) Among the sculpture he termed 'stock references' was the Vatican Ariadne, in the portraits of Thomas Dundas, Thomas Coke and John Monson.\(^{212}\) Why three uses (that he knew of) constituted a 'stock' inclusion is unclear. The idea that the represented works were casts at Batoni’s studio rather than depictions of original sculpture in the collections at Rome persisted. The painter was assumed to be using stock references and studio objects employed as a throwaway visual device. The availability of small scale sculpted copies of classical marbles to visitors to Rome is discussed in the following chapter. It is possible that in Batoni’s early portraits, some of the statuettes depicted may have been owned by and brought to the studio by the sitter, but this serves to heighten the demonstration of their interest. The idea of Batoni owning a collection of sculpture in his studio was unlikely, given his previously noted experience in drawing the sculpture collections of Rome. Batoni's later cataloguers, Anthony Clark and Edgar Peters Bowron, took a more informed approach, crediting the inclusion of antiquity as significant on a case by case basis. For Anthony Clark in the 1980s, this significance did not extend beyond the assumption of antiquity as an indicator of location or of a general expression of taste. This approach remains typical for many scholars in portraiture studies.\(^{213}\)

This chapter argues for an in-depth analysis of Pompeo Batoni’s use of sculptural inclusions, challenging the previous scholarly assumption that sculpture acted as a 'stock' image to the eighteenth-century viewer. The term 'stock' implies that neither the sitter nor the viewer read any significance into the presence of antiquity in grand tour portraiture. Given the context of commissioning, as part of the viewing context of Rome, and with Batoni playing host to

---


212 The presence of the Vatican Ariadne in the portrait of John Monson has since been disproved. John Steegman's account in "Some English Portraits" of the portrait as including the Vatican Ariadne was very similar in description to the portrait of Thomas Coke. Steegman did not have an image of the painting, and it was noted but could not be further substantiated by Anthony M. Clark in his catalogue, *Pompeo Batoni*, 332, Cat. No. 375, 'Lord Monson is shown full-length in grey Van Dyck costume and wearing an ermine-trimmed scarlet cloak; in the background is a version of the Vatican Ariadne.' The portrait was recorded in a private collection at Burton Hall. Steegman, "Some English Portraits", 63, No. 65, 'John Monson', described it thus: 'WL standing wearing grey Vandyck costume and ermine-trimmed scarlet cloak; in background the recumbent sculptured figure known as the Vatican Ariadne.' (WL= whole-length) This description was contradicted by Bowron, *Pompeo Batoni*, Thomas Monson, Cat. No. 388, which records the portrait including a version of the seated Roma, not the Vatican Ariadne.

visitors in his studio, the idea of the negligible use of antiquity in the portraits of British
grand tourists from 1760 to 1775 is untenable. The presence of a range of sculpture, some
depicted like the original, and others altered by Batoni, is suggestive of a range of meaning
within Batoni's work. This range of meaning is further substantiated by the continual
production of portraits with and without sculptural and architectural inclusions throughout
Batoni's career. The choice of composition is unlikely to have been financially motivated for
British sitters, as Batoni's works were reasonably priced in comparison to London artists of
comparable note. Therefore the inclusion of added detail in portraiture was meaningful to a
degree beyond the simple demonstration of wealth.

Edgar Peters Bowron's move to recognise the potential for sculptural inclusions to reference
an individual sitter's interest in classical art, architecture or literature marked a crucial step
further than the idea of basic flattery or geographical indicator. His insight was built on by
Christopher M.S. Johns, who wrote,

Since the artist often included the same statues or close variations in his Grand Tour
portraits, their significance in relation to the individuals represented has been
seriously underestimated.

His article accredited significance to the statue of Roma in the 1766 portrait of the
Honourable Colonel William Gordon, noting the difference in composition compared to
other portraits which included the Roma [Fig. 2.2]. His analysis awarded value according

---

214 In the 1740s and 1750s a half length portrait by Batoni cost 30 scudi, and a full length portrait cost
60 scudi. By 1765 a half length cost 50 scudi and a full length 100 scudi. By 1780 a half length
portrait cost 100 scudi, and a full length 200 scudi. There was a clear disparity between Batoni's
pricings and the cost of a London portrait. In 1760, a half length portrait by Joshua Reynolds cost £24,
later £35, and by 1777, a full length portrait by Gainsborough would cost £100 and a full length by
Reynolds £200. Conversion varied according to inflation, but Jeremy Black, Italy and the Grand
Tour, (Yale University Press, 2003): 'Notes on Dates and Currency', has estimated that one scudo
equalled 5 shillings, therefore in Batoni's time, 4 scudi equalled a pound. By 1780, when Batoni was
at the height of his fame, his full-length portraits sold for 200 scudi, or £50, half as expensive as
Gainsborough, and three times less expensive than Reynolds. This disparity is partially explained by
the fact that it generally cost on average a third less money to live in Rome than London. It is clear
that unless the portrait was particularly ornate or complicated, the pricing of Batoni's works was very
competitive, possibly owing to the assistance of his studio. This competitive pricing encouraged
pictorial innovation.


216 Christopher M.S. Johns, "Portraiture and the Making of Cultural Identity: Pompeo Batoni’s The
Honorable Colonel William Gordon (1765-66) in Italy and North Britain", Art History, Vol. 27, (No.

217 Johns, "Portraiture and the Making of Cultural Identity", 389-390. See also Viccy Coltman, "Party-
Coloured Plaid? Portraits of Eighteenth-Century Scots in Tartan", Textile History 41, (2, November
2010).
to the size of the statue within the painting, and the level of engagement of the sitter with the sculpture.

Michael Yonan's reading of Pompeo Batoni's portrait of the *Holy Roman Emperor Joseph II and Grand Duke Leopold of Tuscany in Rome*, dated 1769, ascribed significance to the statue of *Roma* employed in the portrait, as well as the architectural inclusions visible [Fig. 2.3].

The *Roma* was read as an active symbol, both in terms of its staging within the space of the portrait, and as a source of authority for the Emperor. In the later copy of the portrait requested by the Empress Maria Theresa, Yonan successfully argued that the substitution of the *Roma* with a *Minerva* figure symbolised the Empress' desire to remind the brothers of her power. Yonan's in-depth reading drew on his understanding of material culture, and ascribed significant impact to a statue type which was frequently employed by Batoni.

Both scholars asserted the significance of the inclusion of the *Roma* within a specific, and different, portrait. By employing a highly individualistic reading, declaring the same sculpture meaningful in one portrait, but not in another, the potential for a range of meanings is ignored. On a basic level, the inclusion of any sculpture in the context of commissioning at Rome referenced the collective grand tour viewing experience. By the date the portraits discussed by these scholars were being commissioned, the mid to late 1760s, avoiding repetition in Batoni's portraiture was growing more difficult. The individual status of the sitter was not the only factor affecting the level of conscious detail in the portrait. In light of the difficulty of achieving innovative portrait imagery by the 1760s, it is worth investigating the range of possible meanings inherent in the repetition of one sculpture.

*Self-fashioning and Sociability at Rome*

In order to interrogate portraits which attempted to visually encapsulate the experience of viewing sculpture on the grand tour, it is necessary to first establish the social context. The grand tour was a social phenomenon which resulted in travellers from major European countries acquiring a sense of taste through viewing the architectural and sculptural remnants of the ancient Roman Empire. The *Vatican Ariadne* would have been well-known to any eighteenth-century tourist to Rome. Viewing sculpture was an essential part of the grand

219 Yonan, "Pompeo Batoni Between Rome and Vienna", 35.
220 See Haskell and Penny, *Taste and the Antique*, 24, Fig. 96, 184-187, 'Cleopatra'.
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tour and the Vatican held some of the most celebrated marbles. As early as 1711, the grand
tour was understood as the preserve of the young wealthy male heir to an estate, whose
travels furnished him with an improved sense of taste.221 By 1732, critical commentary on
grand tourists bringing home new ideas from abroad had given way to anxiety over the
superficiality of these ideas,

...it has by degrees become a Maxim among the Great Vulgar as well as the Small,
that Study and an Application to Letters were Things unnecessary towards forming a
Great Man, and that Travel and his own Observations would much better supply
their Place. The contrary Practice of their Ancestors has been thereupon treated with
Contempt and Ridicule, and Politeness and the Grand Tour all the Accomplishments
required to make a fine Gentleman, or a finished Statesman.222

The correlation between gentleman and statesman reveals the importance of grand tour
sociability for a future career in British politics. This editorial is from the Universal
Spectator, a newspaper which had a wide circulation at London.223 It publicly expressed
unease about the value of travel as a mode of education. The seventeenth-century concept of
the grand tour assumed an in-depth knowledge of classical literature, supplemented by
reading en route, often guided by a tutor.224 The editorial suggested that travellers now
valued their own observations over the ancient authors or their guides, bear leaders, or
tutors.225 The grand tour in the second half of the long eighteenth century was evolving into a
series of activities, a ritualised itinerary of events which facilitated 'all the accomplishments
required to make a fine gentleman'. The author's use of the terms 'politeness' and 'grand tour'
reveals the extent to which sociability and the performance of taste now formed the central
tenets of travel. Samuel Crisp wrote from Florence in 1738 that,

221 The Hermit (Cumulation), London, Sat. Aug. 25th, 1711, Iss. 4, printed for John Morphew, near
Burney Collection 11/07/2013).
Books, 2012): 315, notes that the Spectator reached an estimated readership of 60,000 with every
2,000 copies printed.
224 Ian Jenkins, "Ideas of antiquity: classical and other ancient civilizations in the age of the
Enlightenment", in The British Museum Enlightenment: Discovering the World in the Eighteenth
expression, indeed all that one said and did in polite society of the eighteenth century, was informed
by the classics.' This new focus on the performance of a classical education, visible in the increased
interest in the grand tour and the creation of the grand tour portrait, is substantiated by the research of
from private tutors to attending school or university for elite males.
225 See Henry French and Mark Rothery, "'Upon Your Entry into the World': Masculine Values and
the Threshold of Adulthood among Landed Elites in England 1680-1800", Social History 33, (No. 4,
My countrymen here are so numerous that my Studies are much embarrassed by these idle tho' unavoidable Engagements. 226

James Boswell was criticised by other English tourists for speaking Italian, avoiding taverns and seriously studying ruins and pictures daily. 227 The development of a sense of taste was just one aspect: continental travel provided the opportunity for future leaders of London society to renew previously established networks and gain insight into societies which were or could become military rivals at any time. 228 Likewise, visitors to Rome of other nationalities were forming opinions of British culture based on the actions of young heirs at Rome. Charles de Brosses, a French traveller, wrote from Rome,

J'en vois tels qui partiront de Rome sans avoir vu que des Anglois et sans scavoir ou est le Colisee. 229

His disapproval indicates the extent to which British grand tourist priorities had shifted. Their interest in self-fashioning was evident in the disproportionate number of British sitters among Batoni's patrons. Edgar Peters Bowron wrote, 'Of his approximately three hundred surviving portraits, including autograph replicas and variant portraits of the same sitter, two-thirds depict British and Irish sitters, the "Milordi Inglese".' 230 Sitting to Batoni did not necessarily involve referencing antiquity, even for sitters who held a demonstrable interest.

A brief example of a sitter whose circumstances would suggest an enthusiasm for including antiquity in his portrait is British grand tourist Henry Bankes, later a trustee of the British Museum [Fig. 2.4]. His 1834 obituary in The Gentleman's Magazine noted that,

Mr Bankes was an accomplished scholar, intimately acquainted with ancient and modern literature and of a refined and acknowledged taste in the arts, he was enabled to fulfil with peculiar grace his duties as one of the most active and zealous trustees of the British Museum, of which he was generally regarded as the organ and advocate in the House of Commons. 231

228 Jeremy Black, *Italy and the Grand Tour*, (Yale University Press, 2003): 5, 'It was as if the prime destinations of American tourists at the height of the Cold War had been the Soviet Union and China'. It is also worth remembering the dangers of Catholicism and the Stuart monarchy sheltered by the Vatican at Rome. See Lesley Lewis, *Connoisseurs and Secret Agents*, (Chatto and Windus, 1961).
229 Quoted in Wilton and Bignamini, *The Lure of Italy*, 32, note 2.
Yet despite his interest in art, Bankes only sat to Pompeo Batoni on his grand tour at the behest of his mother. It was the sociability to be enjoyed at Batoni’s studio that rendered the experience of commissioning a portrait bearable for Bankes, who wrote on September 28th 1779 that,

I shall sit to Battoni [sic] tomorrow as you have determined on it... I am not sorry otherwise to do it as I have been several times at his house to hear his daughters sing...232

His comment reveals an extended network of visitors to Batoni’s studio, reaching beyond the number of his patrons to include attendees at his daughters’ musical evenings, and his drawing classes. Bankes was not enthused about the resulting portrait. In a letter of November 24th 1779 to his mother he wrote,

It is certainly like me but without any sort of taste or good painting. I have had the greatest difficulty in making him keep it quite simple in a dark coat, the right arm resting against one of those pedestals which are found so often in painting & never any where else.233

Bankes' letters indicate that a detailed dialogue between painter and sitter, both of whom held definite opinions, had occurred. He did not appreciate Batoni’s style, as evidenced by his final verdict on his portrait, but his distaste for the pointless pedestal might have been negated by placing a sculpture on it. On 23rd September 1780, he wrote to his mother,

I think it but a melancholy cold picture whose only merit is being simple and having nothing offensive.234

The necessity of acquiring a portrait by Batoni while on his grand tour, despite Bankes' personal feelings on the subject, was socially imposed. For Bankes, visits to Batoni's studio were carried out as part of his social life, without the expectation that he would commission a portrait. By 1780, sitting to Batoni, or visiting his studio, was a crucial element of British sociability at Rome. Pompeo Batoni was one of the most popular portrait painters in Europe, particularly for young wealthy male sitters.235 The activity of sitting to Batoni became a part

---

234 Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, 554, Cat. No. 553, Henry Bankes. Quote cited (also in Anthony Clark, Pompeo Batoni, 350, Cat. No. 418) as courtesy of Brinsley Ford, taken from letters in the Kingston Lacy archives at Dorchester Record Office.
235 Steegman, "Some English Portraits", 55, on Pompeo Batoni, 'Among his sitters there is a marked predominance of young men over older men, and a remarkable scarcity of women, which shews [sic]
of the British grand tour itinerary at Rome. The practice was part of their learning experience. As David Solkin has noted,

Personal display demanded and received serious attention from the men who governed eighteenth-century Britain. For a ruling class which depended more on culture than on force as a means of social control, appearances were a matter of inescapably political significance, no less so in art than in life.

Other scholars have noted the extent to which eighteenth-century portraiture was understood to facilitate the visual definition or expression of the self, beyond the traditional capture of a likeness. Marica Pointon wrote, ‘Commissions for portraits and commissions for dress both originate in an imagined image of the self and therefore both practices belong to the domain of projection, of what has been called 'self-fashioning'. This self-fashioning was achieved through particularities of dress, pose, expression and surroundings. Batoni's addition of sculpture altered the parameters of the portrait, creating imagery which rewarded the educated male gaze. In surrounding themselves with their preferred antiquities, the sitters were fashioning a visual catalogue of their activities and interests as grand tourists. By positioning themselves in relation to the sights of Rome, the sitters were drawing on the collective memory of traditional grand tourist activity, transforming their personal appearance into that of a grand tourist, and referencing their membership of the exclusive grand tourist community.

Batoni’s Use of Sculpture in the Painted Portrait

As noted in the previous chapter, the inclusion of a classical architectural feature of the Roman landscape in portraiture by Pompeo Batoni began in c. 1753 in the portrait of James Caulfield, Lord Charlemont [Fig. 1.2]. The inclusion of recognisable sculpture likely that his patrons were chiefly found among the wealthy young Englishmen travelling in Italy on the Grand Tour, after leaving their University.’ Steegman was working from a limited catalogue of Batoni's work, but the comment holds true.

Wilton and Bignamini, *The Lure of Italy*, 23, ‘...for the privileged, sitting to him for a portrait incorporating a clear reference to the antiquity of Rome became an integral part of their Grand Tour.’


The Colosseum is first visible in the portrait of James Caulfield, Lord Charlemont. See Bowron, *Pompeo Batoni*, Cat. No. 188, dated c. 1753-5. The portrait is discussed in Chapter One.
began with Robert Clements, whose portrait is dated c. 1753-4. His choice of a bust of the Farnese Homer was informed by viewing the original bust, which he noted as, 'the famous bust of Homer, Antich [sic] & extremely fine'. For grand tourist viewers of his portrait, the presence of the bust indicated Clements' aesthetic judgement, and called to mind their own experience of viewing the bust while at Rome. The choice of a bust of Homer also referenced Clements’ familiarity with classical texts. What emerges on investigation of Batoni's use of antiquity is a rough progression over time, from subtle inclusions to overt display.

The most commonly used sculpture, male or female, was an imaginary bust which Batoni fashioned from the full-length sculpture named the Minerva Giustiniani [Fig. 2.5]. A Roman copy of a Greek original, it depicted the goddess of wisdom in her helmet and aegis. Although in the original statue the goddess looks forward, in the Batoni bust version, Minerva's face was usually angled slightly downwards. This had the effect of casting her features into shadow so that her gaze did not catch that of the sitter within the portrait, or the external viewer. Batoni adapted a full-length figure into a bust, reducing the physicality of the sculpture, and diminishing the impact on the portrait. Edgar Peters Bowron noted,

Lord Thanet's full-length represents Batoni's earliest use in an extant portrait of one of his most frequently employed classical motifs, the bust drawn from the full-length marble Minerva Giustiniani, a Roman adaptation of a bronze original of the fourth century B.C., today in the Vatican Museum (Braccio Nuovo). Batoni first depicted the statue in a subject painting of 1737, The Triumph of Venice (Cat. 12), but it was as a tabletop bust rather than as a full-length statue that the Minerva Giustiniani appears in so many of his portraits of visitors to Rome [14 listed] during the next three decades. Haskell and Penny (1981, pp.169-71, fig. 140) document the particular enthusiasm held by the English for the Minerva Giustiniani, recording an anecdote from Goethe, who was told by the custodian of the Giustiniani collections that the English worshipped the statue and kissed one of its hands so frequently that it was whiter than the rest of the marble.

Compared to the bust of Homer, a male figure from history, a statue of a female divinity was more susceptible to amendment. It is notable however, that a sculpture which was frequently touched or kissed on the hand by English visitors to Rome was reduced to a limbless bust

---

240 Robert Clements, later 1st Earl of Leitrim, c. 1753-4, Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, Cat. No. 166, features a bust of the Farnese Homer. Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, 192, comments, 'The portrait of Clements is of further significance as one of Batoni's earliest uses of an antique marble to situate a sitter in Rome and to suggest an appreciation on the part of the sitter for the beauty of ancient art...' The bust was at the Palazzo Farnese. The quote above is cited in Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, 192, as the Killadoon Papers S/I.

241 Haskell and Penny, Taste and the Antique, 63, Fig. 140, 269-271.

242 Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, 197-8. The correlation between viewing and touching is discussed in Part II of this thesis.
within the portrait. Without a body, the dialogue possible between the sculpture and the sitter was limited, and any possibility of impropriety was curtailed.

Only four full-length female sculptures were employed by Batoni, including a seated statue which had been restored as a *Roma*, bought together with the *Weeping Dacia* relief by Pope Clement XI in 1719 and named a *Roma Triumphans* by Jonathon Richardson in his travel account of 1722, and a seated statue of *Agrippina*. Occasionally the two were combined, according to Anthony Clark, for example, in the portrait of the Honourable Colonel Gordon, as a *Roma* [Fig. 2.2]. In each case, the fact that the statue was fully draped, seated and gazing back at the viewer created a very different effect to that of the reclining and unconscious *Vatican Ariadne*.

The third full-length is the only known example of full female sculpted nudity in Batoni's portraiture, which appeared in the portrait of an unknown gentleman painted in 1758-9 [Fig. 2.6]. It includes a table-top bronze statuette of the *Medici Venus*. As a bronze, the allure of the sculpted body to the eighteenth-century imagination was reduced, the statuette acting as souvenir, rather than a symbol of the original. The statuette blends into the shadowy corner of the portrait and is difficult to see. The positioning concealed the frontal nudity of the sculpture and by presenting an alternative view, expanded on the narrative of the original work, offering a glimpse of the buttocks of the Venus. The dolphin detail of the original marble is preserved and identifies the version. The original *Venus de Medici* was located in Florence, however, the addition of the Colosseum, in its first appearance since the c. 1753 portrait of Lord Charlemont, situates the gentleman at Rome. Thus instead of reading the statuette as a symbol of viewing the original, it is assumed that the sitter had purchased a copy in bronze which he brought to Rome. The sitter does not physically interact with the statuette, but holds a book and gestures to a drawing.

The potential eroticism of the *Venus* is curtailed, but not eliminated: the potential impropriety of its inclusion is evident when compared to a satirical portrait of Sir Francis Dashwood by William Hogarth dating from the 1750s [Fig. 2.7]. The sitter is depicted in monk's robes, leering over a statuette. The flesh coloured tones of the statuette and the
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243 Pompeo Batoni, *Col. the Hon. William Gordon*, 1766, Clark, *Pompeo Batoni*, 303, Cat. No. 298, 'The seated personification of Rome appears to be an amalgamation of the statue of Roma in the Palazzo dei Conservatori with the pose of the seated Agrippina in the Capitoline Museum, Rome...'.


245 This portrait appears to be the first portrait after that of James Caulfield, Lord Charlemont, c. 1753-5, Bowron, *Pompeo Batoni*, Cat. No. 188, discussed in Chapter One, to employ the Colosseum.
hovering hand of the sitter combine to indicate blatant sexuality shocking to the eighteenth-century viewer. The monk's bible is replaced by an erotic novel. Dashwood was a well-known rake, with connections to the scandalous Hellfire Club and the Society of Dilettanti. Such pictorial jokes suggest that the members of the Society of Dilettanti were ready and able to scan portraits for sexual subtext.  

Horace Walpole made clear in a letter to Horace Mann, dated 14th April 1743, that the Society was,

...a club, for which the minimal qualification is having been to Italy, and the real one, being drunk: the two chiefs are Lord Middlesex and Sir Francis Dashwood, (both elected 1736), who were seldom sober the whole time they were in Italy.

The inclusion of the fleshy statuette and lewd gaze and pose of the sitter indicate a reaction to the sculpture only hinted at in the inclusion of the Vatican Ariadne. But the use of sculpture in this way by another painter indicates the readability of the object within the portrait. At a minimum, the grand tour portrait referenced the original sculpture at Rome, which in the case of the Vatican Ariadne, Batoni's fourth full-length figure, was more revealing than was immediately obvious from prints.

The Display and Reception of the Vatican Ariadne

Compared to the other female sculpture employed by Batoni (fully draped, upright, conscious), the Vatican Ariadne was problematic in both composition and characterisation [Fig. 2.1]. The Vatican Ariadne was better known to the eighteenth-century grand tourist as the Dying Cleopatra of the Vatican Museum. Originally owned by the Mattei family, the sculpture was bought for the Vatican by Pope Julius II in 1512. He intended to complete his collection of marble sculptures known as the Belvedere Collection, which was thematically linked to the works of ancient Roman author Virgil. Pope Julius II entered into long and difficult negotiations with the Mattei family under the assumption that the sculpture represented Cleopatra. Although the sculpture was acquired in order to partake in a

248 See Haskell and Penny, Taste and the Antique, 24, Fig. 96, 184-187, 'Cleopatra'. The statue, termed the Vatican Ariadne in this thesis, is at the Vatican Museum, Pio-Clementine Museum, Cat. 548.
Virgilian narrative, her identity as Cleopatra and non-divine nudity became problematic for her papal setting. Her context of display was strictly controlled to suggest an identification with Ariadne and avoided Egyptian imagery until the late eighteenth century.250

On arrival in 1512, the marble was displayed on top of a sarcophagus to form a fountain in the Belvedere statue court. This display format as part of a fountain invoked a longstanding visual tradition of the sleeping nymph by water, a literary trope which was included in the story of Ariadne and Theseus. This identification was consistently emphasised over the narrative of Cleopatra's death by asp, despite the original desire for a statue which through her snake bracelet, fit the Virgilian narrative. Despite this, the statue continued to attract attention as Cleopatra. Abigail Price notes that in the mid-sixteenth century the marble was moved to a less accessible location in order to downplay its impropriety. The new location, known as the Stanza delle Cleopatra, was decorated with scenes from the Old and New Testaments.251 Elisabeth MacDougall has suggested that the intention was to create a visual correlation between the water of the fountain and the waters of baptism.252 The Vatican's attempts to downplay the statue's sensual portrayal of Cleopatra were stymied by visitors to the Vatican, who imagined that the sculpture could have been commissioned by a Roman Emperor. A statue of Cleopatra was recorded by ancient author Dio Cassius in the triumph of the Roman Emperor Augustus. Abigail Price has discussed how the correlation of the two statues was popularised in poetical verse, writing,

The historical specificity of the statue was concentrated further when Balthasar Castiglione (1478-1529) composed his prosopopoeic Cleopatra for Leo X, in which the statue presented herself as the actual image of the queen that had been paraded in triumph by Augustus through the streets of Rome.253

This idea was continued by later poets, and three verses were chosen to be inscribed on marble tablets and displayed with the statue by Pope Clement XI, who became Pope in 1700.254 These verses were also displayed following the move of the sculpture to the end of the Galleria delle Statue of the newly established Pio-Clementine Museum.255 Owing to

---

254 Price, "Museo Pio-Clementino", 139.
renovations to the overall layout, the fountain aspect was demolished. A more matronly sleeping nymph statue was added to the Stanza delle Cleopatra instead, located beside the Belvedere Torso, and confusingly labelled as a copy of the Vatican Ariadne. This did not affect the fame or characterisation of the original.

In 1776, the marble was moved to its current resting place, installed on top of a sarcophagus depicting a Gigantomachy. Throughout the eighteenth century, the sculpture was displayed so as to encourage an interplay between art and poetry. It was segregated from the more celebrated (nude male) sculptures on display in the statue court. In composition, characterisation, and history of display, the sculpture acted as a source of debate and intrigue, referencing ancient authors and rewarding the male gaze, whether intellectual or prurient. The semi-nudity of the sculpture became more titillating once the underlying narratives were discussed: the very mystery over the identification of the marble allowed for in-depth discussion over the bodily attributes of the work. This was not the straightforward nudity of a Venus figure. Viewers were encouraged to envisage the female figure as nymph or queen, as mortal women abandoned by their lovers, either fainting or dying. By choosing Cleopatra, the exotic appeal of the sculpture increased, and the potential historicism of the statue was emphasised. The eighteenth-century viewer identified with the ancient viewers of an Augustan triumph: the sculpture symbolised Cleopatra.

This is evident in a description of the work by a French tourist, M. de la Roque, who embarked on a grand tour in the 1770s,

La Cléopatre, belle figure antique, dont les formes sont toutes aimables & de la plus belle exécution: les draperies ont le plus grand mérite.

The nudity of the sculpture was a result of the careful swathes of drapery so admired by the traveller, which revealed as much as they concealed. Johann Joachim Winckelmann, whose category of sublime sculpture admitted only heavily draped female figures, was dismissive


of the *Vatican Ariadne*. He conflated his description of the Vatican and the Medici versions in his monograph, writing,

> Thus, they are not works that can tell us anything about art in the period of Augustus; in any case, people say that Cleopatra was found dead in a similar position.\(^{259}\)

For British grand tourists, among the attractions of the identification of the sculpture as Cleopatra was the plethora of classical literature dealing with the narrative, and the increased immediacy of a depiction of an actual historical character over a mythological one. No attempt was made to compare the facial features of the sculpture to numismatic or other visual evidence.\(^{260}\) The story of Cleopatra was portrayed in the work of Virgil, Plutarch, Horace and Suetonius, all authors key to a British classical education. Cleopatra was an exotic and dangerous woman, who seduced Mark Antony and in so doing, caused a civil war which was to transform the Roman Empire. The specific moment of the statue's narrative was thought to be when Cleopatra lay dying, bitten by an asp, visible in the form of a bracelet on her upper arm. Her suicide was a result of her failure to seduce Augustus as she had seduced Mark Antony and reputedly Julius Caesar. Without the sympathy of Augustus, Cleopatra faced being paraded through Rome as a captive in a triumphal procession. After her death, Augustus replaced her in his procession with a sculpted representation, which the eighteenth-century imagination translated into the *Vatican Ariadne*.

The narrative of Cleopatra echoed contemporary concerns over the right and wrong ways to travel. According to the texts, Augustus' conquest of Egypt was precipitated by his publication of Marc Antony's will, which had been changed in favour of his children by Cleopatra to the detriment of the family he had abandoned in Rome. The moral was clear: enjoyment of foreign women and liberal societies should not affect the traveller's conviction as to the superiority of their native land. The idea that foreign vices were even more

---


\(^{260}\) Peter Higgs and Susan Walker ed., *Cleopatra of Egypt- From History to Myth*, (exhibition, The British Museum, 2001): 202. 'Little attention was paid to the facial features of any of the statues: Cleopatra's portrait was virtually ignored.'
addictive than domestic pleasures is evident in a 1739 editorial of *The Country Journal or the Craftsman*.

But can any body suppose that *young Men* will not have their *Follies* at *Paris, Rome* and *Venice*, as well as *at London?* - *Will A Governor* have more Power over Them than a *Father*? The *Father*, indeed, may oftner hear of the particular *Follies* of his *Son*, when so near Him, which *He only hears* by the *Gross* when abroad. The *Vices*, to which young *Fellows* in our *Inns of Court* are most subject, generally wear off as *They* grow older, and chiefly affect *Themselves*; but the *Luxuries* brought from *abroad*, increase with *Years*, and corrupt all about Them.  

The author indicates a scale of indiscretions among the young men at university or in law school, some of which were acceptable in London. Travellers might fall prey to worse vices. British grand tourists could read into the *Vatican Ariadne* both the embodiment of the Roman history of their education, and a symbol of the exotic countesses of Italy. The ability to discreetly seduce and depart was an essential skill for British travellers, after all, 'Every well-born Englishman who went south of the Alps in that era seems to have assumed that a really complete tour included at least one Italian countess.' Horace Walpole commented in a letter of September 24th 1774,

> Italian women are the grossest, vulgarest of the sex. If an Italian man has a grain of sense, he is a buffoon- so much for Europe.

The idea that Italian women were more sexually liberated than their British counterparts is borne out by their employment of the character of Cleopatra. The narrative of Cleopatra was perfectly acceptable in Italy, and several wealthy matrons chose to have themselves portrayed in the guise of Cleopatra dropping a pearl earring into her glass. In comparison, the most famous portrait of an eighteenth-century British woman as Cleopatra was that of Kitty Fisher, a well-known London courtesan who was painted by Joshua Reynolds [Fig. 2.8]. Whether the portrait or the rumour came first, Kitty's sexual licentiousness was so well equated with the disreputable character of Cleopatra that she was said to have eaten a
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265 See David Mannings, *Sir Joshua Reynolds: A Complete Catalogue of his Paintings*, (Subject Pictures catalogued by M. Postle, 2 Vol.s, Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 2000): Cat. No. 612, Fig. 418. The portrait is dated 1759, and Mannings notes the pose was adopted from Francesco Trevisani, *Cleopatra*. 
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sandwich with a £50 note as the filling: the contemporary equivalent of dissolving a priceless pearl earring in order to create the costliest banquet ever held.266

The characterisation of Ariadne was proposed by Ennio Quirino Visconti, papal Prefect of Antiquities, in c. 1784.267 When identified as Ariadne, the alluring appeal of the sculpture was diminished in terms of its potential historicism. Ariadne was a mortal woman who assisted Theseus in slaying the Minotaur. The narrative of the sculpture was the moment when Ariadne awakened on the shore, and saw the ship of Theseus sailing away without her, a fate not dissimilar to that of the eighteenth-century Italian women whose British lovers returned by sea to England. The version of the tale by Catullus specifically cast Ariadne in the role of the seduced and abandoned woman who curses her naivety and cries, "nunc iam nulla viro iuranti femina credat".268 Thus the narrative is couched within a global context of male perfidy. Both Catullus and Ovid compared Ariadne to a marble sculpture in her grief.269 Ariadne’s later rescue by and marriage to Dionysus, the god of wine, who granted her immortality, also referenced a key aspect of grand tour travels, according to the above quote from Horace Walpole on the drunkenness of the founding members of the Society of Dilettanti. The identity of the sculpture as Cleopatra remained pervasive, but the possibility of an alternate identification rendered the experience of viewing the sculpture an exercise in the kind of visual and literary analysis expected of the ideal grand tourist.

If the twofold characterisation of the sculpture brought to mind a classical education, the composition of the work played to the prurience lurking behind the idea of the connoisseur. Printed images of the marble did not reveal the full extent of its nudity, placing the work in the realm of the private joke. The nudity of the Vatican Ariadne was fully exposed only by viewing the original from the position of her feet [Fig. 2.9]. Not only was her left breast exposed to the viewer, but her drapery did not cover her right breast, or most of her stomach. Although she appears to be swathed in drapery, this is an impression created by the large amount of material around her hips and the fact that her head was demurely veiled. In reality, her frontal drapery merely falls between her breasts before travelling around her hips and legs.

268 Catullus 64.143, 'let no woman ever believe the promises of men again...', author's translation.
269 Catullus 64.60-7, Ovid Heroides 10.50. The works are discussed in detail by Rebecca Armstrong, Cretan Women, (Oxford University Press, 2006): 187-232.
This semi-nudity was arguably more titillating to the viewer than the overt and divine nudity of the various Venus sculptures, owing to the unconscious state of the figure, and her identification as a mortal woman through the narrative of the sculpture. The majority of classical sculpted nudity was presented in conjunction with a divine narrative, symbolised by the depilated pudenda of ideal beauty on show. The pudenda of the Vatican Ariadne was hidden from view, and her nudity was not divine, but rather that of an historical or mythological figure. Thus to the eighteenth-century imagination, the sculpture remained in a liminal state, between divine and mortal beauty, nudity and nakedness.

This was a sculpted statue of a female body, the near-nudity of which could only be fully appreciated on viewing at Rome. The static eighteenth-century positioning of display of the sculpture, in a niche or against a wall, resulted in its dissemination at the same angle in other media. When it came to creating bronze copies of antiques for Francis I of France, Francesco Primaticcio included the Vatican Ariadne among the casts he took. He adjusted the position of the Ariadne so that the figure is lying down [Fig. 2.10]. This was a more natural pose and served to highlight the fact that this was a female body unaware of the male gaze. Full-sized copies of the Vatican Ariadne in Britain were rare but not unheard of. MacDougall records that, 'In the 1740s at Stourhead, possibly as a result of Pope's influence, Henry Hoare also built a grotto in which he placed a copy of the Belvedere Cleopatra-Ariadne figure and a statue of a river god.'

Printed copies of the sculpture did not expose the full nudity of the marble. For example, the print of the sculpture by Francesco Piranesi, whose work was popular among British grand tourists, shows the straightforward sideways view encouraged by the display context at the Vatican. Although her left breast is clearly exposed in the print, it is not obvious that her right side is also nude. Giovanni Paolo Panini, in his View of Ancient Rome, 1757, (Metropolitan Museum of Art) depicted the Ariadne as resting sideways on top of a long fountain. Another version of the sculpture in the Medici collection at Rome, was displayed at a similar angle. The painting by Diego Velázquez entitled View of the Gardens at the Villa Medici, Rome, with the statue of Ariadne shows the sculpture in the gardens of the Villa
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In the painting, a figure in the temple on the left views the sculpture from the exact angle in which the full nudity of the sculpture becomes evident.

Physical copies of the sculpture either enhanced the nudity, by changing the pose in the case of the Fontainebleau version, or downplayed it by placing it in a nymph-appropriate watery setting, like at Stourhead. The history of display of the marble indicates the extent to which both the composition and characterisation of the sculpture were suggestive, leading to display contexts which reacted to both. When it came to the secondary display of the sculpture within the portraiture of Pompeo Batoni, both aspects of the original marble could only fully be unlocked by a visitor to Rome.

**The Vatican Ariadne within the Portrait: Crowle, Dundas, Weddell and Razumovsky**

The inclusion of the *Vatican Ariadne* in five portraits among an estimated 200 of British grand tourists painted by Pompeo Batoni reveals the potential of sculpture as a readable object within the portrait space. Framed within the context of its eighteenth-century characterisation, composition, history of display, and the limited and varied usage of the marble by Batoni, this chapter argues for the value of in-depth consideration of the use of the *Vatican Ariadne* in grand tour portraiture. The five portraits by Pompeo Batoni which include a representation of the *Vatican Ariadne* are those of Charles John Crowle (1761-2) [Fig. 2.11], Thomas Dundas, later 1st Baron Dundas (1764) [Fig. 2.12], William Weddell (1765-6) [Fig. 2.13], Count Kirill Grigorjewitsch Razumovsky (1766) [Fig. 2.14], and Thomas William Coke, later 1st Earl of Leicester of the Second Creation (1774) [Fig. 2.15]. Four of the sitters fulfil the basic criteria of a grand tourist in being young, male and wealthy, but represent varied levels of social status, from titled aristocracy to nouveau riche. The fifth sitter, Count Razumovsky, is of interest owing to his repetition of previously employed imagery.

This chapter first eschews the traditional scholarly discussion of the importance of each sitter in favour of in-depth visual analysis, showcasing the extent to which Batoni's portraits could be read as nuanced representations of the self. The presence of the *Vatican Ariadne*, as a sculpture with a complicated history of display and characterisation, is considered to have a significant impact on each portrait. The final sitter, Thomas Coke, is discussed in more
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273 Diego Velázquez, *View of the Gardens at the Villa Medici, Rome, with the statue of Ariadne*, c. 1630, 44 x 38cm, Museo del Prado, P01211.

detail, set into a brief history of the sitter's sociability in order to explore the eighteenth-century reception of the portrait, in which the facial features of the *Vatican Ariadne* were thought to portray the features of Coke's married lover. Batoni was familiar with the *Vatican Ariadne* from the earliest days of his career, when he sold drawings of the Belvedere marbles to tourists. Batoni depicted the *Vatican Ariadne* from the side, in the standardised view of her display context at the Vatican. Her nudity was further emphasised or concealed through the careful delineation of her upper torso and nipples.

In the portrait of Charles John Crowle [Fig. 2.11], of Fryston Hall, Yorkshire, the *Vatican Ariadne* is featured in miniature form, in conjunction with the first appearance of another sculpture, the *Farnese Hercules* [Fig. 2.16]. Crowle was called to the bar in 1755, and went abroad on his grand tour in 1761. Crowle was sociable with his fellow countrymen abroad, judging by Francis Russell, Lord Tavistock, who wrote of him to his father from Paris,

> I knew him at school, and he was afterwards very civil to me in Italy. He is not very wise but an inoffensive good humoured lad.

Crowle held an interest in antiquity, was elected to the *Society of Dilettanti* in 1764 and became Secretary in 1774. The information substantiates the idea that his pictorial choices were deliberately referencing his knowledge of sculpture and classical texts. Edgar Peters Bowron noted that the presence of the statuettes, 'testifies to Crowle's interest in the antique...'. He noted the similarity of the setting of desk, chairs, books, landscape and writing implements to another portrait, of an unknown gentleman, writing that the portraits, 'could almost be pendants and readily demonstrate the ease with which Batoni deployed his sitters in a variety of studio routines.'
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275 Clark, *Studies in Roman Eighteenth-Century Painting*, 107, Batoni '...spent long days copying the famous Raphael and Carracci frescoes and the antique statues of the Belvedere. His first success was in selling drawings of these statues to the British.'

276 *Farnese Hercules*, 3.17m, c. 216 A.D, now at the *Museo Archeologico Nazionale*, Naples, inv. no. 6001.


278 Ingamells, *Dictionary*, 258. Crowle attended Westminster followed by Trinity College Cambridge and was elected to the *Society of Dilettanti* in 1764. He was featured in Sir Joshua Reynolds' painting *A Meeting of the Society of Dilettanti in 1777*.


Although Bowron is willing to credit individual sitters with the meaningful use of antiquity, he undermines Crowle's portrait by using the term 'studio routines', which negates the agency of the sitter. Yet this was not necessarily the case at Rome, where the expression of classical taste was paramount. A certain degree of repetition is logical given that these portraits represented Batoni's earliest attempts at full-length portraits.\(^{281}\) If the majority of the detail in Crowle's portrait can be assumed to have been familiar to the painter, then, crucially, the difference between the two works lies in Crowle's innovative choice of antique statuettes. Thus the choice of statues stemmed from the sitter rather than the painter. The presence of the *Ariadne* and the *Hercules* do testify to Crowle's 'interest in the antique' as Bowron stated. They visibly narrow his interest in the antique to tacit approbation of particular works based on his viewing experience at Rome.

The choice of the *Farnese Hercules* is notable, as the work was traditionally disparaged by British viewers until the late eighteenth century, which brought about a change in considerations of masculinity.\(^{282}\) It is the sole known use of this sculpture by Batoni. In the portrait, Crowle leans against an ornate desk with a marble top, which is featured in several portraits, and holds various literary paraphernalia, such as a quill and ink, papers and books [Fig. 2.11].\(^{283}\) One leg is propped against the other in a jaunty stance. He looks straight out at the viewer, giving the impression of a man interrupted as he reads the letter in his hand. The view to the left of the painting is a country scene, calling to mind the Roman *campagna*. Near to the arm Crowle rests on the desk is a small statuette of the *Vatican Ariadne*, while a statuette of the *Farnese Hercules* is situated further back, near the wall. Their position among the various symbols of learning, travel and education on the desk indicates their function: to act as readable objects symbolising Crowle's aesthetic education and development of taste.

The warmer colour of the *Farnese Hercules* and its position towards the back of the painting causes it to fade into the background compared to the lighter shade and the fore-grounded position of the *Vatican Ariadne*. The *Ariadne* is in a sideways position, but is depicted differently from the original marble. Her upper body is twisted away from the viewer, so that her facial features are less visible. The nudity of the original marble is downplayed through a
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281 For a list of earlier full-length portraits, see Clark, *Pompeo Batoni*, 283, Cat. No. 240.
slight increase in drapery over her right breast. Her left breast lacks the prominent nipple of the marble and is more fully draped. First-hand examination of the portrait revealed that the feet are in fact only lightly shaded in, and the end of her plinth fades from view. This may be as a result of changes to the position of Crowle's hand, or it could have occurred more recently, as the painting has sustained surface damage. The upright position hides the snake bracelet, which in the eighteenth century provided the crucial key to her identity as Cleopatra. Thus both the physical appearance and the identity of the Vatican Ariadne are subtly limited, which curtailed any potentially negative connotations of the marble.

Batoni has not depicted the Farnese Hercules exactly, for example, the lion skin visible in the original statue is reduced to simple drapery over the column, but the similarity to the original is striking. In terms of narrative, according to Haskell and Penny, the labour alluded to by the marble was disputed, thus both of Crowle's statuettes inspired aesthetic debate. Hercules was the classical figure most frequently depicted in art between the fifteenth and the eighteenth centuries, usually in two basic narrative functions: the display of a male's physical or military potency or the successful choice between virtue and vice. Combined with the Vatican Ariadne, the resulting interplay between the statuettes created a narrative concerning the choice between virtue and vice, and between masculinity and femininity.

The size of the statuettes necessitates a brief consideration of whether the statuettes were actually owned by Crowle. No sitter could hope to buy the originals, while large-scale copies were prohibitively expensive. Small statuettes were sold by sculptors like Christopher Hewetson as a source of income which supplemented larger commissions. Given the rarity of their use in Batoni’s portraits, the statuettes, if real objects, were not studio props, as this would not be cost-effective. If they were real objects which belonged to Crowle, the act of bringing them to the studio to be painted in a portrait where the desk, books and other symbols of learning were imagined, indicates their importance to the sitter. Regardless of whether Crowle owned the statuettes, their presence in his portrait referenced his grand tour experience. Viewing the original works was tantamount to intellectual ownership for most grand tourists. Andrew Wilton and Ilaria Bignamini note,

...the Pope's Museum became one of the greatest attractions of the Grand Tour and it offered visitors who were wealthy enough to travel to Italy but not sufficiently so to

284 Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, 298, Cat. No. 241.
285 Haskell and Penny, Taste and the Antique, 230.
287 The studio contents of Christopher Hewetson are discussed in Chapter Three.
buy ancient marbles the unforgettable experience of 'owning', for a few hours, the most spectacular works of art in the world.  

As the son of an M.P. within a merchant family, with a career in law and politics, Crowle was not in a position to purchase antiquities. The painted representations visually enter Crowle into the company of an exclusive number of wealthy British grand tourists who had viewed the sculpture at Rome, a useful device for a young lawyer and politician. It is suggestive that both of the works employed in Crowle's portrait are not fully revealed by the standardised print view of the works disseminated abroad. His portrait referenced not only a shared viewing experience, but the superior in-the-round grand tourist experience of viewing the original marbles.

The idea of a personalised viewing experience is brought to the fore in the portrait of Thomas Dundas, later 1st Baron Dundas of Aske [Fig. 2.12]. Although Thomas Dundas’ 1764 marriage to Lady Charlotte Fitzwilliam, the daughter of the 1st Earl Fitzwilliam, served to solidify his social standing, his wealth was inherited from his father, Sir Lawrence Dundas. His father was a merchant contractor who profited hugely from the Seven Years War (1754-1763), a method of gaining wealth considered distasteful. Dundas was elected a member of the Society of Dilettanti in 1764 but appears to have preferred architecture to art. He would later sell a number of Old Master paintings, including a Crucifixion by Nicholas Poussin, inherited from his father, a move which did not appear to arise from financial difficulties. It is worth considering his portrait not only from the angle of the unprecedented inclusion of four classical sculptures, but also from the visual impact of the architectural setting.

The idea of exclusivity, given the relatively limited number of British citizens who had visited the canon of the antique at Rome, is further developed by the intimation of a private viewing in the portrait, achieved through the subtle inclusion of architectural detail. A parquet floor gives way to a marble porch, followed by a semi-circular walkway displaying statues. The glimpse of blue sky and end of the tiled floor past the column create an interesting binary between inside and outside, private and public. To the grand tourist, the overall effect is that of personal aesthetic taste. The setting is imaginary, a reimagining of the Vatican in which some of the best known antiquities of the eighteenth century are pushed to
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288 Wilton and Bignamini, *The Lure of Italy*, 34.
289 Pompeo Batoni, *Thomas Dundas*, 1764, 298 x 196.8cm, The Marquess of Zetland, Aske Hall, West Yorkshire.
the background in favour of the Vatican Ariadne, and others, such as the Belvedere Torso, do not appear.

Thomas Dundas stands in a luxurious outfit, gesturing with his left hand to the Vatican Ariadne. The statue does not appear to be the size of the original in comparison to the body of Dundas, but is clearly not intended to be a statuette. This three-quarter size format is also used for the three male statues visible behind Dundas. The Vatican Ariadne is given priority in the foreground of the portrait, on top of a fountain with running water. The fountain was derived from one designed by Gian Lorenzo Bernini for the Palazzo Navona, near the Pantheon, featuring a crouching figure playing pipes, through which the fountain water runs. The presence of water invoked the pictorial trope of the sleeping nymph, and the identification of the sculpture as Ariadne. The cool of the marble seems almost tactile to the viewer, while the way the dog casually drinks from its waters lends a sense of immediacy to the painting.

The depiction of the Vatican Ariadne is striking. The marble is angled away from the viewer, and is sitting upright in comparison to the original. This has the effect of shielding the extent of its nudity, with the upper body and facial features cast into shadow. Dundas is energetic compared to Batoni's sitters' usual poses. Christopher M.S. Johns commented on the 'erotic charge' of the portrait, writing, 'In a rather balletic pose, he looks away from the somnolent queen while proffering his left hand delicately, as if inviting her to dance.' In offering his left hand and grasping his hat and cane in his right hand, Dundas adheres to eighteenth-century etiquette. Johns' reading indicates the effect of including sculpture within the narrative of the portrait: the marble body enters into dialogue with that of the sitter. Many scholars consider this to be Batoni's finest portrait as a result of the number of sculptures. Anthony Clark commented,

The sculptures were amongst the most famous of all antiquity, and there can be no doubt that they were included at the sitter's request, presumably Dundas was not
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291 For the potential implications of wearing red, see Pointon, Portrayal, 103-120. In Italy, however, sitters were free to dress more extravagantly in frock suits which were clearly part of self-fashioning abroad.
292 Pointon, Portrayal, Chapter 4, 121- 180, discusses the sexuality of exposed male calves and the wearing of stockings. Each of the sitters showcases splendid white calves in full-length portraits which perform their masculinity in comparison to the covered female legs of the Ariadne.
content with the more general allusions to the taste for the antique which appear in most of Batoni's British portraits.295

While appreciative, his comment does not read into the choice of particular sculptures over others from the eighteenth-century canon. Andrew Wilton and Ilaria Bignamini wrote,

> And so in the eighteenth century many travellers sought to validate their experience through allusion to the art by means of which they could identify and describe Italy. Thomas Dundas posed with the Laocoon and the Apollo Belvedere behind him, and with the Cleopatra also in view.296

The words 'also in view', when the Vatican Ariadne is clearly the most emphasised work in the portrait, combined with their failure to mention the Belvedere Antinous reveals the extent to which scholars consider the use of sculpture in Batoni’s portraiture to be negligible.297 Yet by considering the sculpture both as individual works, and in terms of the overall effect, the imagery of the portrait can be further unpacked.

In his pose, pointing with both right leg and left arm towards a symbol of femininity, Dundas blocks the nudity of the Belvedere Antinous, visible above his head. The masculinity of the Belvedere Antinous was questionable given his historical fame as the lover of the Emperor Hadrian. With his hand outstretched, Dundas mimics the pose of the Apollo Belvedere, another example of lithe masculine beauty, situated behind the sitter on the left. The nudity and carefully delineated musculature of the Apollo Belvedere does not appear to have been altered from the original sculpture. Yet the sculpture was displayed differently in 1764. In 1759 Johann Joachim Winckelmann bemoaned the decision to cover the genitals of male sculpture at the Vatican with pieces of tin which functioned like fig leaves,

> Diese Woche wird man dem Apollo, dem Laocoon und den übrigen Statuen im Belvedere ein Blech vor dem Schwanz hängen vermittelst eines Drats um die Hüften: vermuthlich wird es auch an die Statuen im Campidoglio kommen. Eine Eselmäßige Regierung ist kaum in Rom gewesen wie die ißige ist.298

Between the two male sculptures the Laocoon is visible, perhaps the best known of the eighteenth-century canon of the antique. The Virgilian narrative of the marble involved the
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296 Wilton and Bignamini, The Lure of Italy, 16.
297 The attitude can be traced back to Batoni's first cataloguer, John Steegman, "Some English Portraits", 60, No. 37, who wrote that Dundas stands '...beside a Niobe fountain, with the Laocoon in a niche behind him.'
divine punishment of a priest who queried the gift of the Trojan horse. The eighteenth-century admiration of the sculpture stemmed from the idea of noble suffering. With several associated narratives at play, it is suggestive that the main binary of the portrait involves tension between male and female. In comparison to the other sculptures, which are at a distance, the *Vatican Ariadne* is located at the forefront of the portrait. By physically interacting with the statue base and gesturing to the sculpture, a narrative between marble and sitter is established. This kind of direct interaction with a full-sized sculpture in portraiture usually involved matronly draped works such as the *Roma*. 299

The *Vatican Ariadne* was a reclining semi-nude figure within an imaginary viewing context. Dundas points to her barely draped figure, inviting the viewer's gaze to admire the sculpture. Similarly, the male sculptures set at a height could also be imagined as admiring the *Ariadne*. Stripped of their fig leaves, the male nude sculpture could be understood to reference Dundas's adherence to the classical ideal, and possibly, the viewing experience at Rome before the fig leaves were added to protect the modesty of female visitors. However, to viewers accustomed to satirical imagery, the lack of fig leaves could also expose Dundas to accusations of homoerotic interest in the male body. In this context, the visual dominance of the *Vatican Ariadne* in the portrait acts as a deliberately overt reference to the potential eroticism of the female sculpted body for the eighteenth-century visitor to Rome. In so doing, it reassures the viewer that Dundas' interest in the male sculpture was purely aesthetic, and hints at a suitably prurient interest in the female sculpture for the young heir to a large fortune. In this scenario, the potential impropriety of the sculpture, in composition and characterisation, would have been harnessed by the sitter in order to offset potential homoerotic overtones. 300 The portrait demonstrates the potential for the *Vatican Ariadne* to function as a readable object, onto which the viewer projected their own concerns, from classical taste to desire.

If the portrait of Dundas evoked a semi-interior context, the portrait of William Weddell contravened the usual pictorial formula, depicting the *Vatican Ariadne* in an overtly domestic context. Weddell, later a renowned collector and leading member of the *Society of

299 For example, the 1766 Batoni portrait of the *Honourable Colonel William Gordon*, in which the *Roma* is read as a political symbol, removed from any intimation of representing femininity, despite the aggressively male pose of the sitter, with a similar visual device of resting a foot on the statue plinth.

Dilettanti, ordered three portraits from Batoni: one head-and-shoulders oval portrait, one three-quarter length with a view of the Colosseum, and one full-length portrait where Weddell gestures towards the Vatican Ariadne [Fig. 2.13]. The presence of Batoni's signature architectural rubble maintained the idea of the sitter at Rome, but the anomaly is striking. It is worth diverging slightly from the focus on Rome as the context of display in this chapter to note the similarities between the setting of the Vatican Ariadne in the portrait, and the final display context of the painting.

Anthony Clark noted that Weddell hung the full-length version in the parlour at his home at Newby Hall, situated over a granite chimney-piece he bought in Rome. The semi-nudity of the sculpture may have been an amusing choice for the parlour of a house which Weddell had renovated extensively in order to house his collection of antiquities. His collection was largely formed on his grand tour, and included twelve cases of sculpture and 86 paintings. His most famous acquisition was the Barberini or Jenkins Venus, a nude Venus after the fashion of the Aphrodite of Cnidus. The fame of the work stemmed not only from its beauty and resulting price, but also the nudity of the work, which was reputed to have been key to its successful export. The Vatican had restricted the allowance of export licenses for antiquities since 1704. Only inferior marbles, or 'sculptures with erotic or suggestive content considered unfitting for a papal museum...' were granted licenses.

Thomas Jenkins, who sold the Venus sculpture to Weddell, wrote,

My Venus is likewise sold, but I have orders not to say to whom; he had experienced much difficulty in obtaining permission for export which would never have been obtained had it not been for the fortunate Circumstance of its being a Naked female.

This fortunate circumstance ensured Weddell's reputation as a collector of antiquity. By choosing to hang a full-length portrait of himself gesturing to the Vatican Ariadne, Weddell was demonstrating the taste acquired in Rome which led to the decoration of his home.

301 Pompeo Batoni, William Weddell, 1766, 228.6 x 182.9cm, R.E.J. Compton, Newby Hall, North Yorkshire.
302 Clark, Pompeo Batoni, Cat. No. 293. It is notable that it is the full-length portrait of Weddell which includes the Vatican Ariadne. In her work on wigs and masculinity, Pointon, Hanging the Head, 130, considers how head-and-shoulders portraits cut off the male site of sexuality. Mark Schoenfield, "Private Souvenirs: Exchanges among Byron's Southwell Set", The Wordsworth Circle, Vol. 39, (No. 1/2, Winter/Spring, 2008): 30-34 noted that one admirer of Lord Byron sent him a lock of her pubic hair as a love token. The site of sexuality was clearly established in the eighteenth-century imagination.
303 Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, Cat. No. 299.
305 Ingamells, Dictionary, 986-987.
Given the identical pose of the sitter in all three of the paintings, it is likely that Weddell posed for the three-quarter-length portrait including a view of the Colosseum, which is the most naturally composed [Fig. 2.17]. The composition of his full-length portrait is awkward, necessitating the reversal of the Vatican Ariadne [Fig. 2.13]. Weddell stands at the foot of a marble staircase in a blue costume. He holds his hat, gloves and sword in his right hand, gesturing with his left in a pose previously employed by Dundas. In terms of eighteenth-century etiquette, Weddell was required to hold his hat either under his left arm or in his right hand- thus placing the Vatican Ariadne on his left hand side, in her usual pose, would have required altering his entire figure.306 The logical choice would have been to include a different sculpture, instead of reversing a well-known sculpture. The portrait including the Vatican Ariadne can thus be assumed to have been a later commission, with the composition determined by Weddell.307

The idea that Weddell controlled the dialogue between sitter and painter in the composition of the portraiture is substantiated by the divergence from Batoni's usual pictorial formula. Only a small patch of blue sky indicates the Roman campagna outside, while the overall impression is of acquisition, moving away from a setting that grand tourist viewers would recognise as an imaginary version based on the Vatican display context. The breasts of the Ariadne are notably better draped in Weddell's portrait than in her depiction in Dundas' portrait. This might be to offset the sense of intimacy between sitter and sculpture created by posing Weddell on a staircase. The intimation is that further delights await upstairs. The imagery is difficult to fully unpack, and may be centred on a private joke as to Weddell's collecting habits.308 What is evident is that the substitution of the Colosseum with the Vatican Ariadne produces a vastly different portrait, far more than might be expected given the identical pose, likeness, and dress of the sitter.

The only non-British sitter to employ the Vatican Ariadne in his portrait, Count Kirill Grigorjewitsch Razumovsky, chose to commission a portrait from Batoni which borrowed heavily from the previous portrait of Thomas Dundas [Fig. 2.12].309 His willingness to copy
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307 Other interpretations have been suggested, e.g. Michael R. Taylor, and Guigone Rolland, Giorgio de Chirico and the Myth of Ariadne, Philadelphia Museum of Art, 2002): 68, 'The Ariadne statue is reversed in the painting, suggesting that Batoni worked from a print, a testament to the popularity of the sculpture, which at the time was widely believed to represent the dying Cleopatra.' The authors do not explain the statue's position in her other depictions by Batoni.
308 For a discussion of the extent to which female sculpted figures in private collections could reference both classical taste and lewd humour, see the Conclusion of this thesis.
309 Pompeo Batoni, Count Kirill Grigorjewitsch Razumovsky, 1766, 298 x 196cm, private collection, Vienna.
a previous portrait would appear to argue against the deliberate and nuanced employment of antiquity by the majority of Batoni's sitters. The portraits were identical in size, larger than Batoni's usual canvases at 298 x 196cm. However, the issue is complicated by Razumovsky's careful attention to detail in terms of his costume. Count Razumovsky was elevated to nobility in 1744, and his portrait was painted in 1766 [Fig. 2.14]. He is wearing the star, sash and badge of the order of Saint Andrew, and the Polish Order of the White Eagle, which he must have brought with him to Rome. The intricate gold brocade of his red suit is also indicative of a specific outfit, possibly associated with an event at the court of Empress Catherine II in Russia.

Apart from the issue of dress, the two portraits are not as similar as they first appear. The Count leans casually on the back of a chair to the right of the painting, gesturing to the *Vatican Ariadne*, which is on a low plinth. The painting takes a similar angle to the Dundas portrait, down to a sliver of the floor in front of the room where the sitter stands at the forefront of the picture. The three male statues are larger and more distinct than before, the eye drawn naturally in a line from them to the *Vatican Ariadne*, which is on the same side, a reversal from the Dundas portrait. The *Vatican Ariadne's* stomach appears to be fully draped, and although her left breast is uncovered and ends in a slight point, more graphic than in her other Batoni depictions, the breast facing the viewer has clearly been covered up past the nipple in a direct alteration to the original. Her facial features are similar, although with a slightly more delicate nose.

Instead of being surrounded by sculpture on both sides, with a distinction between an indoor and outdoor setting, Razumovsky is literally blocked in. In order to view the male sculpture behind him, he would have to exit the portrait space and circle back around the *Vatican Ariadne*. The positioning of the chair is suggestive of sitting with his back to the sculpture. The overall result is not the sensual narrative of the Dundas portrait, but a kind of declaration of ownership which fails to capitalise on the potential for a dialogue with the sculpture. What is missing from Razumovsky's portrait is a sense that the *Vatican Ariadne* was part of a subtle narrative, a joke concerning the propriety of sculpted nudity in the expression of classical taste. This is highlighted by the direct gaze of the sitter towards the viewer instead of the unknown participant within his portrait to whom Dundas directed his gaze.

For the purposes of this thesis, the sitter can be dismissed as non-British, but the question of the similarity of the portraits remains. Razumovsky's motivation is unclear, perhaps
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stemming from admiration of the portrait of Dundas. The motivation of the painter is more obvious: Razumovsky was Batoni's first Russian sitter, and highly lucrative commissions from the court of Catherine II followed his portrait, including *Chiron Returns Achilles to Thetis* and *The Continence of Scipio*. The portrait indicates the length of time that portraits were on display at Batoni’s studio, as Razumovsky presumably viewed the portrait of Dundas in the two years between the completion of the two commissions.

The four portraits all employed the *Vatican Ariadne* in different ways, from the subtle details of her drapery to the positioning of the marble at a height or reversed. In each portrait, the sculpture was readable as a symbol of a deeper narrative. For the eighteenth-century grand tourist, this kind of in-depth reading of portrait imagery, especially where the potential for humour or allusions to classical narratives existed, was habitual. The success of the work depended on the subtlety of the narrative at play. In the final portrait to include the *Vatican Ariadne*, the allusions drawn by Thomas Coke in his portrait imagery revealed his inability to self-fashion as a successful male grand tourist, as the sitter was figuratively and literally dominated by the presence of the female sculpture in his portrait.

**Thomas Coke and the Vatican Ariadne**

The final, and most suggestive, portrait by Batoni to include the *Vatican Ariadne* was the portrait of Thomas Coke [Fig. 2.15]. Thomas Coke's grand tour began when he left Eton in 1771 and continued until 1774. Coke's great-aunt the Dowager Countess of Coke offered him £500 a year, to which his father added £200, if he would go on a grand tour instead of attending university, which she regarded as 'schools of vice'. Coke appeared in polite society often while abroad and was remarked on for being both handsome and fashionable. His successes earned him the nickname of 'Le bel Anglais' at the Turin court, where he played escort to the daughter of the King of Sardinia, the Princess of Savoy. Sir Robert Keith
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311 Bowron, *Pompeo Batoni*, Cat. No. 247, *Chiron Returns Achilles to Thetis*, 1768-70, 226.5 x 297.5cm, State Hermitage, GE2608, and Cat. No. 248, *The Continence of Scipio*, 1771-2, 226.5 x 297.5cm, State Hermitage, GE2609, both commissioned by Ivan Ivanovich Shuvalov (1727-97) in 1768 for Empress Catherine II of Russia.

312 Johns, "Portraiture and the Making of Cultural Identity", 385, '...it was the artist's habit to display finished works in his studio, often for months, before shipping them off to their owners.'

313 Pompeo Batoni, *Thomas William Coke, later 1st Earl of Leicester of the Second Creation*, 1774, 245.8 x 170.3cm, Viscount Coke, Holkham Hall, Norfolk. This portrait is the only one completed after the move of the sculpture from the statue court to the end of the *Galleria delle Statue*, but does not appear to reference the statue’s new display context (atop a sarcophagus depicting the Gigantomachy).

wrote concerning Coke at Vienna (having parted with the Countess and on his way home), that,

...he made considerable havock amongst the young Beauties.\footnote{Wade, Coke of Norfolk, 20. See also Ingamells, Dictionary, 226-227, (not cited further).}

His sociability on his travels appears to have pleased his family members, evidence of a society which valued the performance of politeness and taste over other accomplishments. Lady Mary Coke summarised her opinion of Thomas Coke on December 1st 1773, writing,

He is a very pretty Man, and a good deal more fashion'd thasn his sister Ly. Hunlock: as he is to have so very great an estate, I am glad to see his [sic] is worth of it.\footnote{Clark, Pompeo Batoni, Cat. No. 377, 333. Cited as Lady Mary Coke, Letters and Journals IV, 268.}

Her comment exposes her criteria for a male British heir: to be pretty and fashionable. Where Coke's reputation as causing 'havock' among beautiful young women abroad was beneficial to him, his excessive attachment to one woman was damaging.

On April 17th 1772, Coke attended the wedding at Macerata of Louise Stolberg, Countess of Albany, to Charles Edward Stuart, known as the Young Pretender. At the age of 52, and holding the politically troublesome position of the last of the Vatican-recognised monarchy of England, the Young Pretender's personal life was particularly vulnerable to scandal. This came in the form of Thomas Coke, who as a charming 18 year old was far nearer in age to the 19 year old bride. Coke followed the couple to Rome, giving rise to suggestions that he was enamoured of the Countess. This contravened an unspoken maxim of the grand tour: the ability to discreetly engage in sexual tourism. Although the Countess was Belgian, her marriage crowned her (Jacobean) Queen of England, Scotland and Ireland, and she posed a figurative threat to the Hanoverian English royal succession. A sexual liaison with a woman considered by some factions to be the new Queen of England was impolitic at best.

Thomas Coke compounded his actions by overtly alluding to them in his grand tour portrait. He posed for Batoni in the costume he wore to a masquerade ball held by the Countess in Rome.\footnote{Aileen Ribeiro, "Batoni's Use of Costume" in Edgar Peters Bowron ed., Pompeo Batoni and his British Patrons, (exhibition, Greater London Council, The Iveagh Bequest, Kenwood, 8 June- 30 August 1982): 21, '...actual masquerade costume- it has that theatrical fussiness which marks the real, as distinct from the possibly imaginary dress.'}

Anthony Clark noted that the costume '... was certainly observed from life and is possibly the costume which he wore to a masquerade ball given in Rome in 1773 by Louise Stolberg, Countess of Albany, the wife of the young Pretender, with whom he danced, and from whom he received a white cockade.'\footnote{Clark, Pompeo Batoni, 333, referenced as Stirling, Coke of Norfolk, 65-66.} The white cockade, also recorded by John
Ingamells, was a circular ribbon which indicated allegiance, here to the Jacobians, a dangerous move for an intended future Whig MP. The attachment alluded to by his costume was further suggested by Coke's choice of the Vatican Ariadne in his portrait. The depiction of the marble lacked the subtlety of her previous appearances, emphasising the sensuality of the marble so that it required little effort to read the sculpture as a symbol of the Countess.

Coke stands in the middle of the painting, one hip cocked in contrapposto, looking away from the viewer. One hand holds his elaborately plumed hat, while the other rests on the statue plinth behind him, which holds the Vatican Ariadne. The pose is notable, as the previous sitters were carefully positioned as gesturing with a hand, and only making contact with the statue plinth with their feet. The colours of his elaborate Van Dyck costume immediately catch the eye. The portrait is carefully constructed in terms of angles: the turn of Coke's head is mirrored by his arms and by the careful placement of his feet at a ninety degree angle to each-other. The dog at his feet is not an eager hound, such as the dogs visible in the portraits of Crowle and Dundas, but a fluffy spaniel. It sits quietly and sniffs at the large feather of Coke's hat, rather than jumping up on a chair or drinking water. Coke stands in a heavily columned area, which cages him in. The raised elbow of the Vatican Ariadne reaches higher than his carefully pomaded hair. Combined with the averted gaze of the sitter, the body of Coke becomes passive, subject to the gaze of the viewer.

By raising the statue to the level of the sitter, the facial features of the marble figure compete with those of Coke to be the subject of the portrait. The depiction of the Ariadne is largely faithful to her original in the Vatican, a decision which revealed the full nudity of her upper body and centred attention on her face. Both breasts are bared, and for the first time, both nipples have been added. She retains the patrician nose of the original, but there is additional detailing of her eyes and lips, and her head is tipped at a slight angle. This enabled the slippage only hinted at in the previous portraits, between the body of the painted marble and the body not only of the original marble viewed at Rome, but of the unknown Italian countess or other foreign conquest it symbolised. This is the most sensual extant depiction of

---

319 Ingamells, Dictionary, 226.
320 The similarity of Pompeo Batoni, John, 3rd Baron Monson of Burton, 1774, 249 x 175.2cm, and Bowron, Pompeo Batoni, Thomas Monson, Cat. No. 388, confused John Steegman, "Some English Portraits", 63, No. 65. It is later in date than Coke's portrait. The sitter rests a hand and a foot on the statue plinth. The presence of a Roma rather than the Vatican Ariadne, and the positioning of the sculpture at a greater distance from the sitter creates a very different effect.
321 Steegman, "Some English Portraits", 63, No. 66, reads it as a temple, 'In background the colonnade of a temple...', an idea which would see Coke literally worshipping the sculpture.
the sculpture by Batoni. Unlike in the portrait of Dundas, where the presence of the *Ariadne* subtly counterbalanced the male sculpted nudity on show, further enhanced by the removal of the fig leaves, by including only the *Vatican Ariadne*, and giving the sculpture such visual prominence, Coke exposed the potential of the sculpture as a symbol of male-female desire, allowing his portrait imagery to be read by the prurient gaze of society. Although this presumably left no doubt as to his heterosexuality, the imagery was so overtly sensual that viewers sought to explain it by referring to Coke’s grand tour experience.

As previously noted, according to the writings of Winckelmann, the most sublime examples of classical taste were draped female sculpted bodies or male nude bodies. The *Vatican Ariadne* was neither, and viewers of the portrait quickly understood the sculpture to function as an overt allusion to the Countess of Stolberg, an idea given further substance by the general impression that the facial features of the *Ariadne* had been altered in comparison to the original marble. Coke returned to London, where the rumour spread that Batoni had included a likeness of the Countess in his portrait at her behest, further emasculating Coke. He was in London by July of 1774, and by August the gossip had spread to the coffeehouses of London. The scandalised reception of the portrait in England indicated the importance of the grand tour portrait as a visual certification of a successful grand tour. Horace Walpole remarked,

> The young Mr Coke is returned from his travels in love with the Pretender's queen, who has permitted him to have her picture.

The wording, aided by the life-sized sculpture in his portrait, cast Coke as the submissive character in a love affair. It was the sense that Coke had publicly contravened British cultural mores that was the source of gossip, rather than the act of adultery. Eighteenth-century polite society largely acknowledged such behaviour, ignoring it unless it affected the performance

---

322 Scholars are divided on whether this *Ariadne* can be said to have the portrait features of the Countess. Comparing portraits of the Countess illuminates little. Wade, *Coke of Norfolk*, Plate 4, refers to the 'family tradition' that the Countess commissioned the portrait, and cannot disprove it, despite thinking it unlikely (solely because it was the practice for men to return home with a portrait) from her access to the Norfolk manuscripts.

323 Horace Walpole commented on it in England on August 18th, 1774. Ingamells, *Dictionary*, 226, records Coke as having reached England by July 1774 so either the rumour took a month to spread from Batoni’s studio at Rome or the portrait caused comment on arrival a month after Coke. The former seems more likely.

324 *Walpole Correspondence*, 178, XXXIX 18 August 1774 to Henry Seymour Conway, quoted by Clark, *Pompeo Batoni*, Cat. No. 377, 333. Conway was abroad on a 'tour of military curiosity', and his reply is lost. The letter continues, '...to have her picture. What can I tell you more? Nothing!'. Walpole, who gleaned his news from newspapers, letters and his coffeehouse (see letter to Conway December 31st 1774, ‘This is all my coffee-house furnished this morning'), considers Coke's portrait to be news equal in importance to a will dispute and military honours. W.S Lewis, ed., *The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence*, (1974, Book III): 178-180.
of social duties, as evidenced by the casual language of Lady Hertford, who wrote to Horace Walpole on Friday 8th September 1775,

Lord March is not quite in his good graces at present, for they have been three weeks there, and he has not made them one visit, though he has made a great many to a beautiful kitty in London.325

Thomas Coke's error lay in his neglect of his self-fashioning. By losing control of his portrait imagery, and acting too openly in public, he became the lovesick patsy to a newly political figure. His love life continued to be a source of amusement to British society. He married Miss Jane Dutton, youngest daughter of J. Lenox Dutton, Esq., on Friday October 8th, 1775.326 Coke's sister had already married into the family, meaning a further connection through marriage was unnecessary. Wenham Coke had planned to marry his son to a rich heiress of £40,000 a year.327 Coke chose to defy his father and on May 6th 1775, having reached his majority, announced his engagement.

He repeated this behaviour many years later: Susanna Martins Wade reports that, 'At the age of 68 and after 21 years as a widower he astonished his friends and London society by suddenly marrying his 18-year-old godchild, Lady Anne Keppel, daughter of his close friend, Lord Albemarle.'328 Lady Keppel originally intended to marry Coke's heir, his nephew William Coke, but he was disagreeable to the match. Two weeks after the marriage of Lord Albemarle to Coke's 45-year-old niece Charlotte Hunloke, Coke announced his now superfluous engagement to Albemarle's daughter. The resulting scandal was similar to that created by his grand tour affair. London society named the match 'Mr Coke's absurd marriage', calling his decision 'a breezy love-fit.'329 Among other children, a son was born to the unlikely couple, disinheriting Coke's nephew.

The details of Coke's life and character after his grand tour, and the specific depiction of the Vatican Ariadne in his portrait appear to corroborate the rumour that the sculpture was included as a kind of lover's token, a miniature portrait within a portrait. This would be in accordance with eighteenth-century ideas concerning the wearing of miniatures by lovers, as

325 Such behaviour was quickly discovered if indiscreet, especially in London, e.g. Lewis, Horace Walpole's Correspondence, 262. The courtesan in question was probably Catherine Frederick, nicknamed Kitty by Lady Hertford, as 'cat', rather than 'kitty', was used as slang for a prostitute, according to Francis Grose, Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue, 1811, digitised by Project Gutenberg, available at www.archive.org.
327 Wade, Coke of Norfolk, 25.
328 Wade, Coke of Norfolk, 169.
329 Wade, Coke of Norfolk, 170.
explored by Marica Pointon.\(^{330}\) This reading is contradicted by Sabrina Norlander Eliasson, who wrote,

> The sexual implications of the antiquities in Batoni's portraits may be stressed through the heartbreaking story of Louise... Despite the doubtful plausibility of this story, it clearly shows that there was a predisposition to regard the antiquities as readable objects within these portrait settings.\(^{331}\)

Eliasson's reading of the Coke portrait is based on the idea that the potential readability of the *Vatican Ariadne* within Coke's portrait was curtailed by the 'distinct museum context' and functioned only as 'an artefact belonging to the past.'\(^{332}\) This reading neglects to take into account the high profile of museums, galleries and studios as sites of sociability on the grand tour. The importance of considering the sensual potential of the full-length figure of the *Vatican Ariadne* is evidenced by the eighteenth-century reception of Coke's portrait. Apart from the question of her varied depiction by Batoni and problematic history of display at the Vatican, by taking into account the possible narratives invoked by the original sculpture, the impact of a correlation between Louise Stolberg and Ariadne or Cleopatra, as abandoned women betrayed by lovers, is immediately obvious.

Thomas Coke had a history of disregarding societal norms in order to pursue his romantic inclinations, but the Countess of Stolberg was already married, to a figure of political importance. His grand tour portrait was an opportunity to visually demonstrate his ability to self-fashion as a successful grand tourist, who had acquired a sense of taste on his travels, and was able to subtly reference his grand tourist experience in his portrait imagery. The final verdict on his portrait by Batoni came from Coke's family, who in an effort to excuse the imagery, claimed that the portrait had been commissioned by the Countess. A later hand added an inscription to the painting, recording that the painting was painted for the Countess and 'presented by her' to Coke, meaning that he had no control over its imagery.\(^{333}\) In his failure to commission a successful grand tourist portrait of himself, Coke revealed the extent to which his grand tour was about seducing women. Of all the British sitters who employed the *Vatican Ariadne*, Coke was the only one who was not elected to the *Society of*

---

\(^{331}\) Eliasson, *Portraiture and Social Identity*, 97.  
\(^{333}\) Steegman, "Some English Portraits", 63, No. 66, 'Inscribed on canvas "This portrait painted for the Countess of Albany wife of Prince Charlie was presented by her to Mr. T.W. Coke afterwards Viscount Coke and Earl of Leicester." According to Ingamells, *Dictionary*, 226, Coke was created Earl of Leicester in 1837. Since he died in 1842, this inscription was conceivably added during his lifetime.
Dilettanti.\textsuperscript{334} This is not necessarily a matter of cause and effect, as Coke's interest in antiquity appears to have been limited.\textsuperscript{335} It is evident that the dialogue between sculpture and sitter in Coke's portrait encapsulated his grand tourist experience, however, the imagery also exposed his failure to acquire the ability to correctly portray himself as an arbiter of classical taste.

Conclusion

This chapter posited visual subtexts to British grand tour portraiture created by the inclusion of recognisable marbles: at the most, a nuanced visual portfolio of the sitter's individual grand tourist experience, at the least, a symbol of a collective grand tourist viewing experience which facilitated future sociability. Viewing sculpture was a central element of the grand tourist experience, and the readability and materiality of sculpture in painting reflected this. Batoni's studio was a site of sociability for visitors to Rome in the late eighteenth century, in which they could view his current works.\textsuperscript{336} The impetus behind sculptural inclusions, whether referencing grand tour learning, or simply adhering to pictorial fashion as established by the 1760s, can both be assumed to be meaningful within the display context of Rome. Visitors to Rome who viewed the portraits \textit{in situ} were called upon to express their understanding of the quoted sculpture and their memories of viewing sculpture were brought to the fore. On arrival in England, the portrait acted as a visual confirmation of grand tourist status by referencing the sitter's presence at Rome. Further unpacking of the imagery depended on the classical education of the viewer, and their understanding of the cultural phenomenon that was the grand tour.

This chapter employed as a case study the five portraits by Batoni which depict the \textit{Vatican Ariadne}. By focussing on the importance of the antique regardless of the individual sitter, a broader understanding of the dialogue between sitter and sculpture within the portrait space

\textsuperscript{334} Lynn Hunt, \textit{Invention of pornography: obscenity and the origins of modernity, 1500-1800}, (Zone, 1996): 253, discusses the link between the Society of Dilettanti and libertinism. Despite their gatherings which involved an excess of food and alcohol and crude bodily humour, the Society maintained an external scholarly appearance, however flimsy, in accordance with eighteenth-century cultural mores. For the Society's appreciation of visual jokes, see Jason M. Kelly, \textit{Society of Dilettanti: archaeology and identity in the British enlightenment}, (Yale University Press, 2010).

\textsuperscript{335} Wade, \textit{Coke of Norfolk}, 45, on inheriting his scholarly great-uncle's house (Holkham House) in 1776, Coke declared himself insufficiently versed in classical art and architecture to alter the buildings, and focussed on the gardens.

\textsuperscript{336} Clark, \textit{Pompeo Batoni}, 17, from 1759, Batoni was living in a large house at 25 \textit{Via Bocca di Leone} in Rome, with a studio, evening drawing class, exhibition rooms and space for his daughters' musical evenings.
was achieved. When it came to the inclusion of the *Vatican Ariadne*, it is clear that this dialogue was highly nuanced in order to control the viewer's reading of the sculpture. For the discerning eighteenth-century viewer, the inclusion of sculpture within the portrait space could signify layers of meaning which are now difficult to fully unpack.

In the 1764 portrait of Thomas Dundas, the established canon of the antique was visually rewritten in favour of the *Vatican Ariadne*. The 'erotic charge' of the portrait was subtle, and made obvious only to the grand tourist viewer who held the appropriate memories: viewing the nudity of the original, the difficulty of eliminating prurience from the grand tourist gaze, and the prevalence of sexual conquests as part of grand tour sociability. In Chapter One, the humour to be found in caricatured images of grand tour sociability at Rome depended on the viewer recognising the sitters and their key character traits, and it is likely that this held true for the grand tour portrait, particularly those portraits including a readable object. By 1774 and the portrait of Thomas Coke, Batoni had created portraiture in which a statue referenced a female lover more blatantly than the original sculpture, so that the portrait, as much as the behaviour, caused scandal in London. This scandal was presumably given fuel by an awareness of Coke’s established reputation for making ‘considerable havock amongst the young Beauties’.

---

337 For the correlation between travel and sex, see Ian Littlewood, *Sultry Climates: Travel and Sex*, (Da Capo Press, 2003).
Part II: Chapter Three

Sociability in the Sculptor's Studio: Christopher Hewetson, Antonio Canova and the Roman Studio, 1778-1830

Introduction

Part I of this thesis explored trends in painted portraits of visitors to Rome from the perspective of the stereotypical eighteenth-century British grand tourist: young, male and wealthy. It examined the extent to which the importance of classical sculpture to the preservation of class boundaries culminated in Batoni’s rich depictions of male sitters from 1744 to 1775. A painted portrait was a public act of self-fashioning. Part II of this thesis engages with a different aspect of portrait art: sculpture. Similarly to how Chapter One identified a trend and Chapter Two explored its visual limits, in Part II, Chapter Three addresses the experience of viewing sculpted portraiture in the studio, and Chapter Four will explore the most daring portrait sculpture of the second half of the long eighteenth century. Both chapters consider the reception and viewing of portrait sculpture in the studio as indicative of broader changes in sociability and sensibility, and gain insight into the heightened profile of the studio visit through a different kind of self-fashioning as engaged with classical sculpture: the publication of a travel journal.

Part II explores sociability at Rome during a long period of military tension. 1778 saw key battles in the American Revolution, and France declared war on Britain. The third voyage of Captain Cook also brought ideas of nationalistic identity to the forefront of social debate. Jeremy Black points out that the performance of grand tourism took place in foreign countries which were either enemies or allies to England.338 Either status was subject to change. It is in this context, April of 1778, that the English landscape painter Thomas Jones recorded the Italian perspective on English visitors to Rome,

The Romans arranged their English Visitors into three Classes or degrees... The first Class consisted of the Artisti or Artists, who came here, as well for Study and Improvement, as emolument by their profession- the Second, included what they termed Mezzi Cavalieri- in this Class were ranked all those who lived genteely, independent of any profession, kept a Servant- perhaps- and occasionally frequented the English Coffeehouse- But the true Cavalieri or Milordi Inglesi were those who moved in a Circle of Superior Splendour- surrounded by a group of Satellites under

the denomination of Travelling Tutors, Antiquarians, Dealers in Virtu, English Grooms, French Valets and Italian running footmen.\footnote{339}

This differentiation of English visitors to Rome reveals an emphasis on sociability, nationality and wealth. Artists and genteel visitors socialised at the English coffeehouse in the \textit{Piazza di Spagna}, a key hub of networking for foreign visitors to Rome.\footnote{340} The coffeehouse acted as a locus of public sociability, but they retained the facility of their private lodgings.\footnote{341} In comparison, the wealth and social significance of the \textit{milordi} equated being surrounded by employees who guided their interactions. They were expected to perform daily rituals of behaviour according to societal norms, resulting in near constant sociability. Patronage of artists, particularly those of the same nationality, was important in times of military tension.\footnote{342}

Thomas Jones was quick to stress the nationality and status of his visitors in 1778,

\begin{quote}
There was at Rome about this time a great Concourse of the English Nobility & Gentry, male & female – All of whom, I believe – did me the honour of coming to see my pictures – and some became Purchasers.\footnote{343}
\end{quote}

Purchasing or commissioning pictures was an exercise predicated on viewing the work of the artist. The viewing activity, and associated financial activity, of grand tourist visitors to eighteenth-century Rome was carefully controlled by a complex network of artists, guides and art dealers. Art dealers went so far as to exhibit paintings by favoured artists in their own homes, thus ensuring their visibility.\footnote{344} For sculptors, viewing activity took place within the context of creation, the studio. The studio was a unique space: while access to private collections might be restricted to those with wealth, status, or the right connections, all three of Thomas Jones' levels of visitors to Rome could obtain access to view the sculptor's studio.

\begin{footnotes}
340 The importance of the coffeehouse as a hub of sociability, facilitated by the general understanding of the coffeehouse as a social equalizer, is ably discussed by Ellis Markman, \textit{The Coffee-House: a Cultural History}, (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2004).
342 Thomas Jones' ascription of particular attributes to particular nationalities among the employees of \textit{milordi} (French fashion, English horsemanship) is unsurprising given the military tension between the nations in question.
343 Jones, \textit{Memoirs}, April 1778.
344 Jones, \textit{Memoirs}, 1st April 1780, 'Each of these Gentlemen had his party among the artists, and it was customary for everyone to present a Specimen of his Abilities to his Protector...These Specimens were hung up in their respective Rooms of Audience for the inspection of the Cavaliers who came...'
\end{footnotes}
The activity of visiting a sculptor's studio bore similarities to viewing public and private collections at Rome. Establishing standard viewing practices at collections reveals more about the unique position of the studio within the viewing experience at Rome. In the case of Irish sculptor Christopher Hewetson, the detailed inventory of the contents of his studio recorded immediately after his death in 1798 allows for the extrapolation of the physical circumstances of a visit to his studio and the materiality of the space.\(^{345}\) A number of sources record Hewetson as a sociable figure, and his studio was located between the two main hubs of artistic society at Rome.\(^{346}\) The unfinished busts in his studio in 1798 allow for a reconstruction of his recent visitors. By examining key examples of Hewetson's work in detail, this chapter posits the studio as the primary display context of his sculpture. This reconstruction establishes the studio as a location for sociability, patronage and the performance of grand tourist values in late eighteenth-century Rome.

Although Thomas Jones' words on the levels of visitors to Rome reveal a bias towards the male gender, he proudly made notation of male and female members of the English gentry and nobility viewing his paintings.\(^{347}\) As early as the 1780s, the number of milordi at Rome was dwindling in comparison to the arrival of compatriots of varied social status. In Chapter One, the imagery of grand tourists at Rome in the 1750s portrayed the sitters as actively learning, reading, viewing or socialising. Rather than travel with a library of classical texts to discover new sites, travellers from the 1780s on held expectations of each site they visited, formed from countless travel guides they read before their departure. With a focus on viewing, rather than on patronage, the studio became a site of discovery. The writings of visitors to Rome in the early nineteenth century reveal the studio visit as a key element of sociability for all British visitors to Rome, not solely grand tourists. Establishing the female authoritative voice and viewing practices in early nineteenth-century travel literature reveals how art criticism had moved beyond the traditional authority of the grand tourist. The celebrity of the early nineteenth-century studio of sculptor Antonio Canova indicates that the studio became a site of general sociability, amalgamated into societal norms at Rome. The figure of the artist-guide began to supersede the traditional dealer-guide as the influx of non-grand tourist visitors to Rome broke down the established networks.

\(^{346}\) Figgis, "Irish Artists and Society", 31.
Extrapolating wider significance from the studio context requires a precise definition of the term. The increasing importance of the studio space within Rome is apparent: the assumed space and functions inherent in the term 'studio' literally broadened over time. Michael Cole and Mary Pardo consider how the Latin word *studium*, which Cicero used to mean pleasurable hard work and devotion to a subject, came to denote Italian spaces of learning, occasionally being attributed to a space of artistic training. In the late seventeenth century the word studio was more often used to designate the space in which ideas were conceived, while the actual locus of work was normally called the *bottega*, or *stanza*, both of which terms can also simply mean 'room'.

Scholars disagree on when exactly the word studio came to represent an amalgamated space containing the binary processes of *invenzione*, the creative selection of the subject, and *esecuzione*, the act of chiseling and shaping the marble block. Michael Cole and Mary Pardo believe that the word 'studio' did not enter the English language in this sense until the nineteenth century. This is an overly conservative estimate given the prevalent and confident use of the term in British writings of the early nineteenth century. Their work focussed on the painter's studio, in which the processes of imagination and creation were often confluent.

Alison Yarrington argued for an earlier date in relation to sculptors, writing:

Towards the end of the eighteenth century, the use of the word 'studio' to describe the workplace of the sculptor, especially that area where examples of his current and previous works could be admired, became more frequent.

In this chapter, which concerns the sculptor's studio in Rome from 1778-1830, the term 'studio' is employed as designating the space in which the sculptor and his assistants carried out the full process of the creation of sculpture, from the conception of ideas or the consideration of copies, to the polishing of the finished marble works and the display of previous, ongoing or inspirational works.

---

For British artists, an awareness of the benefits of displaying their work to the public can be assumed from the first Royal Academy exhibition of 1769 in London.\textsuperscript{353} Prior to this, the studio viewing experience was limited to other artists, art-dealers, and wealthy patrons who were in a position to purchase works on show, or to commission new ones. Both exhibition spaces and studio spaces enjoy a strong visual record according to Giles Waterfield, who points out that the studio never achieved a fully private function.\textsuperscript{354} The physical experience of visiting the sculptor's studio, necessitating walking around pieces and observing all of the works in the space, mimicked the experience of visiting public collections of sculpture at Rome. The tendency among sculptors to reference classical works, both sculpted and literary, encouraged conversation as part of viewing.

Examining the similarities and dissimilarities of the studio visit to the grand tourist viewing experience is illuminating. The enactment of sociability in the studio conformed to wider museological viewing practices of late eighteenth-century Rome. Given a visual context without explanatory material such as labels, the viewing experience was largely informed by prior readings, hiring a guide or tutor, or the presence in the space of a knowledgeable person willing to converse. The intimation is that grand tourists could afford more meaningful interactions with the materiality of Rome by hiring the most knowledgeable guides or ciceroni. The viewing of sculpture was considered to include a verbal element—discussion, analysis, gossip.\textsuperscript{355} Discussion of the space was part of the experience, as Carole Paul discovered in her research on the Borghese collection at Rome,

\begin{quote}
For most eighteenth-century visitors, the experience of the Borghese collections was primarily a social event; any engagement with the works of art displayed there was framed by the demands of social performance.\textsuperscript{356}
\end{quote}

Carole Paul's work on establishing the average eighteenth-century interaction with the Borghese collection mirrors the focus on sociability in this chapter. In the seventeenth and early to mid-eighteenth centuries, sculpture was observed by most individuals as one element

\textsuperscript{353} By public is here meant those who could afford the entry fee, recorded by David Solkin and John Sutherland, "Staging the spectacle" in \textit{Art on the line: the Royal Academy exhibitions at Somerset House, 1780-1836}, ed., David H. Solkin, (Yale University Press, 2001): 37 as a shilling per visitor, with the catalogue costing extra. They note (p.27) that it was not until 1809 that the Royal Academy officially instituted a 'varnishing day' for painters to make the finishing touches to their works once hung- evidence of prioritising the public viewing over the eventual private setting of the works once purchased.


\textsuperscript{355} Carole Paul, \textit{The Borghese Collections and the Display of Art in the Age of the Grand Tour}, (Ashgate, 2008), interrogates the spatial and social meanings of the Borghese collection.

\textsuperscript{356} Paul, \textit{The Borghese Collections}, 3.
of a building-wide programme of viewing.\textsuperscript{357} This mode of viewing, which prioritised the overall experience, was slowly counteracted by the success of the Winckelmann aesthetic best promoted in his 1764 \textit{Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums}, which prioritised a detailed and prolonged focus on one work at a time.\textsuperscript{358} Further dissemination of the canon of classical sculpture as individual sculptures of value, in the form of prints, or depicted in grand tour portraits, also served to alter this perspective. While Winckelmann's work did not overtly change the display format of Rome's collections, there were changes in the way visitors interacted with the works within the space.

For example, Winckelmann's aesthetic contributed to the increased interest in the torch-lit visit to the sculpture collections of Rome in the late eighteenth century. The torch-lit visit at the Vatican was highly programmatic, even ceremonial, with rehearsed extinguishing and lighting of torches by servants.\textsuperscript{359} The advantages to viewing sculpture by torchlight included the ability to focus on one work at a time, and a sense of movement and immediacy. Claudia Mattos considers Winckelmann to have been 'inaugurating a new type of gaze, which was not distracted and relational, as it had been before, but focused and inquisitive.'\textsuperscript{360} This newly focused gaze is substantiated by changes in sculpture towards greater surface detail, and changes in art criticism and reputation-making. The increased profile of the studio visit is evident in precisely the same decades Claudia Mattos attributes to the popularity of the torch-lit visit: from the 1780s to the mid-nineteenth century.

These changes were part of a wider theoretical aesthetic which elided the traditional differentiation between grand tourist and connoisseur.\textsuperscript{361} Viewing the sculpture of Rome was a necessary element of visiting the city, but not all grand tourists were interested beyond the basic performance of attendance.\textsuperscript{362} By the early nineteenth century, the idea of

\textsuperscript{357} For example, the decoration at the Borghese collections had been designed in decor and architecture as a 'vehicle' of the culture expressed by the collection, Paul, \textit{The Borghese Collections}, 2. A history of this idea of sculpture as part of an overall decorative scheme is given in Claudia Mattos, "The Torchlight Visit: Guiding the Eye through Late Eighteenth- and Early Nineteenth-Century Antique Sculpture Galleries", in \textit{Critical Exchange: Art Criticism of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries in Russia and Western Europe}, ed. Carol Adlam and Juliet Simpson, CISRA Vol. 12, (Peter Lang Publishing, 2008): 132.

\textsuperscript{358} Johann Joachim Winckelmann, \textit{Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums}, 1764.

\textsuperscript{359} Mattos, "The Torchlight Visit", 139.

\textsuperscript{360} Mattos, "The Torchlight Visit", 133.

\textsuperscript{361} See Alex Potts, \textit{Flesh and the Ideal: Winckelmann and the Origins of Art History}, (Yale University Press, 2000).

\textsuperscript{362} Paul, \textit{The Borghese Collections}, 3, 'Even those not particularly learned or interested in art would have felt called upon to comport themselves as if they were...'.
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connoisseurship and the figure of the male grand tourist were losing their authority in the face of new viewing practices.\textsuperscript{363}

Torch-lit viewings and the singular-sculpture viewing aesthetic they implied were however largely restricted to wealthy tourists owing to the expense.\textsuperscript{364} There existed an established convention that Rome was a place best navigated with assistance, both when travelling and when viewing ruins or collections of sculpture. This resulted in a kind of hierarchy of quality of viewing, facilitating the viewing experiences of wealthy visitors. Those grand tourists who could afford to often embarked on a course of learning of several weeks. Philip Yorke, a young man dependent on his uncle's money for his travels, took James Byres' course, and was careful to denote his guide's qualifications when writing home,

\begin{quote}
It is a fortunate circumstance for those who are curious about antiquities to have as admirable a guide as Mr Beyers, [sic] a scotch gentleman... came to Rome to study architecture, & after some years application undertook to shew the antiquities, in which he has so well succeeded that he is sure of being constantly employed.\textsuperscript{365} ... Notwithstanding the pleasure I have in hearing our worthy & intelligent conductor dissert on the pictures statues & antiquities which he shews us, yet I shall not be sorry to have finished, that I may have the pleasure of returning a second time by myself to examine with attention the things that have struck me the most.\textsuperscript{366}
\end{quote}

Not all visitors to Rome were 'curious' or wealthy enough to embark on a course, but it was advisable. Having viewed Rome's sights with the assistance of Byres, Philip Yorke was subsequently qualified for independent viewing, a practice which was understood to be potentially dangerous. Rome could be overwhelming to the unwary traveller, both mentally and physically. William Hazlitt reached a state of mental exhaustion through excessive viewing, writing,

\textsuperscript{363} Harry Mount, "The Monkey with the Magnifying Glass: Constructions of the Connoisseur in Eighteenth-Century Britain", \textit{Oxford Art Journal}, Vol. 29, (No. 2, 2006): 167-184, details the viewing behaviour of the connoisseur as concerned with technical ability and minute detail, with an emphasis on cataloguing. This viewing method was contradicted by Winckelmann, whose attention to detail stemmed from a passionate response to antique sculpture.\textsuperscript{364} Lady Murray, \textit{A Journal of a Tour in Italy}, in 5 volumes, London: Privately Printed, c. 1836, British Library, General Reference Collection 10129.bb.18, Vol. II, 156, 'Parties, of twelve persons only, are allowed to go round the Vatican by torch-light, and the fees and torches make the expense amount to twelve scudi. The time occupied is generally two hours.' Lady Murray visited in the nineteenth century, but fees can be assumed to have been charged in the eighteenth century, at the very least in relation to hiring a guide who could procure torches. The number of servants suggested by the eighteenth-century account found in Mattos, "The Torchlight Visit", 139, supports this.\textsuperscript{365} \textit{Hardwicke Papers}, Vol. XXX, British Library Add MS 35378, letters from Philip Yorke to his uncle Lord Grey, Earl of Hardwicke, Rome, October 31st, 1778, 257-262.\textsuperscript{366} \textit{Hardwicke Papers}, Vol. XXX, Rome, December 5th, 1778, 279, British Library Add MS 35378.
You have no stimulus to exertion, for you have but to open your eyes and see, in order to live in a continued round of delight and admiration.367

In comparison, Phillip Yorke was energised by viewing Rome in 1778,

It is one of the few places that has fully answered my expectations, for I confess that however my ideas might have been raised by the descriptions I had read, the sight of those venerable remains & of those fine specimens of ancient and modern art which abound in Rome have far surpassed them.368

Philip Yorke fulfilled the criteria of the learned and wealthy traveller, who read the literature and engaged a guide, and was rewarded with a positive viewing experience. Physical fatigue arising from mental confusion over how to navigate Rome was a common literary trope. According to Richard Wrigley, the disease of malaria was well known, but not well understood, and contributed to various urban myths.369 There was also the risk of getting lost if travelling alone, like Thomas Jones, who wrote in 1776,

...the want of a Guide made me lose a great deal of time in wearesome and unsatisfactory perambulations – I remember once in particular, having found my way to the Pantheon, I started from thence for the Campo-vaccino – but after bewildering my Self in intricate circuitous Streets for two hours, to my great Surprise, found myself at the Pantheon again – Being by this time so tired as well as disappointed – I was glad to enquire my way back to the Piazza di Spagna – the district in which I lived.370

It is not surprising that residents of Rome who could not assist with pointing out tourist sites would be able to direct Jones to the Piazza di Spagna. The Piazza di Spagna was the district in which the majority of foreigners in Rome lived, including the Irish sculptor Christopher Hewetson. The closeness of this social topography is well illustrated by Nicola Figgis in her article on Irish artists at Rome.371 She notes that the long-term British residents of Rome, particularly artists, gave rise to the Piazza di Spagna being nicknamed the 'ghetto degli Inglesi'. By the 1770s, artists had shifted north of the Piazza di Spagna towards the parish of the Piazza del Popolo [Fig. 3.1].372 Foreign nationals in residence in this area included Henry Tresham, Nathaniel Marchant, James Smith, Nicolas Jackson, Robert Home, Thomas Jenkins, James Byres and Christopher Hewetson. Christopher Hewetson lived above his

369 The most extreme example is the avoidance of certain areas thought to cause the sickness now known as malaria. See Richard Wrigley, "Pathological Topographies and Cultural Itineraries", in Pathologies of Travel, ed. Revill and Wrigley, 207-228.
370 Jones, Memoirs, December 1776.
studio, (marked with a star on Fig. 3.1), which was located near the Spanish Steps on the *Vicolo delle Orsoline*. The location was significant, geographically speaking, as it was roughly half way between the *Piazza di Spagna* and the *Piazza del Popolo*, or the two historic centres of artist sociability, and thus placed Hewetson at the centre of cultural life for British residents at Rome. This close-knit community facilitated the dissemination of new methods of viewing.

Christopher Hewetson, Sculptor

Examining the career of Christopher Hewetson reveals his adherence to three key elements to success for the late eighteenth-century sculptor: a sociable persona, a studio displaying multiple works, and a strong link to an art dealer-guide. An Irish sculptor who trained under John Van Nost the Younger in Dublin, Christopher Hewetson was a key figure in Roman social and artistic circles, and was favoured by artist-dealer Thomas Jenkins. Hewetson was first recorded in Rome in 1765 by Hayward's List as residing with Henry Benbridge, an American painter. Highlights of his career included a 1772 bust for William Henry, brother to George III, and the 1793 funeral monument to Provost Baldwin at Trinity College Dublin. Hewetson's early success in winning the commission for a bust of Pope Clement XIV in 1771 propelled his career to new heights. His achievement was noted by a network of religious and familial connections, including Dr Thomas Burke, who wrote from Ireland to Father O'Kelly in Rome to pass on his congratulations to the sculptor,

Compliments of congratulation to Mr. Hewetson for the honour done him by the Pope in preferring him to many others of his own persuasion & countrymen &

---

374 This was presumably early after his arrival at Rome, before he moved to his premises on *Strada Vittoria*, off the *Corso Orsoline*, near the Spanish Steps. Henry Benbridge studied under Pompeo Batoni and Anton Raphael Mengs, two of the most popular portrait painters for English visitors to Rome in the long eighteenth century. Hewetson was evidently friendly with Mengs, whose bust he sculpted in 1779. The entry reads, 'Mr. Huston an Irish sculptr. /wt Mr. Bambridge painter /from Philadelphia 1765', and was dated between February 1765 and February 1766. See Lindsay Stainton, "Hayward's List: British Visitors to Rome 1753-1775", *The Volume of the Walpole Society*, Vol. 49, (1983): 13.
375 A provisional catalogue of works by Christopher Hewetson was published by Brian de Breffney, "Christopher Hewetson", *Irish Arts Review (1984-1987)*, Vol. 3, (No. 3, Autumn 1986): 52-75. The catalogue is now known to contain errors, but forms a useful overview.
employing him to make a marble bust of His Holiness, which is evident proof of his distinguished abilities.376

This commission gained international attention for the Irish sculptor, and the sheer wealth of surface detail to be found in the bust exposes his ambition to succeed [Fig. 3.2]. The ornate clothing and minute detail of veins and wrinkles around the eyes rewarded close-up viewing in the studio. The slight angle in the tilt of the shoulders, visible in the slight gaping of the vest over the left arm, combined with the turn of the head gives a lively aspect to the bust.

The excess of the cord which ties the vest together dangles in a straight line down the centre of the chest, in contrast to the row of small buttons at the neck of the garment underneath. This is rendered more noticeable owing to the device of one missing button. The imagery of the vest is largely floral, with small details carved inside larger designs of wreaths and crests. This is not comfortable clothing, but formal wear appropriate to his office.

The wealth of detail added a sense of realism, as though the Pope had posed in this very garment. The clothing encouraged viewing in the round. The addition of a small lined hood to the robes, where the Pope is already wearing what looks to be either a lined braided cap, or a cap which shows a fur inside lining at the curled edges, inspired closer inspection of the back of the bust [Fig. 3.3]. The hood partially conceals the fine carving of the locks of hair escaping from the cap at the back of the neck, as well as the continuation of the crisp collar, which cuts into the fleshy face. The abundant locks springing from the back of the cap are in contrast to the thinning hair at the forehead. The inclusion of this near-hidden detail at the back of the bust rewarded the visitor to the studio who studied the bust in the round with a 'focused and inquisitive gaze'.377

Any visitor to the studio unfamiliar with the features of the Pope would depart feeling as though they were acquainted. As well as providing a rich visual feast for the viewer, the papal bust achieved an excellent likeness of the Pope [Fig. 3.4]. The upper lip of the mouth is slightly raised, the corners of the lips slightly pursed, emphasised by the heavy dimpling at the sides of the mouth, and the cupid's bow exaggerated by the shadow cast on it by the strongly carved nose above. Drooping flesh under the eyes is contrasted with a slightly furrowed brow and strong eyebrows, the detail of which seems to melt into the carving of the

377 Mattos, "The Torchlight Visit", 133.
wrinkles and veins at the side of the face. The eyes are incised, further emphasising the turn of the bust to its right, away from the central line of sight.

The Pope was pleased enough with his bust to award Hewetson two gold medals, further boosting the sculptor's reputation. This likely contributed to his subsequent commission for a monument to the late Provost of Trinity College Dublin [Fig. 3.5]. Provost Baldwin was responsible for the portrait busts still exhibited in the Long Room of the Trinity Library and had willed his £80,000 fortune to Trinity College Dublin on his death.378 Baldwin died in 1759, therefore the likeness of his figure on the monument was likely achieved through the use of other portraiture.379

This commission provides further evidence of Hewetson's habitual prioritisation of the studio viewing context. A description of the monument in the words of the sculptor, published by Katharine Esdaile, is worth quoting:

...I chose to represent Dr. Baldwin as near his end, his Will dropping from his hand... The third figure in this group is that of a Muse, the Simbol [sic] of Science, supporting her Benefactor and lamenting the near approach of his end.380

The beseeching open hand of a dying man 'near his end' added great pathos to the funerary monument. Hewetson's choice of a narrative for the figures contributed to its success, adhering to the contemporary trend for sculpture as theatre.381 The monument was exhibited in Rome to great acclaim in July 1783. This exhibition presumably took the form of an open invitation to view the monument at Hewetson's studio. The sculptor was painted in front of the monument by Stefano Tofanelli, who also appears in the portrait [Fig. 3.6].382 The painting is dominated by the monument, set within a wide stone arch. Tofanelli and

378 Malcolm Baker, "The making of portrait busts in the mid-eighteenth century: Roubiliac, Sheemakers and Trinity College, Dublin", The Burlington Magazine, Vol. 137, (No. 1113, Dec. 1995): 821-831, investigates the authorship of these busts. The figure of £80,000 was quoted by Hewetson in his "Description of Dr Baldwin's Monument, by Christopher Hewetson, the artist, who made it. -10th April, 1793", first published by Katharine Esdaile, "Christopher Hewetson and his Monument to Dr Baldwin in Trinity College, Dublin", The Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland, Vol. 77, (No. 2, Dec. 1947): 134. Katharine Esdaile gives the provenance as loose notes found in a copy of Whitaker's History of Whalley owned by R. H. Beaumont. The authenticity of the description appears accurate and has been quoted without question by scholars.
380 Esdaile, "Hewetson and his Monument to Dr Baldwin", 134-135.
381 The success of sculptors who invested a sense of immediacy and emotion into their sculpture, often choosing a moment of particular narratival significance, is examined in relation to the work of sculptor Louis-Francois Roubiliac in London by David Bindman and Malcolm Baker, Roubiliac and the Eighteenth-Century Monument, Sculpture as Theatre, (Yale University Press, 1995).
382 Private collection, image released by the Galleria Carlo Virgilio at the Piazza di Spagna, Rome in connection with the sale of the painting in 2000. This is the only known image of the painting, but it seems unlikely that the figure of the painter would be impinged on by the edge of the canvas in the original.
Hewetson discuss the monument in relation to a drawing of it held by Hewetson. Tofanelli points to a detail with his right hand, which emerges from his toga-like clothing. Hewetson in comparison, as Joe McDonnell noticed, was fashionably dressed, which was his preference.\(^{383}\) The presence of a small dog, energetically posed, adds a sense of liveliness to the scene. The performance of casual sociability in front of the statue suggests a familiar setting like Hewetson's studio, which would not involve the logistical difficulties associated with moving the monument.

Logistical difficulties in moving the monument did occur. Hewetson's letter of November 26th 1784 to Dr Troy, a bishop living in Kilkenny, reveals that part of the shipment, to which Hewetson had added some books and candlesticks intended for Dr Troy, had been mixed up with the monument. Hewetson was professionally and personally embarrassed by the experience, writing to Dr Troy that,

"...with regard to the Gilt Copper frame, as it is called, it can be no other than part of the ornaments of the Monument which by mistake have been sent to you for Candlesticks. What a Blunder! ...I am an unfortunate fellow and shall be so long as I live. I conjecture that the paper of instructions I sent to the College has been lost, otherwise so many blunders could not have been made. If this is the Case I fear whoever put up the Monument has made a fine Pastiche of it. There was not wanting this to alarm me on the score of erecting this work for I had enough to dread before from Ignorance or Malice, both of which the world abounds with and I suppose Ireland has its share of them.\(^{384}\)"

Hewetson's instructions on how to assemble and display the monument at Trinity College Dublin were evidently lost or ignored. The task fell to sculptor Edward Smyth, who raised the monument by a foot by adding a base of Irish granite.\(^{385}\) [Fig. 3.5] Although the 'blunders' were eventually resolved, the Baldwin monument in Dublin was at various points viewed without its crown, without ornamentation, with a replacement crown, and raised a foot higher than Hewetson intended.\(^{386}\) The new height may have been necessary, as the


\(^{384}\) Letter from Christopher Hewetson to Dr Troy, Rome, 26th November 1784, Trinity College Dublin, Dept. of MSS, TCD MSS MUN P1/876. Published by McDonnell, "Piggybacking Hewetson's Baldwin Monument", 77, Appendix C.2.

\(^{385}\) McDonnell, "Piggybacking Hewetson's Baldwin Monument", 79.

\(^{386}\) McDonnell, "Piggybacking Hewetson's Baldwin Monument", sees the absence of the archway represented in the Stefano Tofanelli painting (also visible in the inset drawing held by Hewetson) as the most significant difference between painting and original. His phrasing suggests that the archway was part of the monument. This archway is evidently either an aspect of the intended display context in the new Trinity College Dublin chapel, or nothing more than artistic license on the part of the painter. Adding a classicising motif to the architecture of the space in which the monument was displayed in Rome, which was most likely Hewetson's own studio, would be in keeping with Tofanelli's neoclassical style.
intended site in the new College Chapel was not ready. The monument was erected in the Examinations Hall, where it remains to this day. Hewetson's concern over the ignorance or malice of Irish sculptors tasked with erecting his sculpture indicates the loss of control he felt once the sculpture left his studio. This may have contributed to his decision to openly invite visitors to view the monument in his studio at Rome before shipping it.

Despite this public viewing, it is not clear that Hewetson subsequently retained a version of the Baldwin monument to display in his studio. Only two years later, Hewetson's studio was visited by Irishman Henry Quin. Quin wrote in December 1785 of his excitement over the reputation of his fellow Irishman,

> For the Honour of my Country I am glad to hear that the best sculptor at present in Rome is an Irishman, Hewson, [sic] he that made Baldwin's monument.387

Despite Quin's apparent familiarity with the Baldwin monument, his good opinion of Hewetson did not long survive his arrival at Rome. On visiting Hewetson's studio in January 1786, after viewing that of Canova's, Quin wrote,

> We then went to our Countryman Hewson [sic] the Sculptor... He is at present employed in one for Pope Rezzonico- it is not a great work, but two Cupids and a Bust. He seems to be chiefly employed in Busts. There was nothing in his workshop to enable us to form a comparison between his and Canova's Talents.388

Henry Quin's independent assessment based on his studio visits was a symptom of the new paradigm of reputation-making at Rome.389 Either Canova's works were overwhelmingly better than those of Hewetson, or Quin did not have the opportunity to properly admire the Baldwin monument. A painted souvenir in the form of the portrait by Stefano Tofanelli was not adequate for visitors accustomed to studios providing a varied and exciting viewing experience. Henry Quin's rapid change of opinion as to Hewetson's talents reflected an understanding already held by Hewetson, of his eclipse by the younger sculptor Canova. This had been made evident when in 1783 the commission for the tomb of Pope Clement XIV, whose bust launched Hewetson's career, was awarded to Canova over Hewetson.

388 Henry Quin, January 14th 1786, quoted in Brinsley Ford Archive, RBF/1/606, Hesilrige-Heywood.
389 His use of the term workshop instead of studio could reflect Henry Quin's disappointment with Hewetson's works, or it could be a result of his recent arrival to Rome leaving him unfamiliar with the most common term.
Quin's assessment of Hewetson as 'chiefly employed in Busts' appears to have been accurate. The sculptor also produced large volumes of copies after the antique in various sizes. The death of Hewetson resulted in a full inventory of his assets. The documentation survives at the Archivio di Stato di Roma, and was recently published by Paolo Coen. The documents include Hewetson's will and form an inventory of the contents and value of the studio, dated 7 December 1798. At the time of his death, the space contained 'a hundred and forty pieces in marble and plaster', some complete, some fragments, and others at varying stages of completion. Hewetson's unclaimed works were valued at over a thousand scudi by the end of the three-day inventory. The busts, which were to be finished by Christopher Prosperi, were worth roughly four times this amount.

Paolo Coen estimates from the values ascribed to these works that ninety per cent of Christopher Hewetson's income stemmed from copies of the antique. Included in the inventory are copies of: a small Ceres from the Pio-Clementine Museum, a small modest Venus, a small Polyhymnia, the Pio-Clementine Melpomene, a marble head of a daughter of Niobe, a bust of Cicero, the torso of the Laocoon, the Belvedere torso, and various other Roman statuary. Many of these works were small in size, the majority estimated at 75 centimetres. Coen attributed this to concerns of transport, cost and export licenses. These were the kind of concerns affecting patrons who commissioned works. Visitors who could not afford to commission a bust of themselves at £68 might be persuaded to purchase a small copy of an antique sculpture. The cost of these small copies were estimated in the inventory as ranging from 3.5 to 60 scudi, or £0.80 to £15 depending on size, quality of material and state of completion. To put this sum into context, nine years previously it was estimated that a student could live for a year in Rome on £80. George Cumberland wrote to Rev. W. Cumberland, October 12, c. 1789,

...there you will be in a fine Climate, among english, [sic] surrounded by all that is beautiful in Nature or Art, and where you may live in every respect like a gentleman.

---

390 Larger commissions concerning the antique were recorded, for example his 1781 commission for a copy of the Cleopatra for the Grand Duchess Maria Fedorovna of Russia. These large commissions reflect traditional artist-patron networks, while the production of 75cm copies of antique sculpture would have been aimed at less wealthy visitors.

391 Coen, "Nuovi Documenti", Doc. 3, C. 428. The document records the name as 'Christofari Nevvtson'. The bequest to Jenkins in the will and other details support Paolo Coen's identification of Nevvtson as Hewetson.

392 Coen, "Nuovi Documenti", Doc. 3. It is worth noting that there were only two sculptural pieces in the house itself.

393 It is estimated that one scudo equalled 5 shillings, therefore 4 scudi equalled a pound. See Jeremy Black, Italy and the Grand Tour, (Yale University Press, 2003): "Notes on Dates and Currency".
for £100 a year at Most- £80 is the common expence [sic] of Students and they are none of them saving...394

For Hewetson to see value in producing these small works, when he was rarely without commissions for portrait busts, there must have been a correlation between his sales and the demographic of buyers who visited his studio. It was more than a marketing strategy aimed at surviving the lean years of the 1790s. Hewetson was recorded as making statues after the antique of two feet in height as early as 1772.395 Judging from his output, Hewetson did not need to finance extra help in the studio. There is evidence of only two workers assisting him during his career. In 1787, the Diario Ordinario reported the assistance of scarpellino Antonio Blessi with the monument to Cardinal Rezzonico.396 The ability of Christopher Prosperi to complete Hewetson's unfinished busts also suggests his prior employment at the studio.

At the time of Hewetson's death sixteen marble portrait busts remained in the studio which were paid for, but not yet completed. There is some corruption of the names, the majority of which appear to be British. Among them were busts of Lord and Lady Plymouth, John Thogmostron, Lady Carnegie, Lord Harrington, John Macpherson, Lord Brommel and Lord Clifford. Assuming a rate of completion of no longer than two years from the date of commission, the unfinished works in the studio are revealing. Each of the above patrons visited Hewetson's studio, or socialised with him as they sat for their busts. The bias towards British visitors reflects Hewetson's ability to effectively portray himself as an elite gentleman with whom his sitters were comfortable conversing. This was a difficult task even in London, as scholar Rosie Dias has indicated,

If an artist was to portray the rich and famous, he had to be fluent in the defining social idioms and etiquette of the wealthy and aristocratic and have a studio within which men and women of rank would feel at home and where their social credibility might even be enhanced.397

Dias' monograph largely concerns painted portraiture, but her insight is even more applicable to the sculptor's studio.

394 British Library, Cumberland Papers, Add MSS 36496, f.39.
395 Letter from Charles Gore to Sir William Barker, found in Joe McDonnell, 'Piggybacking Hewetson's Baldwin Monument', 70-71, footnote 31. Cited as Trinity College P/1/11/75. The entry references a 'Flora, Juno, Venus £20 (all about 2 feet high).'
396 The entry, noted by McDonnell, "Piggybacking Hewetson's Baldwin Monument", 72, is found in Chracas, Diario Romano (1787), 103, n. 1272. McDonnell's quotation of the entry, in footnote 44, is incomplete, but the mention of Sig. Antonio Blesi as scarpellino is accurate.
The physicality of rendering a sitter in three dimensions was suggestive of a haptic interaction between sitter and sculptor. The successful sculptor projected an image beyond reproach and by his behaviour negated any possibility of a prurient gaze. Christopher Hewetson's number of commissions for female portrait busts in a genre of sculpture which statistically weighed male-heavy is evidence of his efforts to project a sophisticated image. His attention to detail included maintaining a fashionable wardrobe, culminating in his large debt to an 'English tailor' at the time of his death.398 Hewetson not only looked the part, but was well-liked at Rome. He was described as 'cheerful good generous-hearted', by George Cumberland, one of his correspondents who had sat to him for a bust.399 One of Rome's main dealer-guides, Thomas Jenkins, thought highly enough of Hewetson to leave him £100 in his will.400 This was unusual, as Hugh Honour commented in his article on Thomas Jenkins, 'Unlike the others, Hewetson was a close friend of Jenkins. The sculptor was probably the only artist who got much more than he gave in the course of their long relationship.' This system of favouritism among the dealers who controlled the viewing activity of their charges encouraged widespread gossip as to intended patronage. The distance between London and Rome was no barrier, as Hewetson noted in a letter to George Cumberland in May of 1791,

More than once it has happen'd, that a letter from hence [Rome] has been shewn to a friend, who has mentioned its contents to a third person, and so it has travelled, till, it returned again to Rome, not a little altered by the journey, and here it has served to revive the torch of Discord, never entirely extinguished nella Piazza di spagna.401 Hewetson's use of the Piazza di Spagna as a shorthand for his contacts at Rome shows it held a firm association with the British who socialised at the coffeehouse and the artists whose homes and studios littered the nearby streets. He was evidently more careful in his letters than he was in person however, as only three months after writing the above tale of caution, another artist wrote of him that,

Our friend Hewetson was a few days ago called coram vobis for unguarded expressions in the coffee house which had been exaggerated to the Secretary of State. However, he came of [sic] with flying colours, which notwithstanding will put him on his guard. Was I in his place I never would put my foot in the English Coffee House...402

398 Coen, "Nuovi Documenti", Doc. 3.
399 George Cumberland, quoted in Brinsley Ford Archive, RBF/1/606, Hesilrige-Heywood.
400 Brinsley Ford, "Thomas Jenkins", 421.
401 Christopher Hewetson to George Cumberland, May 14th 1791, British Library, Add MSS 36496, f. 333.
The coffeehouse mentioned is presumably the English Coffeehouse at the *Piazza di Spagna*. The above quote reveals the tensions surrounding the public performance of national identity at a time of military conflict. Despite clear evidence of his sociability and good reputation among the artists at Rome, even Hewetson fell afoul of the gossip network occasionally. His fellow artist John Deare wrote in 1794,

> Hewetson and I don't speak to each other, owing to Lord Berwick giving me a commission to copy the Apollo Belvedere and the Venus de Medicis the size of the originals for him, notwithstanding that villain Jenkins used all his interest for him—thatis, he first took his Lordship to Alberino and Sposino but not being able to manage the business there and get his discount he then and lastly took his Lordship to his very good friend Hewetson—when his Lordship asked the old thief about me (saying that he wished to have some statues done) he answered—"Mr Deare, My Lord, umph, I believe my Ld he's clever at a Bass relief, but for a statue my Ld-I-I-I-can't say." Yet this old wretch like Boydell says he's a friend to the English artists.

The recipient of this letter from John Deare was none other than the George Cumberland to whom Hewetson had described the constantly burning 'torch of Discord' at the *Piazza di Spagna* a few years previously. John Deare's letter reveals the extent to which the viewing and purchasing behaviour of visitors to Rome was controlled by their dealer-guides.

From 1768 to 1783 Hewetson held the reputation of the best sculptor in Rome, with commissions for busts in 1778 and the monument to Baldwin from 1780 to 1784. He achieved this through his ability to socialise, his awareness of the importance of exhibiting his works before shipping them, and his strong relationship with Thomas Jenkins. His studio offered portrait busts with a wealth of surface detail which rewarded an in-depth viewing in the round, as well as copies after the antique in various sizes and materials. Thus his studio appealed to all three of Thomas Jones' levels of visitors to Rome. Yet by 1793 Venetian sculptor Antonio Canova was being described by Scottish tourist Sir Henry Forbes as 'the first statuary present in the world'. This reversal of fortunes was foreshadowed by Henry Quin's frustration in 1786 at the disparity between viewing the studios of Hewetson and

---

403 According to Brian de Breffney, "Christopher Hewetson", 53, many English residents at Rome left in the late 1790s owing to the French occupation of the city. It is suggested that Hewetson spent time in Naples shortly before his death in 1798, working on busts for Lord and Lady Hamilton, but these busts remain untraced.


405 Waters letters to George Augustine Walker, Lille 18 H 67, quoted in Brinsley Ford Archive, RBF/1/606, Hesilrige-Heywood. Letter dated November 11th 1778, 'Hewetson has had many busts to model this year; most of which have done him honour.' Ibid., letter dated November 29th 1780, 'Your friend Hewetson is immortalizing his fame by a monument for Ireland which indeed does him great honour and is the admiration of Rome.'

Canova. By the early nineteenth century, visitors like Henry Quin acted as disseminators of aesthetic judgment outside of the traditional artist-dealer-patron networks. Canova's reputation had certainly not been popularised by the other artists, many of whom were jealous of his talent. The one exception, according to Italian artist Francesco Piranesi, was Hewetson, despite losing out to Canova on several commissions. Answering the question of how Canova's reputation was so quickly and firmly established is one of the benefits of studying the sculptor's studio in the early nineteenth century.

The activity of nineteenth-century visitors to Rome was predicated on new viewing trends slowly pervading society. The late eighteenth-century interest in the torch-lit visit of sculpture collections was linked to the literary indoctrination of new methods in viewing sculpture. It became a fashionable activity, which propagated the 'focused gaze' described by Claudia Mattos. By the mid-nineteenth century, sculptors were appropriating the methodology of the torchlight visit, directing the viewer's gaze to admire their own works. Sculptors who relied solely on their dealer-guide contacts were no longer assured of commissions. The studio visit was an important aspect of sociability, patronage and the performance of grand tourist values in late eighteenth-century Rome. But it also provided the opportunity for non-grand tourist visitors to Rome to articulate themselves in spaces once reserved for patrons, dealers and artists.

**Viewing Rome in the Early Nineteenth Century**

By the 1800s the early eighteenth-century viewing behaviour of grand tourists at Rome had been undermined by the changed demographics of visitors to Rome and years of military conflict between Italy and France. The independent viewing activity of visitors in the 1800s eroded the traditional networks of artists' Rome. The social geography of Rome established around the prioritisation of a small number of wealthy grand tourists was no longer viable.

---


408 Mattos, "The Torchlight Visit", 133.

409 Brinsley Ford Archive, RBF/2/11 Canova, cited as Tom Moore, November 2, 1819, *Memoirs, Journal and Correspondence of Thomas Moore*, ed, the Rt Hon Lord John Russell, MP, 1853, Vol. III, 68, 'I saw the statue by candlelight, Canova himself holding the light and pausing with a sort of fond lingering on all the exquisite beauties of this most perfect figure'. The statue was the *Pauline Borghese as Venus Venetrix*, discussed in Chapter Four.
This manifested itself outside the studio in the form of the increased attention to individual works expressed in the popularity of the torch-lit visit to Roman collections. Inside the sculptor's studio, the genre of the portrait bust enjoyed unexpected popularity. Contemporary sculpture began to claim status equivalent to that of ancient sculpture. Sculptors created works which sustained in-depth viewing in the round, prioritising the studio over the final display context, to the extent that private display contexts began to emulate the studio.\(^{411}\) The studio of sculptor Antonio Canova gained a cultural status on par with the Pio-Clementine Museum.\(^{412}\) New visitors to Rome were eager to attain the cultural experiences long touted by grand tourists as an exclusive barrier to the higher echelons of London society. The studio became an established locus of viewing activity for all of the British at Rome, amalgamated into Roman sociability.

This change reflects the aesthetic authority of a new demographic of British visitors to Rome from 1817 onwards, evident in the writings of female authors Charlotte Eaton and Lady Murray.\(^{413}\) The extent to which the idea of female travel writers marked a drastic change from previous behaviour is evident in a letter from James Russel to his sister, written in 1740, in which he assured her that,

> I shall wave giving you a description of the surprizing [sic] remains of the old Roman grandeur and magnificence; being sensible, that the ruins, which time and age have made in what was once very beautiful, can be no ways agreeable to one of your sex. I shall therefore only touch upon some things, which are at present in their full perfection and glory: but you must not expect any exact order or connection; and the extent of my paper will not allow me to expatiate in long particularities.\(^{414}\)

\(^{410}\) Malcolm Baker discusses this trend in relation to English sculpture, *The Marble Index*, (Yale University Press, 2014): 4, 'Running throughout is the question of how these seemingly limited genres, especially the bust with its traditional associations with the past, became such a central mode of representation within a culture in which many of the components of modernity were being fashioned.' Baker's focus on celebrity sculptors and sitters results in his difficulty attributing sculptural change to wider cultural trends, such as the increased influence of the non-patron, whose activities are difficult to track owing to their lack of purchasing activity.

\(^{411}\) New plinths facilitated private viewing in the round. Nicholas Penny noted, *The Hope Venus turned on its pedestal when it was displayed in Duchess Street...large brass handles remain attached to the plinth of the Three Graces; the hole for the original handle of the Blundell Psyche is also easily found...*, Nicholas Penny, 'Canova's 'Three Graces' Edinburgh', *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 137, (No. 1113, Dec. 1995): 861.

\(^{412}\) After the appropriation of the *Apollo Belvedere* by the French, Pope Pius VII replaced it at the Vatican with *Perseus* by Antonio Canova.


James Russel assumes that by dint of her sex, his sister could find no beauty in ruined buildings. Presumably the idea that the ruins represented a connection with the historic past would be a concept too intellectual for her to grasp. By the 1780s, the predominantly male environment enjoyed by James Russel at Rome would give way to an influx of well-read female visitors which continued into the early nineteenth century, represented in this chapter by Mary Berry, Charlotte Eaton and Lady Murray. The resulting change in sensibility was not necessarily effected by mixed-gender sociability, but is most easily traced in the writings of female visitors, who perhaps through feeling constrained within public spaces, recorded their viewing experience in detail in privately published journals. In the early nineteenth century, those travellers who fit the traditional grand tourist persona faced new challenges. Rome was no longer the undisputed visual apex of grand tourism, nor did it offer the original tenets of grand tour travel: expense, experiencing new cultures, travelling dangerous areas, viewing and collecting art. The symbolic figure of the 'Grand Tourist' split: those who followed the original itinerary translated wider grand tourist ideals into commissions, a focus on elaborate portraiture, and a desire to possess the materiality of Rome. Others visited Rome but considered the locus of true grand tourism to lie elsewhere, in Sicily, Greece or the Levant. These countries, although previously explored by their countrymen, nevertheless offered a higher degree of the dangerous, self-improving, and above all, expensive, lustre previously achieved by travel to Rome. Richard Westmacott, the son of the famous sculptor, wrote in 1817 concerning the public tension over whether Rome still held the best sights,

Now that I am approaching my exit from Italy I cannot but congratulate myself on having seen the best shew that Europe perhaps the world has to boast of, I am aware however there are those who will dispute the character I give of Italy. Last winter while we were engaged in Rome in admiring the Antiquities and remains of that antient [sic] Metropolis, a party arrived from Greece. They told us that we were in great error; that all the beauties we saw were nothing to those which Athens alone could furnish...While we were listening to their discourse, another set of Travellers arrive from Egypt. Alas say they how you are all deceived; what is there in Greece or Italy that for Antiquity or Magnificence can be compared to the Pyramids, or the Ruins of Thebes or Heliopolis.... It is plain that in the estimate travellers form of the Comparative beauty of the scenes they have visited a little Egoism often finds means to intrude itself, and that as Man sets the highest value not simply on what is best, but what cost him most pains...  

415 This was indicative of a wider societal trend to collect material souvenirs of events to form an emotive connection to the past through tangible fragments. For the roaring trade in souvenirs from the battlefield of Waterloo, in some cases taking the form of human body parts, akin to practices of relic-making, see Susan Pearce, "The material of war: Waterloo and its culture", in Conflicting Visions: War and Visual Culture in Britain and France c.1700-1830, ed. John Bonehill and Geoff Quilley, (Routledge, 2005): 207-226.

The final words, 'what cost him most pains', reveal the struggle of the British elite to maintain the superiority of taste underpinning their class structure. If the experience which cost the traveller the most pains, financial and physical, was not equated with the best experience, then the cultural stranglehold of the wealthy was negated. Richard Westmacott, as the son of a sculptor, would have been well aware of the changes in taste towards Greek marbles.\(^\text{417}\) He is careful to mark this new trend down to egotism, preserving the value of his viewing experience at Rome.

The performance of aesthetic judgement and sociability for visitors who did not fit the grand tourist criteria was most easily located in the studio. Newly completed work facilitated art criticism from all viewers, perhaps most freely from visitors with no expectations of performing patronage. Visitors from London and Paris had been increasingly exposed to viewing activities once reserved for patrons. Thomas Crowe noted the effect of the Salon exhibitions in Paris, which,

...marked a removal of art from the ritual hierarchies of earlier communal life. There the ordinary man or woman was encouraged to rehearse before works of art the kinds of pleasure and discrimination that had once been the exclusive prerogative of the patron and his intimates.\(^\text{418}\)

In London, the Royal Academy exhibited art to any member of the public with a shilling to spare.\(^\text{419}\) The popularity of these exhibitions prompted the Shakespeare Gallery initiative in 1786, a social phenomenon ably examined by Rosie Dias in *Exhibiting Englishness: John Boydell's Shakespeare Gallery and the Formation of a National Aesthetic*.\(^\text{420}\)

English artists had an interested viewing public, but their ability to exhibit was restricted by the value judgements of the Royal Academicians. This resulted in a backlash against the Royal Academy which reached unprecedented numbers of readers owing to the new channel of art criticism, the newspaper.\(^\text{421}\) The rise and fall of the Shakespeare Gallery was symptomatic of wider cultural change in Britain. Visitors to exhibitions were now guided by

\[^{419}\text{Solkin and Sutherland, "Staging the spectacle", 37.}\]
\[^{420}\text{Rosie Dias, Exhibiting Englishness: John Boydell's Shakespeare Gallery and the Formation of a National Aesthetic, (Yale University Press, 2013).}\]
\[^{421}\text{Dias, Exhibiting Englishness, 93-96. Joshua Reynolds' attempt to exhibit his 1789 'Death of Cardinal Beaufort' at the opening of the Shakespeare Gallery was met with harsh criticism from newspaper art critics, such as the writers at The Chronicle, who considered his visual borrowings from Nicolas Poussin as evidence of a lack of originality and talent, instead of appreciating the academic intention behind the visual referencing.}\]
often anonymous art critics who published accounts in newspapers and pamphlets. English artists attempted to form an English aesthetic celebrating English literature and history, sources more easily accessible to middle class viewers than classical texts. The popularity of portrait busts had rendered some classical busts familiar: by 1817 most private and public spaces associated with the upper classes boasted a collection.422 Charlotte Eaton considered it normal to accurately identify classical busts of the ancient Roman Emperors,

They [the Emperors] took care to multiply their persons, and what with statues, busts, medals, and coins, one sees them so continually, that there is no mistaking their physiognomy. I feel as intimately acquainted with the twelve Caesars as if I had known them all my life.423

For the British at Rome, these cultural changes manifested in several different ways. Grand tourists continued in their traditional methods of sociability, with an increased attention to the sculptor's studio. The popularity of the torch-lit visit continued. Sculptors who excelled in works in the round, like Antonio Canova, gained popularity. The key difference at early nineteenth-century Rome lay in the amalgamation of the viewing activities of the grand tourist and the median tourist of genteel status: both held a vested interest in the studio. This amalgamation had begun as early as 1784, as Mary Berry's day in her journal indicated,

...to several artists: Mr Tresham, who has published a series of drawings, the history of Sappho; to a statuary in the Corso, who is repairing a statue of Venus lately found, for the Pope; to Me Hewitson, a statuary--several good busts, portraits, but Rome is not a place in which to admire modern busts. Afterwards to Lady E. Foster, to hear Bianchi play over some of the airs of his last opera.424

For Mary Berry, her interest in cultural activities at Rome saw her visiting the studios of several sculptors, before taking in a music recital. Her inability to remember the name of one of the sculptors, and lack of interest in 'modern busts' reveal that these activities were performed without much engagement with the sculpture viewed. However, the necessity of her visit exposes the slow insertion of the studio visit into late eighteenth-century cultural norms. The traveller in the age of print culture and armchair savants was hard pressed to avoid travel guides, letters from friends, published journals and prints prior to travelling.425

424 Brinsley Ford Archive, RBF/1/606, excerpt from Mary Berry Journals, Vol. I., 103-4, dated April 1st, 1784.
425 Jonathan Andrews, "Letting Madness Range: travel and mental disorder", in Pathologies of Travel, ed. Richard Wrigley and George Revill, (Rodopi, 2000): 60, 'As travel became increasingly a la mode after 1700, it was accompanied by a growing glut of travel literature. While much of this was in the
The saturation of the literature market was such that in 1793, a traveller could sell his travel journal before his departure from England.\textsuperscript{426} The studio offered a new and constantly evolving viewing experience.

In relation to well-known sculpture, travel literature began to prioritise the viewing experience over the written account. Describing emotional reactions on viewing original sculpture became more prevalent as a literary trope, partly owing to an increase in sensibility. Sensibility was understood as the ability to be affected by art. Nineteenth-century viewers of sculpture desired to form an emotional connection to the historical past, to be affected by experiencing the materiality of the viewed object. The concern with materiality reflected a surge in post-Enlightenment introspective thinking. The focus of travelling had shifted away from the idea of the grand tourist coming of age ritual, to a celebration of the self, as Chloe Chard noted. The general shift towards travel as 'consolidating the personal and cultural identity of the traveller' is particularly evident in the writing of female visitors to Rome, who regardless of wealth, status or intelligence, had long been denied recognition according to the grand tourist parameters.\textsuperscript{427}

One such visitor was Charlotte Eaton, author of \textit{Rome in the Nineteenth Century}, a privately printed account of the author’s viewing experience at Rome based on letters written during a residence in Rome in 1817 and 1818.\textsuperscript{428} Her writing reveals a socially imposed binary between the expression of artistic taste and the inability to publicly claim a cultural pedigree reserved for wealthy males. She reveals an intelligent and prepared approach to viewing art at the Corsini Palace, commenting that,

\begin{quote}
You may generally form a tolerably correct conjecture of what a gallery will contain, as to subject, before you enter it.\textsuperscript{429}
\end{quote}

nature of descriptive tour guides and adventuring, many of these travel guides also gave specific advice to invalids on how to procure and safeguard their health.' \textsuperscript{426} Malcolm Nicolson, "The Continental Journeys of Andrew Duncan Junior: a physician's education and the international culture of eighteenth-century medicine", \textit{Pathologies of Travel}, ed. Wrigley and Revill, 94, 'Charles Este, for example, recorded that he had sold the rights of his \textit{A Journey in the year 1793} before he had left England or opened a notebook.' \textsuperscript{427} Chard, "Lassitude and Revival in the Warm South", 191.

\textsuperscript{428} According to the \textit{Oxford Dictionary of Biography}, Charlotte Anne Eaton [née Waldie], (1788–1859), writer, was born on 28 September 1788, the second of the three daughters of George Waldie of Hendersyde Park, Roxburghshire, and his wife, Ann, \textit{née} Ormston, eldest daughter of Jonathan Ormston of Newcastle upon Tyne. On 22 August 1822 she married Stephen Eaton, a banker, of Ketton Hall, Stamford, Rutland. Her age at the time of her marriage was unusual for the societal mores of the time, and it is possible that during her stay at Rome in 1817 and 1818, she was already considered a spinster or acting as chaperone, a social position which granted limited freedom. It is notable that she appears to have been married at the time of the publication of her journal. \textsuperscript{429} Eaton, \textit{Rome in the Nineteenth Century}, Vol. III, 74.
Eaton then insinuates that unlike many visitors, she is capable of retaining her attentions for the truly valuable works of art, writing,

How much more pleasure there would be in seeing them, if the good were placed apart for your inspection, and you were not sickened and disgusted with the quantity of rubbish you must sift, to find those really worth looking at.\(^{430}\)

Her words contravene the traditional all-inclusive methodology of viewing a collection, adhering instead to the Winckelmann-inspired aesthetic which promoted an in-depth viewing of specific artworks. Her emotive language reflects her frustration when her preferred viewing method is curtailed by the display and layout of the Corsini collection. Her subsequent comments suggest that her viewing experience was also affected by the demands of performing mixed-gender sociability in the space. For a female visitor to Rome, this required conversing with a so-called connoisseur and suppressing her own sense of taste,

I have been persecuted all this morning with a connoisseur, full of the cant of connoisseurship without one particle of real feeling for the beauties of the art- a man who walks about the world, seeing, and thinking, and feeling, with other people's eyes, and understanding, and taste- who does not say what he thinks, but thinks what he shall say- who is, in short, a determined dilettanti by rule.\(^{431}\)

For Charlotte Eaton, the traditional models of sociability favouring the grand tourist detract from her viewing experience. Her intense criticism of her viewing companion stems from his inability to emotionally connect with the art and her belief that he parrots opinions without forming his own. Her jealousy over the male entitlement to verbally perform aesthetic judgement is evident in her careful use of language in her only source of expression: her journal. As a female writer of travel literature, not scholarship, Charlotte Eaton was required to maintain respectability in the form of an apologetic tone, or occasional caveat to the reader.\(^{432}\) Her criticism of the male viewer is quickly followed by a pseudo-apologetic acknowledgement that she cannot claim the gendered status of connoisseur,

But perhaps, what he is to me I am to you, for, though no connoisseur, I may be sufficiently wearisome...\(^{433}\)

---


\(^{432}\) The societal tension over the contradictory advice for women to engage with classical literature, and subsequent anxiety over their attempts to articulate their knowledge, is explored by Pam Perkins in “”Too Classical for a Female Pen”? Late Eighteenth-Century Women Reading and Writing Classical History”, *Clio*, (33:3, Spring 2004). A similar contradiction occurred where women were encouraged to draw, and to engage with art, but were restricted from activities which trespassed on the traditionally male sphere of art appreciation.

Eaton's writing establishes and subtly contravenes the understood binary between male and female art appreciation. She is of the opinion that all of Rome's collections contain both good and bad works, with the possible exception of the Villa Albani, which received high praise on both content and display. There her reader is referred to Winckelmann with the claim, ...he [Winckelmann] has left so complete and critical an account of its sculptures, that it would be the height of presumption in me to particularize them; indeed, I almost feel afraid to speak of them at all, lest I should be led to dwell too long upon what is so interesting in inspection, and so dull in description.

The experience of viewing is presented as valuable, no matter how well scholars have described the work. This is a result of Charlotte Eaton's desire to be affected by the sculpture, to form an aesthetic judgement based on an emotional response. Even the language of Winckelmann, who often fell into raptures, was 'dull' in comparison to the viewing experience. At the Pio-Clementine Museum, the expected deferment to a male authority is contradicted in favour of the expression of sensibility in the face of the Apollo Belvedere [Fig. 3.7],

That it is the finest statue in the world, I feel better than all the canons of criticism can prove it. Vain, indeed, is here the cold language of critics and connoisseurs. The heart and mind feel its power, and are penetrated with its transcendent beauty.

Such is the beauty of the Apollo that Eaton is ready to ascribe 'more than mortal powers' to the sculptor. She claims that, 'Description would be the excess of absurdity: even the best copies are vain.' The ascription of the highest viewing pleasure to the original has a number of implications. It adds value to the experience of viewing well-known objects of art, to the ability to emote, and to the 'focused gaze'. It detracts from ideas of connoisseurship and criticism as expressed in traditionally male rhetoric, revealing a change in sensibility not necessarily restricted to women, but coinciding with an increase in mixed gender sociability, which prompted women to record their thoughts in written form.

Eaton's emotional, even feminine, reaction to being 'penetrated' by the beauty of the Apollo is quickly given context in the form of an anecdote. Stories of the male reaction to sculpted female bodies date back to Pliny, but the feminine response to male bodies was rarely

---

435 Ibid.
438 Ibid. Despite her words, Eaton goes on to describe her viewing experience.
439 Mattos, "The Torchlight Visit", 133.
The anecdote provided a paradigm for excessive emotional interaction with a statue, substantiating Eaton's safe position between cold scholarship and fevered exultation. She wrote,

You will think me mad- and it were vain to deny it- but I am not the first person who has gone mad about the Apollo. Another, and a far more unfortunate damsel, a native of France, it is related, at the sight of this matchless statue, lost at once her heart and her reason. Day after day, and hour after hour, the fair enthusiast gazed and wept, and sighed her soul away, till she became, like the marble, pale, but not like the marble, cold. Nor, like the lost Eloisa, 'nor the idol of her love, could she forget herself to stone', till death at last closed the ill-fated passion, and the life, of the maid of France.441

The emphasis on the nationality and purity of the 'unfortunate damsel' reveals a deliberate contrast to Eaton's educated British gaze. The anecdote showcases how early nineteenth-century society was uncomfortable with women encroaching on a viewing experience that was once considered predominantly male. The French maid does not articulate her passions, but weeps and sighs without any verbal expression of taste. Performing sociability at a sculpture collection remained a gendered activity. Female visitors were particularly vulnerable to the whims of collection owners, guides or companions.

Emily Napier noted her variety of viewing experiences in a letter home in 1814,

....at Ghent we remained a whole day, which I spent entirely to my satisfaction in looking at Character & Pictures; of which last I saw a small but most beautiful collection belonging to a Mnr le Sassegant, who was so obliging as to show it to me himself & did it in the civilest quietest way possible, allowing me to look at what I liked without stunning me with their perfection like a Monr Bartier at Brussels who very near made me forswear private collections for the rest of my life, altho' I saw at his house the most beautiful Guido I ever beheld.442

Emily Napier here values the experience of forming her own opinions, viewing a collection independently of her guide. Some collection owners were offended by deviation from the accepted pattern of viewing, as Charlotte Eaton noted,

I thought Cardinal Fesch was rather severe upon the English. "You don't follow the example of your countrymen," he said to us. "They ask the name of the painter and

440 See Pliny the Elder (Naturalis Historia 36, 21) and Lucian (Amores 13-14) for the ancient reception of the Aphrodite of Knidos.
442 National Library of Ireland, MS 40,242 (27), Letter from Emily Napier to Anne, Calais, August 14th, 1814.
the subject, and they note them down; they make complete catalogues of all my
paintings, and then they go away."\textsuperscript{443}

Eaton's reaction to the Cardinal suggesting that the English could not connect with art past basic attendance and cataloguing reveals the extent to which art appreciation had changed from the eighteenth-century paradigm. In terms of nationalistic stereotypes, the British were disadvantaged in a viewing method requiring the passionate evocation of the senses. Lady Murray detailed the stereotypes which were thought to exist,

The intelligence and love of the arts amongst the Italians enhance the delight the many productions in various styles afford the traveller. They are so proud of their painters, so anxious to point out the best lights for viewing their works, and appear so gratified by the admiration they excite, that it is difficult to believe it is probably for the thousandth time the exhibition is repeated. In England the sight-shewers get a lesson by heart, which they must begin again if interrupted by a question in the middle of it; in France, they overpower with a set of hackneyed phrases about the works of art of which they do not know the meaning; but in Italy the descriptions of the custodes vary according to their auditors and the feeling of the moment, and they appear perfectly masters of their subject.\textsuperscript{444}

The English and the French perform without true understanding of the value of art, which the Italians grasp through expressing their emotional response and 'the feeling of the moment'. For the female traveller, one advantage of visiting Italy was the opportunity to engage with guides who were open to their opinions. If the guide were also the artist, then the female traveller could impact on the creation of art itself.

The studio visit warranted both an emotional connection and technical discussion, becoming a lynchpin of gendered travel writing. The writing of Lady Murray reveals a fascination with visiting sculptors' studios. She was also an enthusiastic veteran of the torchlight visit to the Vatican, writing,

I do not know a greater enjoyment to a lover of the arts than viewing the Vatican by torch-light; for the extent and beauty of the locality is even more striking when thus partially illuminated than it is when seen in broad daylight, at which time so many objects divide the attention; for the expression of the heads and folds of the draperies gain considerably by being more strongly marked. The custodes precede with torches, and it is desirable to be accompanied by an artist to point out what is most remarkable. The Cavaliere Agricola was our guide, and I often look back with delight to the three evenings spent within these classic walls.\textsuperscript{445}

The advantage of viewing by torchlight is clearly stated: the ability to focus the gaze on specific works. Her account references at least four visits to the Vatican collections, once by

\textsuperscript{443} Eaton, \textit{Rome in the Nineteenth Century}, 61.
\textsuperscript{444} Murray, \textit{A Journal of a Tour in Italy}, Vol. I, 143.
\textsuperscript{445} Murray, \textit{A Journal of a Tour in Italy}, Vol. II, 155.
daylight, and three times by torchlight. By her own reckoning, this added up to at least six hours of viewing and 36 scudi, not including the cost of a guide,

Parties, of twelve persons only, are allowed to go round the Vatican by torch-light, and the fees and torches make the expense amount to twelve scudi. The time occupied is generally two hours.446

Lady Murray appears to have taken a particular interest in visiting studios during her lengthy stays from 1816 to 1834. Perhaps because of her familiarity with the artists, her opinions are less carefully couched in an apologetic tone than those of Charlotte Eaton. This could also be a benefit of her assumption of the title 'Lady'.447 Lady Murray does not however seem to have been a patroness.448 Her performance of sociability in the studio space did face some constraints. For example, her account of viewing the studio of Roman sculptor Guaccherini [sic] reveals both an inability to speak freely and a determination not to dissemble according to the demands of politeness,

Guaccherini ... shewed us a bust he had done of Monsignor Capaccini, in which the likeness was very successful; and a cast of Prometheus and the vulture. Guaccherini silenced my expressions of regret that so much talent should have been bestowed on so painful a subject, by saying the Laocoon was equally unpleasing. I could not attempt to compare the unrivalled masterpiece of antiquity with any thing so decidedly inferior, so I returned to the bust and expatiated on its merits, which I could do conscientiously.449

The sculptor's attempt to compare his work to the canon of the antique, in this case, the Laocoon, is immediately rebuked by Lady Murray. The use of the word 'cast' here suggests that the sculptor is exhibiting a cast of a work already completed and dispatched. Lady Murray's unwillingness to discuss the 'decidedly inferior' work reveals her limitations on expressing herself as a viewer in the space. Her intimation is that the sculptor has

446 Murray, A Journal of a Tour in Italy, Vol. II, 156.
447 The British Library, where the Lady Murray Journal is held, holds no biographical information on the author. They tentatively identify her as Elizabeth Meade, Countess of Clanwilliam. Other items by a Lady Murray, e.g. a Tour of Holland, 1822, are not given this further identification. This identification is suspect: the Oxford Dictionary of Biography holds only one person who matches this title, wife to Richard Charles Francis Christian Meade, third earl of Clanwilliam (1795–1879), Lady Elizabeth (1809–1858). This is unlikely, as the author would have been 7 years old for her first recorded visits to Rome. A possible alternative is Amelia Matilda Murray (1795-1884), daughter of Lord George Murray, but she appears to have been closely associated with the court, and the dates do not fully match. It is surprising that more scholars do not make use of the Lady Murray journal, for example, David Bindman's recent monograph, Warm Flesh, Cold Marble: Canova, Thorvaldsen and their Critics, (Yale University Press, 2014) contains no reference to the journal.
448 One exception is Lady Murray's request that Canova sit for a portrait of himself by Agricola, a commission which was not carried out before Canova's death in 1822. The potential expense of this portrait is unclear, as Agricola and Canova were good friends, and there was presumably a relationship between Lady Murray and Agricola, who acted as their guide around the Vatican. Murray, A Journal of a Tour in Italy, Vol. II, 294-302.
overreached his talents, and should concentrate on portrait busts. The portrait bust does not achieve any status beyond being a good likeness, the most basic function of portrait sculpture.

This reticence on the part of Lady Murray to articulate her negative opinions may stem more from the boundaries of politeness than restraints of gender. Some of her studio visits appear to contradict the expected cultural norms for a female viewer. Of particular interest are her repeated visits to the studio of Finelli, despite the potential impropriety of her actions,

During my stay at Rome in 1834, Finelli was employed in modelling a colossal group of Saint Michael overcoming Satan, who is bent to the earth and covers his face with his hand. The head and flowing hair of the Archangel might serve for the god of day, and the legs appear to have been imitated from those of the Apollo Belvedere; his figure is strong and muscular, and his shoulders are Herculean. I often went to Finelli's to watch the progress of the model. The man who sat for the figure of Satan was frequently obliged to rest, as the forced position he was placed in threw the blood to his head. The group is ordered by an Englishman of the name of Holt, who has property near Milan, and is forming a gallery of modern sculpture. When finished, Finelli is to choose the most favourable light in it for the display of his work.450

Several aspects of this account suggest that Lady Murray is effectively pushing the boundaries of the studio as a mixed-gender space by attending a life drawing class, an activity closed to women until the early twentieth century. She is careful in her wording to exclude any overt impropriety. Her comments on musculature take the form of comparison to antique bodies. The intimation is that the exposed limbs of the Archangel were completed before she began to observe the progress of the model. The group was of a religious subject, and intended for an English patron, aspects offering a kind of respectability to her interest in it. The promise of the most favourable light to Finelli was flattering to the sculptor. Yet the sculptor showed no inclination to design the sculptural group in relation to its final display aspect. The viewing of the work in the studio was given precedence. Lady Murray's ability to record repeated visits to the studio of an Italian sculptor, in which live modelling took place, reveals the extent to which the studio visit had been normalised by 1834. This is not to say that no potential impropriety existed around the viewing of sculpture. Lady Murray records viewing a sculptural group which was kept in a shed owing to the 'nudity and position' of the

figures. In her account, her careful use of the term 'we' over her habitual use of 'I' reflects her awareness of the necessity to maintain her feminine respectability.

According to Lady Murray, having visitors in the studio had become a normal part of practice for sculptors at Rome. Some sculptors even worked better with company, as was the case with Rinaldo Rinaldi. Lady Murray noted,

Rinaldo Rinaldi, a Venetian, was for some time a pupil of Canova, and works the marble in the same beautiful style. I have spent hours in his studio, where he always gave free access, and though visitors a little interrupted him, he seemed to work with more spirit when in company.

There is no apparent onus here on the sculptor to converse with those viewing him work. As a pupil of Canova, Rinaldi may have acquired the habit of working in a studio open to visitors from his mentor. Terence Hodgkinson records a comment from the Memoirs of Canova written by Antonio D'Este,

While Canova was executing his model for the 'Genio' on the monument to Clement XIII he kept open house in his workshop; many artists came to watch him, among them "due scultori Iusson irlandese..."

Letting visitors watch him work was an exercise originally aimed at establishing his reputation among the other artists. The monument to Clement XIII was completed in 1792. The 'Iusson' referred to by Antonio D'Este was likely Christopher Hewetson. A 1793 portrait of Canova in his studio by Domenico Conti gives an impression of a small studio space [Fig. 3.8]. The sculptor is shown working on the La Touche Amorino with other works visible in the background. He holds a hammer and chisel and the floor is strewn with marble chips and dust. The statue is near completion, if not finished. The sculptor wears fashionable clothes, but with a casual open shirt. The overall effect is of a glimpse behind the curtain to the genius at work. According to writer C. F. Fernow, Canova moved to larger premises before 1806. Canova's new studio was designed to handle large crowds of visitors, who performed rituals of viewing and sociability with or without input from the sculptor.

---

451 Murray, A Journal of a Tour in Italy, Vol. III, 128, 'In the courtyard of the Palazzo Nicolini, there is a colossal group of Meleager and Atlanta, which has been long for sale, as, from the nudity and position of the figures, it is not allowed to be exposed to public view. It is kept in a shed inclosed [sic] by wooden doors falling to decay, and the porter supported one of them while we viewed the group.'


453 Hodgkinson, "Christopher Hewetson", 49. Taken from Antonio D'Este, Memorie (1864): 55.

The main authority on Canova's studio practice is the scholar Hugh Honour. From his work, it is possible to track the progress of Canova's studio from locus of interest, to landmark of Rome. One of the sources he discusses is an account of a visit to Canova's studio by the French painter Francois-Marius Granet. Honour estimates the date at 1809 or 1810. The account, as paraphrased by Hugh Honour, is worth repeating:

After making his way through the crowd of carriages and the throng of waiting servants in the street, he found the first room "rempli de grands personnages et des belles dames de toutes nations." In the centre there was a statue of a female figure on a plinth which an assistant very slowly revolved. A number of admirers were inspecting models for statues in the next room. Granet then went through a series of ateliers where assistants were working with "un zele extraordinaire". Chips of marble were flying about like snow-flakes, he said. But he could see nothing of "l'homme qui donnait la vie de tout ce mouvement". Asking for Canova he was told that he very rarely appeared before the crowd of strangers invading his ateliers and would see only artists.

The motivation of these crowds of visitors was the performance of sociability. Canova's studio had become a locus of fashionable viewing behaviour, offering a variety of viewing experiences. Three stages of the creation process were on view: the finished product in the round, the making of models for sculpture design, and the physical activity of chipping away at the marble. If the finished marble was equated with the classical canon, then visiting the studio was akin to experiencing the classical past. At the very least, Canova's studio provided visitors with the opportunity to re-enact the golden days of the discovery of antiquity, without necessitating travel to Greece or Egypt.

Granet's use of the term 'atelier' to designate rooms within the studio is interesting, and does not appear to stem from his French nationality. Hugh Honour acknowledges that Granet's account was contradicted by other visitors to Rome, including Charlotte Eaton. The majority of accounts of personal interaction with Antonio Canova came after 1813. It is possible that Canova changed his working practices at this time, handing more of the mechanical aspects to his assistants. He employed assistants throughout his career, but

---

457 Brinsley Ford Archive, RBF/2/11 Canova, cited as TU Sadler ed., An Irish Peer on the Continent, 1801-1803, 1920, 179-80, Lady Catherine Wilmot uses the same term, 'One of the sights most beautiful to behold is the atelier of Canova. He is look'd upon by many, to surpass the ancient sculptors- and I am convinced if it was not for the prejudice in favour of the antique some of his productions would outshine any that was ever seen in the world before.'
458 Honour, "Canova's Studio Practice-I: The Early Years", 148.
retained creative control over two key aspects of his work: the design, and the finishing touches, with a focus on 'flesh, draperies and hair'. This led to a fascination with the fleshiness of Canova's marbles, and debate over his techniques to add colour to the marble.

Despite the popularity of his studio in 1810, Antonio Canova evidently returned to working in sight and welcoming visitors personally by 1816. Perhaps owing to the previous difficulty in meeting him, there was a definite cultural cachet in winning his attention, as Lady Murray was quick to emphasise,

I feel proud in recording his friendly attention during our two first residences in this city. It was on the 25th of July, 1816, we visited his studio, where he received us in his working dress, and shewed us all his models and statues, which would fill a museum... The oftener I visited his studio the more I was struck with its superiority to any of the others at Rome, both in extent and contents.

Even though he was in 'his working dress', Antonio Canova obliged his visitors on what appeared to be their first visit to his studio. Lady Murray considered it the best studio in Rome, owing to its size and the viewing experience it offered. Her focus on the idea of the viewing experience reflects the nineteenth-century conflation of sociability and viewing, within and without the studio.

If the studio was a museum, then the sculptor could appropriate the role of a guide. The improved profile of the late eighteenth-century studio saw a move from dealer-guides to independent visitors to studios. These visitors relied on the sculptor or an assistant being willing to show them around the space. In the case of Antonio Canova, it appears he was willing to take the role of guide a step further. Charlotte Eaton wrote,

We saw the statues and paintings of the Villa Ludovisi only once, and in haste; and we were indebted to the kindness of Canova, who conducted us there, for seeing them at all.

460 Honour, "Canova's Studio Practice -II: 1792-1822". This idea of fleshiness is discussed in the following chapter in relation to the conflation between sculpted and real bodies.
462 Here we see a repetition of Lady Murray's careful use of 'we' and 'I', the same technique employed when viewing the inappropriate sculpture hidden from public view in a shed. She avoids potential impropriety by signalling the presence of a companion, presumably her husband, on her first visit to Canova's studio. Thereafter her language reverts to the first person, adding value to her expression of aesthetic judgment.
Eaton's gratitude was likely real, as she experienced difficulty accessing several different collections, including the Palazzo Mattei,

Our attempts have been all fruitless; either we thundered for half an hour at the door, and got no answer, or, if we obtained admittance, the Cardinal Mattei was in bed, or at dinner; or else he had gone out with the key in his pocket, even when a time had been fixed; so that we have given it up in despair.  

Private collections at Rome were only open to visitors according to the whims of their owners. As Lady Murray does not appear to have faced such difficulties, it is possible that Charlotte Eaton's lack of a title impeded her entry. Despite her appointment, there was no social onus on the Cardinal Mattei to provide access to his collection to unknown British tourists. For Charlotte Eaton, performing sociability in the studio and developing a link to Antonio Canova resulted in increased access to other collections of art. Canova's international reputation as an artist awarded him access to the collections of Rome, particularly those housing his work. For Lady Murray, claiming a close relationship with the sculptor brought her greater cultural cachet and lent credence to her aesthetic judgement. She attempted to build on this by requesting Canova sit for a portrait and by requesting a plaster cast of his hand. The use of Italian in her account of discussing the intended portrait with Canova reveals the sense of superiority she felt. She wrote,

The polite conversation recorded here, with Canova gently claiming he would be a rough subject for a portrait, and Lady Murray insisting that it would be precious to her, borders on the inane. The emphasis on the portrait as a personal favour, which would detract from his work on commissions for wealthier patrons, reveals the social benefits to Lady Murray. She also requested a plaster cast of Canova's right hand, and remained in the studio while the

---

465 Murray, A Journal of a Tour in Italy, Vol. II, 294-302. The portrait in question was not completed owing to the sculptor's death in 1822.
process was undertaken. Her desire to obtain both a visual and a physical souvenir of the sculptor, combined with her appreciation of his studio as the best in Rome, can be taken as symptomatic of the desires of the majority of visitors to Rome. Early nineteenth-century viewers of sculpture were emotionally invested in the sculpture they viewed, treating antique statues as tangible pathways to the classical past, and contemporary sculpture as material to be acquired through the commission of a portrait bust, a statue, or a social experience with the sculptor.

Conclusion

The sculptor's studio functioned as a microcosm of Rome, where cultural changes and new facets of sociability, outside of the traditional artist-patron network, were played out on a small scale. In the long eighteenth century, the financial incentives behind controlling the viewing behaviour of wealthy grand tourist visitors to Rome resulted in networks of artists and dealer-guides. These networks began to break down once the social function of a studio visit moved beyond a simple act of potential patronage. From the 1780s on, visitors to Rome from London or Paris of varied social status were accustomed to viewing exhibitions of current work, and on arrival at Rome, treated the studio visit as a similar activity. Cultural influences, including the writings of Winckelmann, and the fashionable activity of viewing the Vatican collections by torchlight, slowly affected how sculpture was viewed.

This combination of cultural trends resulted in the insertion of the studio visit into the social geography of Rome, even affecting the daily life of visitors who were not particularly interested in art. As noted in Chapter Two, the possibility of the artist’s studio acting as a social space was evident in 1779, when Henry Bankes wrote of his visits to Batoni’s studio and home to hear Batoni’s daughters sing, despite his distaste for the portrait artist’s ability. Christopher Hewetson similarly realised the potential of sociability in the studio, but harnessed it by providing a viewing experience more closely related to the sculpture collections of Rome. During this period, sculpture evolved to sustain a more focused gaze, and began to be carved in detail in the round, regardless of the intended post-studio display context. Sculptors who provided a pleasurable viewing experience received more visitors to their studio, and portrait busts became more popular as a genre. Christopher Hewetson's career benefitted from cultivating a relationship with Thomas Jenkins, performing

466 Ibid. The cast is untraced.
sociability, and offering all his visitors the opportunity to purchase his work, regardless of their budget.

In the early nineteenth century, a new methodology of viewing sculpture had been introduced at Rome. Rome was no longer the main locus of male grand tourism, but facilitated the viewing behaviour of visitors of various levels of wealth and social status. Female visitors to Rome, like Charlotte Eaton and Lady Murray, began to articulate their newfound powers of art appreciation through the booming genre of travel literature. Their self-published accounts of their viewing experience at Rome, which date from the 1820s but refer to visits from 1817 onwards, normalised their presence in the studio. Antonio Canova gained an international reputation, assisted by his early habit of working openly, rewarding visitors to his studio, and his ability to create works reminiscent of the classical canon. As noted, his studio was later redesigned to cater to large numbers of visitors, providing them with access to three stages of his working process, but withholding the performance of his genius.
Part II: Chapter Four

*Nineteenth-Century Portrait Nudity: The Reception of Antonio Canova's Venus and Napoleon, 1803-1822*

Pointing to a cast of a colossal statue of Napoleon, now in the possession of the Duke of Wellington, he [Canova] said, that when he proposed to the Emperor to place the Genius of Victory in his hand, which is often done in the statues of the Roman Emperors, Napoleon replied, "Il fait lasisser faire a un homme de genie comme vous, il ne faut pas vous gener."467

*Introduction*

The previous chapter of this thesis considered Venetian sculptor Antonio Canova’s studio as part of a broader investigation of the role of the studio within the social geography of Rome, with a particular focus on re-imagining the studio of Irish sculptor Christopher Hewetson, whose detailed carving and sociable nature heightened the profile of his studio among visitors to Rome. As noted however, on arrival at Rome, Canova quickly outstripped Hewetson in popularity and in commissions, becoming a sculptural equivalent to Pompeo Batoni in terms of the geographical breadth and social importance of his patrons. This chapter builds on the changing shifts in viewing sculpture detailed in Chapter Three, moving from an exploration of how sculpture enhanced the viewing experience, to looking at how the mixed-gender viewing experience, and broader societal and cultural biases of visitors to Rome, affected the way sculpture was viewed. By broadening the scope of previous chapters to focus on portraiture of non-British sitters, the chapter offers new insights into the viewing, reception, and interaction with sculpture at Rome in the early nineteenth century.

Over the course of his career, which lasted until his death in 1822, Canova undertook numerous sculpted commissions for members of the Bonaparte family, the political elite of France.468 This chapter will investigate the reception of Canova’s *Napoleon as Mars the Peacemaker* (described above) [Fig. 4.1], and *Pauline Borghese as Venus Venetrix* [Fig.

---

467 Lady Murray, *A Journal of a Tour in Italy*, London: Privately Printed, c. 1836, British Library 10129bb.18, Vol. II, 294-302. The term 'fait lasisser' is presumably 'il faut laisser', as in, 'one should let a man of genius like you do as he likes...'.

468 In terms of portraiture alone, Canova accepted commissions from Pauline Bonaparte, Madame Mere (mother to Napoleon), the wife of Lucien Bonaparte, and Elisa Baciocchi, but refused commissions from Joseph Bonaparte and Cardinal Fesch. F. Boyer, *Le Monde des arts en Italie et la France de la Revolution et de l'Empire*, (Torino, Biblioteca di studi francesi 4, 1969): 143, takes this to mean that Canova preferred to portray women rather than men. It is true that Canova's male forms came under increasing criticism for being overly feminine as the nineteenth century progressed.
4.2], between 1803 and 1822. These works are notable for combining full-length figural nudity with portrait features of living sitters, a format of portrait sculpture which was innovative to the point of transgression. Pauline Borghese's sculpture was extremely popular, as it adhered to a long tradition of viewing ancient sculpted Venuses at Rome. Napoleon's sculpture, when viewed by the sitter at Paris, was thereafter 'kept out of view' until its capture by the English in 1815. Yet Canova encouraged the viewing of both statues at Rome, keeping a cast of the Napoleon as Mars and engravings of the Pauline as Venus in his studio. The question of how one statue became a symbol of male military defeat, while the second became a symbol of female sexual license, exposes the intricacies of nationalistic conceptions of gender and propriety. The writings of Lady Murray, who described her visits to Canova's studio in detail, provide new insight into the creation and reception of the statues.

The Napoleon as Mars has been previously discussed by scholar Christopher M.S. Johns as a key piece of evidence in his theory of Antonio Canova's subversion, where possible, of commissions, particularly portrait commissions, for the Bonaparte family. His work, which examines Canova's history of accepting or declining commissions over the course of his career, is persuasive, but fails to treat the commissioning and the creation of portrait sculpture as a public act. The completed sculpture was on view to visitors to Rome of all nationalities in the studio for several years before it was shipped to Paris. This chapter posits an alternative interpretation of Napoleon's negative reaction to his portrait sculpture, employing the writings of Charlotte Eaton and Lady Murray in an examination of concepts of gender and the propriety of sculpted nudity between 1803 and 1822. As examples of sculpted nudity of living sitters, the Pauline as Venus and the Napoleon as Mars were at the forefront of debate over how to view sculpture at Rome.

---

469 Napoleon Bonaparte as Mars the Peacemaker, Apsley House, London. Pauline Borghese as Venus Venetrix, Galleria Borghese, Rome. In the interest of brevity, the statues are hereafter referred to as the Napoleon as Mars and the Pauline as Venus.
471 Christopher M.S. Johns, Antonio Canova and the Politics of Patronage in Revolutionary and Napoleonic Europe, (University of California Press, 1998): 6 suggests that all of Canova's portrait sculpture was subversive in some way, writing, 'On a political level the interpretative ambiguity of the statues Canova executed for Europe's rulers often frustrated those who paid for them, while his private patrons, who usually sought only cultural status, were satisfied to select works from a menu the artist devised.'
472 Johns cites the writings of Charlotte Eaton in his monograph Politics of Patronage, but does not appear to be aware of the Journal of Lady Murray.
The Viewing Context at Rome

Setting the statues into the context of criticism of Canova's oeuvre reveals general unease over Canova's portrayal of masculinity. As Chloe Chard has pointed out, the issue of sculpted nudity and propriety has been the subject of much art historical analysis which,

...ignored the ability of concepts of nakedness to assume a wide range of different rhetorical functions, some of which place them in affiliation with concepts of sensual pleasure, and some of which resist any immediate metonymic link with sensuality.473

In this chapter, two modes of viewing sculpture emerge which encapsulate this range of different functions. One was based on generations of viewing sculpture in a predominantly male environment, and articulated excellence through the desire to touch created by the sculpture. The other was based upon expectations of viewing raised by the Winckelmann aesthetic and Romantic sensibility, desiring an emotional connection to sculpture, and often expressed by the female visitor to Rome.474 Although simplistic, establishing this dichotomy is useful in placing the reception of Canova's sculpture into a gendered sociability affected by cultural changes to ideas of masculinity, femininity, and the ideal body.

The introduction of portraiture depicting nude living sitters brought the issue of viewing sculpted bodies to the forefront of societal debate at Rome. The traditionally male sphere of art appreciation at Rome widened to include the educated female gaze from 1778 to 1830. The mode of viewing employed by British female visitors to Rome, in particular Charlotte Eaton and Lady Murray, was part of a cultural change towards Romantic sensibility, desiring an emotional reaction to sculpture which had long been celebrated as part of the grand tourist narrative.475 The desire to be emotionally moved by viewing sculpture was not determined by the gender of the viewed body, or the gender of the viewer. This chapter is not suggesting a reality within which sculpted bodies were never viewed with prurience by female visitors to Rome.476 It is evident however from analysis of the travel accounts of Charlotte Eaton and

474 The term 'Romantic' borrows from literary scholarship on the rise of the novel, and the new interest in art which forged an emotional connection with the viewer, in accordance with the principles of the Romantic movement in Britain. See T. Woodman ed., *Early Romantics- Perspectives in British Poetry from Pope to Wordsworth*, (MacMillan Press Ltd., 1998).
476 Nor is it suggesting that women had not visited Rome before 1778, but that the majority did so in the role of sister, daughter or wife, in other words, accompanied by a man who controlled their viewing experience. The turn of the century saw the emergence of well-read female visitors to Rome who articulated and printed independent accounts of viewing Rome.
Lady Murray that the public nature of their writing necessitated the careful couching of their opinions within a text presenting the standard tropes of the female author, such as the *apologia*, or caveat professing no pretensions to real (male) scholarship.\textsuperscript{477}

In comparison, some male viewing of sculpture could play with the idea that marble bodies and real bodies were interchangeable, a concept propagated by fashionable activities like *tableaux vivants*.\textsuperscript{478} Traditionally, eighteenth-century wealthy male visitors to Rome had celebrated female sculpted nudity and praised limited expressions of male nudity. Their preferred male sculpture included the lithe form of the *Apollo Belvedere* or the limbless *Belvedere Torso*. As noted in Chapter Two, heavily muscled figures like the *Farnese Hercules* were less popular. The greatest praise was reserved for female sculpted nudity which evoked the desire to touch, or in other words, appeared both life-like and appealing. This desire to touch was enhanced by viewing sculpted bodies in the original marble. Jonathon Richardson wrote of the *Medici Venus* [Fig. 4.3],

\begin{quote}
I confess, before I saw this statue, I had some prejudice against it, from what I had observed in the casts; and it has faults; but it has too such a fleshy softness, one would think it would yield to the touch.\textsuperscript{479}
\end{quote}

Jonathon Richardson, co-author of widely disseminated travel guides with his father, found the opinion he formed by viewing casts was overridden by interaction with the original statue. The direct viewing of her surface which he desired to touch, and made sure to examine under every possible light, caused him to overlook any flaws.

Jonathon Richardson’s reaction was typical: one of the figures viewing the *Medici Venus* in Johann Zoffany's 1772-1778 painting of the *Tribuna* gazes with rapture, caught with his

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{477} The title pages of Lady Murray's *Journal* contain an apologetic dedication which disavows any claim to scholarship, 'To you, my dearest Julia, I dedicate this Journal, written exclusively for my own use, to assist me in recollecting the many beautiful and interesting objects which would most probably have either escaped my memory, or, at any rate, have left but a confused impression upon it.' The journal is deliberately presented as more of an aide-memoire than travel literature in accordance with the expected refined sensibilities of the nineteenth-century woman. See Marie-Pascale Pieretti, "Women Writers and Translation in Eighteenth-Century France", *The French Review* 75, (No. 3, 2002, 474-88).

\textsuperscript{478} The *tableaux* involved recreating moments from a play or even sculpture e.g Emma Hamilton. A popular choice was the living statue of Act 5 Scene 3 of Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*, according to Alison Yarrington, "The Poetics of Sculpture: Pedestal, Verse and Inscription" in *Display and Displacement*, ed. Alexandra Gerstein, (Courtauld/ Paul Holberton Publishing, 2007): 90, 'In the 'long' eighteenth century the 'statue scene' was well known outside the play as a must for tableaux vivants and by the 1830s Mme Tussaud was quoting lines from it in the publicity advertising the 'historical' exhibitions that she held in London as a form of cultural accreditation.'

\textsuperscript{479} Jonathon Richardson, *An account of some of the statues, bas-reliefs, drawings and pictures in Italy...*, (1722): 55-56.
\end{footnotesize}
hand hovering above the leg of the sculpture [Fig. 4.4]. Of all the jokes about the prurient male gaze in the painting, this figure, struggling between viewing and the desire to touch, best encapsulates the difficulty of repressing impropriety in performing artistic judgement. Both this figure and Jonathan Richardson display a fascination with the surface of the original marble, a viewing experience unobtainable with casts.

The Medici Venus is located in Florence and was often one of the first examples of classical sculpture to be viewed by travellers headed to Rome [Fig. 4.3]. Jonathon Richardson viewed the statue in 1722. Charlotte Eaton viewed the same sculpture in Florence in 1817. Her account indicates different priorities to Jonathon Richardson, prioritising emotion over form,

Immediately after breakfast, therefore, we set off to pay a visit to the Venus di Medici, [sic] whose morning levee we found already crowded with a circle of the ardent admirers who daily pour forth their rapturous adoration at her feet.... although new beauties continually rose upon me as I contemplated her form of perfect symmetry and more than feminine grace, the soul was wanting; the expression, the sentiment I sought for, was not there; she did not come up to the soul-seducing image in my mind. It was not a goddess, nor a celestial being that I saw before me -it was a woman, a lovely and graceful woman certainly; -but still I think that I have actually seen women, real living women, almost as beautiful, and far more interesting: and, indeed, -to confess the truth, -I thought her legs were rather thick, and her face very insipid.

When confronted with the Medici Venus, the first viewing experience recorded in her account of her travels, Charlotte Eaton was disappointed. Her expectation was of a figure more lovely than naturally possible, and a goddess-like expression. Instead, she observed thick legs and insipid features, but unlike Jonathon Richardson, her mode of viewing did not excuse those flaws. The ability to attribute the figure's shape to a living woman, which would titillate prurient viewers, undermines her viewing experience. She was frustrated not to feel the same response that resulted in 'ardent admirers' visiting the Venus daily. She concluded that her approach to viewing sculpture was flawed, writing,

...it does not prove her want of beauty, but my want of taste; and, convinced of this mortifying truth, I quitted her presence at last, with no small vexation to find that I could not feel, as I ought, the full force of that unapproached perfection, which has

---

480 The painting gives an idea of the other male sculpture near the Venus, such as the Uffizi Wrestlers, which were of the hyper-masculine, muscular type.

481 When the Medici Venus was replaced by Antonio Canova's Venus Italica, its male viewers grew bolder in their admiration of the figure. Carol Ockman, *Ingres' Eroticized Bodies: Retracing the Serpentine Line*, (Yale University Press, 1995): 57 records a comment by Ugo Foscolo (1778-1827) on his interaction with the Venus Italica: 'I have visited, and revisited, and loved, and kissed, and-don't let anyone know- I even once caressed, this new Venus.' Cited as letter of October 15, 1812, cited in Fratini, "Opere di sculture", 45, n.5. See also the Conclusion of this thesis.

rendered this renowned statue the idol of successive generations, the triumph of art, and the standard of taste.483

The 'standard of taste' which produced a canon of admired antique statues was gendered, prioritising the male grand tourist gaze. This 'idol of successive generations' of male viewers disappointed a female viewer, or less simplistically, the viewer who sought Romantic expression, soul and sentiment.

Near the Venus Eaton commented on a small figure after the Lycian Apollo [Fig. 4.5]. Her comment on this male figure revealed a conflict at the heart of early nineteenth-century British viewing of sculpture. There were two types of male sculpted figures, and one did not match their increasingly narrow definition of masculinity,

Beside the Venus, he looks mean and effeminate. He suffers more from her neighbourhood than the other statues, because more in the same style of beauty. No female form has been suffered to stand the comparison.484

The Lycian Apollo stood in exaggerated contrapposto, with one arm thrown over his head. By 1817, an Apollo and a Venus could be viewed as belonging to the same 'style of beauty'. The Lycian Apollo was compared to female statuary, not the other (male) statues nearby.

Eaton's instinctive response was to reject a previously acceptable genre of male sculpture: the effeminate male. In her binary, the portrayal of characteristics considered to be feminine, such as grace or sensuality, automatically categorised the sculpture as female, regardless of gender. Her response reflects a longstanding tension over such bodies: eighteenth-century viewers, according to Alex Potts, deemed the admiration of the similarly posed Apollo Belvedere acceptable only through the understanding that he was relaxing after killing the Python- and thus part of a military narrative [Fig. 3.7].485

Charlotte Eaton's enthusiastic

---

483 Eaton, Rome in the Nineteenth Century, Vol. I, 3. She makes no mention of the reaction of her companion. Despite her disappointment, she judges the Medici Venus superior to Canova's Venus at the Palazzo Pitti, but considers Canova's Venus superior to the other classical sculpture, (Vol. I, 18) 'We afterwards walked through a long suite of superb, cold state apartments in the Palazzo Pitti, the residence of the Grand Duke, to see the Venus of Canova; so that it was my lot in this one day to see more Venuses than I ever saw before in the whole course of my life. I have no hesitation in saying, that this justly celebrated modern Venus far surpasses all the ancient Venuses in the gallery, excepting the Venus de Medicis, but she greatly falls short of that- I mean in perfection, for she certainly exceeds it in height. She is represented as coming out of the bath, and drawing round her beautiful form a drapery, one end of which she has raised from the ground, and presses to her bosom with the most graceful modesty imaginable ...'. Eaton's response to the sculpture reveals the necessity of adhering to the established canon of classical sculpture- Canova's Venus can come close to perfection, but must not surpass the original work, however disappointing.


response to the *Apollo Belvedere*, despite her distaste for the sculpture after the *Lycian Apollo*, supports Potts' theory.\(^{486}\)

This tension was not conducive to the continued use of classical sculpture as a standard of taste.\(^{487}\) By the late eighteenth century, increased access to art resulted in satirical prints mocking the figure of the connoisseur and suggesting that prurience had entered the educated gaze.\(^{488}\) The mode of viewing employed by a broader demographic of visitors to Rome suppressed any potential impropriety in an attempt to attain a personalised and meaningful viewing experience. Thus issues of prurience and the gendered gaze were constantly impinging on the viewing experience. The idea that a male/prurient versus female/emotional binary existed is less accurate than considering that two different modes of viewing were competing. For Charlotte Eaton, this resulted in the devaluation of works which had been exalted by a different mode of viewing.

As a British visitor to Florence in 1817-18, Charlotte Eaton's understanding of masculinity, femininity and propriety was based on her nationalistic cultural biases. The British definition of propriety, and British and French definitions of masculinity, were traditionally narrow in comparison to Italian customs.\(^{489}\) Carol Ockman has argued that changes to the French understanding of masculinity occurred following the French Revolution, which ended in 1799.\(^{490}\) The prevailing idea of maleness, previously accepting of courtly fashions and etiquette, now prioritised bodies hardened by revolutionary activity. The correlation of aristocracy with sodomy and excessive sexual licentiousness further stigmatised effeminate

---


\(^{487}\) Karen Eustace, *Canova: Ideal Heads*, (Ashmolean Museum, 1997): 40, calls this 'ideal beauty', but arrives at a similar argument, 'When, during the nineteenth century, the prestige of the neo-classical collapsed, and Canova went into a long eclipse, it became impossible, for a while, to share and appreciate that conception of ideal beauty which had once held Europe and America in its grip.'

\(^{488}\) Satirical prints, e.g. Thomas Rowlandson's 1799 print, *Connoisseurs*, poked fun at the idea of connoisseurs as taking a prurient interest in the female nude. Danielle Thom, "Amorous Antiquaries: Sculpture and Seduction in Rowlandson's Erotica", in *Burning Bright: Essays in Honour of David Bindman*, ed. Diana Dethloff et al., (University College London, 2015): 207, notes, '...Rowlandson's sculpture-inspired erotic and bawdy images offered a way of negotiating the tricky territory between sexual permissiveness and polite good taste opened up by the dissemination of the antique nude.'

\(^{489}\) Nigel Llewellyn, "'Those Loose and Immodest Pieces': Italian Art and the British Point of View" in *Italian Culture in Northern Europe in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Shearer West, (Cambridge University Press, 1999): 67-100, details the eighteenth-century British mode of viewing abroad, which prioritised the male gaze and excluded women from particular sites of sociability and art, including the Tribuna at the Uffizi in Florence.

\(^{490}\) Carol Ockman, *Ingres' Eroticized Bodies: Retracing the Serpentine Line*, (Yale University Press, 1995).
bodies. Dror Wahrman has posited a similar trajectory in turn of the century England, from gender fluid categories accepting of transgressive activities such as cross-dressing, towards rigidly defined gender categories based on sex. The systemic and unilateral changes across multiple spheres of British societal mores and culture detailed in his monograph are termed 'gender panic'. His argument can be summarised thus:

Gender, the behavioural and cultural attributes of masculinity and femininity, collapsed into sex, that is, into the physicality inscribed on the body of every individual.

With the modern sense of identity so firmly entwined with the body, gender became a crucial aspect of that body. Contemporary viewers of Antonio Canova's sculpture carried their anxieties over the proper expression of gender into his studio at Rome. This manifested in two key ways: curiosity over his use of surface finish and softness, and anxiety over the extent to which this finish or softness was appropriate in the depiction of male figures. His career spanned a long period of intense social and cultural change, albeit more slowly in Italy than in England and France.

Softness of flesh uninterrupted by 'projections' adhered to the idea of female beauty as expressed in Hogarth's 1753 Analysis of Beauty,

There is an elegant degree of plumpness peculiar to the skin of the softer sex, that occasions these delicate dimplings in all their other joints, as well as those of the fingers; which so perfectly distinguish them from those even of a graceful man.

---

491 A summary of the scholarship on late eighteenth-century French sexual identity is found in Mary L. Belhouse, "Erotic "Remedy" Prints and the Fall of the Aristocracy in Eighteenth-Century France", Political Theory, Vol. 25, (No. 5, Oct. 1997): 701-2, '...the new cultural boundaries of sexuality drawn in late eighteenth-century French culture mean that attacks on sexual behaviour and gender identity tend to be heavily freighted with class antagonisms and vice versa.'


493 Wahrman, Making of the Modern Self, 44.

494 For a discussion of contemporary attempts to guess at Canova's technique, see Eustace, Ideal Heads, 48. The interest in the surface was not new- Winckelmann used an argument based on the surface of skin in discussion of the artists behind the Apollo and the Laocoon, 'Apollo e lisciato e levigato colla pomic: o col piombo all'uso degli Antichi: e Laconte e terminato col ferro solo sino all'ultima raffinatura, nell' istessa maniera che i'e la Niobe, la pivantica Statua dal fiore delle Arti.' Johann Joachim Winckelmann in Hans Diepolder and Walther Rehm ed., Briefe, (8 Vol.s, Berlin, 1952): Vol I, 441-2, No. 259, Firenze, 5 December 1758, An Albani.

495 William Hogarth 1753, quoted by Ockman, Ingres' Eroticized Bodies, 2, as an introduction to her discussion of the serpentine line in the work of Ingres. Ockman's work mirrors the argument of this chapter in terms of her understanding of the shift in art, 'how the sensual reconfigured neoclassicism in the late eighteenth and the nineteenth century and how that reconfiguration set in motion a crisis in definitions of masculinity.' Unlike Wahrman, Ockman (p.4) attributes this confusion between sex and gender, male and female to 'a radical redefinition of the male body in the wake of the French revolution that ultimately is responsible for the increased emphasis on the female nude in the nineteenth century.'
Canova, however, employed softness and dimples in his male figures as well as his female. His attempts to sculpt more masculine figures which did project muscles and veins were not celebrated by British visitors. Lady Murray, in a rare negative comment on Canova's work, commented on his Pugilists [Fig. 4.6] that,

...the sinews and muscles indicate strength; but I always think Canova's genius more suited to the expression of female grace and beauty than of the ruder passions and actions of his own sex.  

The use of the term 'expression of female grace' from a viewer who praised the figures on the Stuart Monument, is not necessarily intended to mean Canova should never sculpt male figures [Fig. 4.7]. This monument, dating from 1819, is discussed later in this chapter as the apex of Italian celebration of Canova's dimpled male beauties. Her words suggest she viewed Canova's talent as best displayed in female figures, but that Apollo type figures, belonging to the same 'style of beauty', would be preferable to 'ruder' figures. Lady Catherine Wilmot had a similar reaction, 

If you choose to see through my eyes you will prefer Canova's [Hercules] a thousand times beyond the other, for I cannot help thinking the Farnese Hercules one of the most lubberly propositions I ever saw in my life.  

Canova's works were considered in parallel to classical sculpture at Rome, but without the imposed value judgements of generations of viewing activity. His most successful sculpture appealed to both modes of viewing: the emotional desire to connect to ideal beauty in idealised features, and a touchable surface. On the envelope, to borrow Satish Padiyar's phrase, of Canova's sculpture, new concepts of masculinity and gender were debated, and the question of propriety addressed. This is particularly evident in the writing of British visitors to Rome. The reception of Canova's work became gendered: his female figures were celebrated, his hyper-masculine figures were criticised, and his male figures were the site of debate over how to portray masculinity.

It is in the context of the gendered reception of Canova's works and debate over his ability to portray masculinity in sculpted form, in which viewers of different nationalities held widely different opinions, that Canova was requested to create portrait sculpture of Napoleon Bonaparte. In 1801, Canova had recently completed his muscular Pugilists, which would be purchased by the Pope in 1802 to build up the Vatican collections raided by Napoleon in  

1798 [Fig. 4.6]. Previous scholarship has concentrated on the nudity of the *Napoleon as Mars*, which was certainly innovative.\footnote{Johns, \textit{Politics of Patronage}, 89, Ockman, \textit{Ingres' Eroticized Bodies}, 299.} However, it is evident from an examination of Canova's other works, and an understanding of viewing practices of sculpture in the early nineteenth century, that sculpted male nudity came in many different forms. A more nuanced understanding of the nudity of the *Napoleon as Mars* is needed to better understand its mixed reception and eventual rejection by the sitter. It is notable that the main supporters of the sculpture were figures like Quatremere de Quincy and Baron Denon, whose adherence to the classical ideal was paramount, despite cultural change in France and Britain.

*Napoleon as Mars the Peacemaker*

The *Napoleon as Mars the Peacemaker* [Fig. 4.1] combined portrait sculpture and idealised sculpted nudity of a living sitter. Despite Canova's reputation, the statue was not celebrated by viewers at Rome, it was exhibited only briefly in Paris, and became a symbol of Napoleon's defeat in England. In light of Canova's talent, criticism of the sculpture has resulted in the theory that Canova deliberately subverted the imagery by proposing the statue as a colossal nude.\footnote{Johns, \textit{Politics of Patronage}, 6.} The sculpture experienced a complicated reception and history of display. This is emphasised when it is compared to the *Pauline Borghese as Venus Venetrix*, a sculpture with a similarly weak allegory excusing portrait nudity [Fig. 4.2]. Yet the reception and display of this female sculpture was generally positive.

The issue at the heart of the debate over the design of the *Napoleon as Mars* for Napoleon's supporters was how best to glorify a figure who combined the hyper-masculine character of a militant politician with a below-average body. In 1801, Count Giambattista Sommariva wrote an open letter published in a newspaper on 10 April, calling for a sculpted image of Napoleon to be commissioned from Antonio Canova, \footnote{F. Boyer, \textit{Le Monde des arts en Italie}, 131, cited as \textit{Moniteur Universel}, Paris, An IX, 839, 20 Germinal (10 Avril 1801), written by Count Sommariva.}

...du plus habile sculpteur du siecle, la statue du plus grand capitaine du monde.\footnote{501 See Lady Murray, \textit{A Journal of a Tour in Italy}, Vol. I, 129, for the Count, who acquired Canova's \textit{Palamedes} which is still exhibited at the Villa Carlotta, north of Milan, once the home of Count Giambattista Sommariva.}

The sycophantic wording does not negate the likelihood that the idea was the Count's own, given his avid collecting of neoclassical sculpture.\footnote{502 At this point in time Napoleon was}
First Consul of the French Republic, following ten years of French revolutionary activity which had ended in 1799. By 1804 Napoleon was titled Emperor. Canova was reluctant to accept the commission, most likely owing to Napoleon's involvement in military action on Italian soil. As leader of the French army in Italy, a position he was awarded in 1796, a series of successful military manoeuvres saw the French under Napoleon annex Italy, which at the time was made up of small independent areas. This insult was compounded by Napoleon's policy of appropriating the valuables of occupied territories, including the best antiquities of Rome. Rome fell in 1798, and Canova's home town of Venice, which had been given to Austria in 1797, was not relinquished until 1806, the year Canova completed the statue.

In 1802, at the insistence of Napoleon, and having exhausted every possible excuse, Antonio Canova agreed to the portrait commission. He travelled from Rome to meet Napoleon near Paris, at the Chateau du Fontainebleau, in order to begin work on a portrait bust. After a week, Canova departed with a model of Napoleon's head in clay. The sculptor's difficulty with his subject was recorded in the Memoires sur Napoleon written by Louis-Antoine Fauvelet de Bourienne, private secretary to Napoleon from 1797,

Canova, étant arrivé a Paris vint a Saint-Cloud pour modeler la figure du premier consul dont il allait faire la statue colossale. Ce grand artiste venait souvent dans l'espoir de faire poser son modele, mais cela causait a Bonaparte tant d'ennui, degout et d'impatience, qu'il ne posait que fort rarement et pendant tres-peu de temps. La ressemblance s'en est ressentie. Cependant il avait pour Canova les plus grands égards; chaque fois qu'on l'annoncait, le premier consul m'envoyait lui donner un seance; mais il hausait les épaules en me disant: Encore posait! Mon dieu, que cela est ennuyeux!503

The wording is very strong: Napoleon was bored, disgusted, impatient, annoyed at the thought of sitting to Canova, and his secretary considered the likeness of the bust to have suffered as a result.504 He would agree to sit to the sculptor, but not for very long. There is no mention of set appointments, it appears as though Canova turned up, was given a room, and waited. Yet Napoleon was aware of the potential of portraiture, both politically and personally. In 1801 he refused the Prince of Spain an image of himself because he deemed him unworthy of it, writing,

504 The translation of 'La ressemblance s'en est ressentie' is difficult. It is here translated as indicating that the likeness was affected by Napoleon's refusal to pose often or for long. Similar anecdotal evidence exists concerning Napoleon's unwillingness to pose for Jacques-Louis David.
Je n'enverrai jamais mon portrait a un homme qui tient son predecesseur au cachot et qui emploie les moyens de l'inquisition. Je puis m'en servir, mais je ne lui dois que du mepris.\textsuperscript{505}

On a personal level, he travelled with a portrait of his wife Josephine, writing to her that he missed her, and was disappointed to find that on kissing her portrait, it did not respond, 'ah c’est cette nuit que je me suis bien aperçu que votre portrait n’est pas vous...'.\textsuperscript{506} His understanding of portraiture as a symbol of the self was evident. What is not clear is the extent to which Napoleon took a personal interest in the details of the proposed statue, beyond the cultural cachet of having Canova sculpt him. Judging from the secretary's account of his visit, Canova had been commissioned for a 'statue colossale' from the outset. Napoleon was accustomed to the idea of public life-sized portrait sculpture of himself. Two life-size clothed portrait statues of Napoleon by lesser-known artists were already planned in 1801; one by Giovanni Battista Comolli for Paris and one by Maximilien Laboureur for Rome.\textsuperscript{507} Given that the latter involved Napoleon in a Roman toga, there were few options for another statue by a neoclassical sculptor.

Ennio Quirino Visconti, the curator of antiquities at the \textit{Museé de Napoleon} at the Louvre, and Dominique-Vivant Denon, the head of the Museé, advised Napoleon in favour of heroic nudity rather than military uniform.\textsuperscript{508} The idea of 'heroic nudity' lay in the understanding that classical art employed nudity as a method of denoting male heroism or divinity. Thus the appreciation of the work was predicated on an educated gaze. By 1811, the dissemination of art criticism in newspapers ensured that a single negative reaction to the sculpture could reach thousands. Even if the colossal statue had been clothed, the classicising attributes demonstrated a hubris Napoleon could no longer afford.

\textsuperscript{505} \textit{Napoleon Correspondence}, Vol. 7, 112, No. 5516, 9 April 1801.
\textsuperscript{506} Appendix of Original Letters, Letter No.1, in C. Tennant, 'A tour through parts of the Netherlands, Holland, Germany, Switzerland, Savoy, and France, in the year 1821-2. Including a description of the Rhine voyage in the middle of autumn, and the stupendous scenery of the Alps in the depth of winter. Also containing, in an appendix, fac-simile copies of eight letters in the hand-writing of Napoleon Bonaparte to his wife Josephine (1824)', Vol. II, 1824.
\textsuperscript{507} Boyer, \textit{Le Monde des arts en Italie}, 113, presumably Giovanni Battista Comolli (19 February 1775 – 26 December 1830). According to the Henry Moore Biographical Dictionary of Sculptors in Britain 1660-1851, 'In January 1802 he paid his first visit to London during the Peace of Amiens. Later that year he was in Paris, where he executed a bust and a model for a colossal statue of Napoleon.' The bust is now thought to be at the Junior United Service Club, London, but the statue does not appear to have been completed. Given that he is thought to have studied under Antonio Canova, it is possible that his model was abandoned following Canova's acceptance of the commission. Maximilien Laboureur's (1739-1812) \textit{The Statue de Bonaparte en Premier Consul}, was erected in Place Foch, Paris, and features the Emperor in a Roman toga. (p.131)
\textsuperscript{508} Johns, \textit{Politics of Patronage}, 96.
Lady Murray's account of viewing a cast of the work with Canova in his studio is useful here. She commented that the use of a figure of Victory was common in portrait sculpture of ancient Roman emperors,

When he [Canova] proposed to the Emperor to place the Genius of Victory in his hand, which is often done in the statues of the Roman Emperors, Napoleon replied, "Il fait laisser faire [sic] a un homme de genie comme vous, il ne faut pas vous gener." This was a tacit approbation of the idea; but Napoleon's reverses had begun when the statue was finished, and some mauvais plaisant having said that Victory was flying away from him, he had it kept out of view.509

Lady Murray clearly considered the negative reception of the sculpture to stem from changes to Napoleon's position of power. But despite his use of the title, Napoleon avoided overt comparisons with the Roman emperors. In 1801, Napoleon had risen to power on the basis of military tactics and personality cult. His rule was supposed to circumvent the tradition of a god-given right to rule that had been propagated by the French royal family, which had begun to falter across Europe in the wake of Enlightenment thinking on the rights of man. Equating him with a god of war was dangerous. Napoleon's rule was the result of a decade of revolutionary activity. An allegory which reminded Lady Murray of a Roman emperor likely held too many unfavourable connotations in a country recently ravaged by civil war. He preferred positive allusions to figures from history like Hannibal, who defeated the Roman armies based on tactics, and Charlemagne, whose military takeover of Italy in the Middle Ages was welcomed by the Pope.

These allusions were made in the first of many portraits of Napoleon by Jacques-Louis David, Napoleon Crossing the Alps, dated 1801 [Fig. 4.8]. The advantage of painted imagery was that David could keep up with what Christopher M.S. Johns termed the 'rapid political change' of the period and the correlative shifts in Napoleon's portrayal.510 A brief look at David's work at the dates of creation and exhibition of Canova's portrait sculpture of Napoleon establishes a rapid progression of imagery from early hubris to cautious propaganda. Napoleon Crossing the Alps depicted Napoleon riding a horse on a mountain. David stirred up a sense of heroic French nationalism by alluding with a heavy hand to Hannibal and Charlemagne, inscribing their names on a stone visible in the lower right of the painting. He ignored the practicalities of Napoleon's actual journey on a mule in favour of

509 Lady Murray, A Journal of a Tour in Italy, Vol. II, 294-302. The actual wording appears to have been 'On n'impose pas de lois au génie'. See Boyer, Le Monde des Arts en Italie, 112, who comments, '...et si, plus tard, il s'inquiéta à la pensée que l'effigie colossale commandée au sculpteur italien serait d'une nudité totale, il s'inclina cependant lorsque celui-ci déclara qu'une statue "héroïque" ne pouvait être autrement.'

510 Johns, Politics of Patronage, 1.
the boldly rearing horse easily held in check by Napoleon, a visual metaphor for his capable rule of the armies of France.

The year after Napoleon viewed his portrait sculpture by Canova, David had moved away from aggrandizing imagery, in favour of a sombre depiction as a statesman. His 1812 portrait, *The Emperor Napoleon in his Study at Tuilieres*, showed Napoleon standing in front of his office desk [Fig. 4.9]. The imagery is of a fatherly figure guiding the ship of state with a steady and politic hand. The time on the clock, 4:13, combined with Napoleon's slightly unkempt appearance, suggests he has been working all night. None of the attempted heroism or pomposity of his earlier portraits by David appears. Napoleon's supporters desired a politician, not a revolutionary hero. Napoleon's dramatically lit features and slim, muscular body were replaced by a slight paunch and a clearly receding hairline. Canova was commissioned to depict the Emperor in 1801, but Napoleon did not view the marble until 1811, by which time the public image of the 42 year old was more sedate.

Regardless of the changes to his personal appearance, the initial choice of a divine allegory was ambitious. Despite his equestrian portrait, at no point in his career did Napoleon have a god-like body. His portrait statue inevitably combined a portrait head with an idealised body. But there was a difference between presenting an idealised version of Napoleon's body, and a specimen of ideal male beauty. Once the decision had been made to portray an ideal body, Canova's only option was to avoid fleshiness or femininity and evoke the idea of a martial god. The origin of the choice of this ideal body is difficult to track.

François Cacault wrote to Talleyrand in December of 1801, 'On a parle de l'idee de Canova de le representer sous la figure de Mars desarmé et pacificateur.'511 The choice is not necessarily subversive: this was a similar narrative of repose following military action which underwrote the heroic nudity of the *Apollo Belvedere*. But disarmed does not mean nude. Had Napoleon been wearing armour, Canova could have attempted a body which bridged the gap between Napoleon's figure and the ideal. The sheer size of the sculpture at 3.45m was also a factor- the sculpture would have dwarfed the other marbles at the Louvre.512 The figure of Victory blamed by Lady Murray added movement to the figure and a sense of luxury, being made of gold.513 The staff held connotations of coronation and statesmanship.

512 For context, the *Farnese Hercules* is 3.17m.
513 Napoleon favoured both gold and the figure of Victory in his furnishings. See Odile Nouvel and Anne Dion-Tenenbaum, *Symbols of Power: Napoleon and the Art of the Empire Style 1800-1815* (Abrams, 2007).
not traditional attributes of Mars. By 1811, the idea of Napoleon as a peacemaker, following 20 years of war for the French, was tenuous at best.

Napoleon stands with one arm outstretched, on which a figure of Victory alights, and the other grasping a long staff [Fig. 4.1]. The key attribute was a sword which lay sheathed with its belt, slung casually around the tree trunk which supports the figure. The problem with the translation of a warrior from ready for action and holding instruments of war, to post-action and holding political symbols of power, was that it weakened the allegory. Napoleon was visually affiliated with the more usual classical precedent of a disarmed Mars: in the company of Venus, with whom he carried on an adulterous affair.514 Thus some nineteenth-century viewers defaulted to a recognition of the figure's nudity and contrapposto stance. Maria Edgeworth described it as 'Canova's gigantic statue of Apollo-Bonaparte'.515 Lady Catherine Wilmot, who appears to have confused Napoleon and Ferdinand IV, described seeing,

...amongst other things the King of Naples as a colossal figure of Mars, which is a good joke after he had fled from his country the moment he was attack'd.516

The Napoleon as Mars was less open and less energetic than the Apollo Belvedere [Fig. 3.7] in the positioning of the upper body and arms, but the positioning of the legs was similar. The main difference is in the turn of the head in the opposite direction. Charlotte Eaton's reaction to the Lycian Apollo figure, discussed above [Fig. 4.5], indicated the British difficulty with the brand of masculinity expressed by the Apollo type. Through close inspection of the marble, it is clear that the sculpture lacks the sensuality usually employed in Canova's Apollo-like figures. The modelling and finish of the skin is well distinguished from the rough bark of the tree or the stone circle on which he stands. Napoleon has been rendered, albeit nude, in a masculine manner, with well-defined but not exaggerated muscles. His stance is offset by the large step the figure is taking. Unfortunately, the straight line of the staff held by the figure exaggerates the serpentine line created by the pose. Although the figure's flesh has been rendered in a realistic manner, with attention to light and shade as seen in the modelling of the elbow, there is a limited degree of sensuality to the moulding of the skin [Fig. 4.10]. The sinews and protruding veins of the Pugilists are absent, but there is no dimpling or sensuality to the skin. This can be seen in Canova's depiction of

514 Jacques-Louis David painted a version of Venus and the Graces disarming Mars in 1824, now at the Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels.
Napoleon's backside, muscular and firm, particularly in comparison to the dimples in the folds of his cloak which billows down at his side [Fig. 4.11].

Canova's most scathing critic, Carl Ludwig Fernow, wrote of 'a chest too broad and protruding, giving heaviness to the upper part of the body- the body itself, too long- the hips too narrow to support the body, or to give the lower limbs a firm position- and badly formed feet.'\[517\] Christopher M.S. Johns considers the Napoleon as Mars to be Canova's 'most singular failure'.\[518\] This criticism is excessive. Canova was attempting to create a figure which was firm but not heavily muscled, slender but not desirable. The major weakness of the pose is in the turn of the head [Fig. 4.1]. For the viewer standing in front of the colossal statue, the full-frontal view of the body, complete with large fig-leaf, provides only a profile view of the portrait features. The device of the fig-leaf, as Michael Squire has noted, calls attention to the very nudity it attempts to offset.\[519\] The sheer height of the sculpture at 3.45m caused difficulty in absorbing the imagery as a whole.

Horst Janson 'perceived in Bonaparte's posture an attitude of embarrassed hesitancy'.\[520\] This is because of the contrast between the confident stance, and the turn of the head away from the viewer. Although the draping of the cloak, falling behind the outstretched arm, is similar to the Apollo Belvedere, the fact that no part of the drapery is actually being worn heightens the impression of total nudity. The unfettered access of the viewer to the nudity of the figure, and the turn of the head away from the viewpoint which best reveals the body: these are characteristics of the Aphrodite of Cnidus, the inspiration for the Venus de Medici [Fig. 4.3]. Canova was accustomed to giving his allegorical figures a turn of the head, and his modelling of the sculpture avoided overt sensuality. But to British and French viewers, to visually reference the Apollo Belvedere in any way was to enter the Napoleon as Mars into the same 'style of beauty' as the Venus.\[521\] Neither fully portrait, nor fully idealised, the sculpture caused confusion. This was not however, necessarily deliberate or subversive: the same formula worked for the Pauline as Venus.

A brief examination of the Stuart Monument in St Peter's Basilica in the Vatican is useful here as a visual demonstration of the apex of Canova's desirable male figures [Fig. 4.7]. The

---

monument, completed in 1819 after the nude portrait sculpture, featured busts of the deceased members of the Stuart family who had held a claim on the British throne, depicted flanked by two weeping Genii of Death, who hold inverted torches. Canova's imagery was visibly provocative: the luminous sheen to the skin of the figures, the partial nudity, the sideways stance and drapery only just preserving their modesty, and the prominent dimpling of the buttocks [Fig. 4.12]. The figures contravene the increasingly strict understanding of male and female flesh, in which if male flesh were to protrude outwards, pushing the boundaries of the envelope of skin in the form of veins and muscles, the female was to protrude inwards, with dimples and hollows. Initially celebrated, this commission was soon called into question by conservative members of the clergy, who pressured the Pope into writing to Canova to request the covering up of the Genii. In comparison, the Napoleon as Mars was moderate in its nudity.

This reading is contrary to the stance taken by the majority of scholars. Christopher M.S. Johns wrote, 'I believe that Napoleon primarily feared the comparison of his present balding, paunchy self to Canova's sublime, heroic creation, unquestionably crowned with his own likeness.' Given the difference in portrait imagery of Napoleon in 1801 compared to 1811, this is likely. It does not however fully explain the history of display of the sculpture, or Napoleon's rejection of the sculpture. Napoleon permitted the statue to remain on view at Canova's studio for many years, from its completion in 1806 to 1810, and then at the Louvre from its arrival in January 1811 to his visit to see it in May 1811. The statue represented the ultimate acquisition of Italy's art: the embodiment of Napoleon as antiquity. Napoleon's adviser Baron Denon, who was admittedly biased, received the imagery positively, writing to Napoleon in 1806 that it belonged,

---

522 Murray, *A Journal of a Tour in Italy*, Vol. II, 8, 'On each side stands a beautiful angel, chiselled with all the softness and grace of Canova.'
523 Johns, *Politics of Patronage*, 163. Johns believes that 'The letter underscores the increasingly difficult situation of Pius VII, whose tolerance and progressive cultural interests were viewed with hostility by the dogmatists rapidly gaining control of the Church hierarchy. Similarly, it suggests that the cosmopolitan syncretism characteristic of Canova's neoclassical aesthetic was less desirable in a world that valued medieval theocratic historicism more than the outmoded grandeur of the ancient civilisations so beloved of the eighteenth century.' It is not necessarily the nudity of the figures in a sacred location, hardly a new concept at the Vatican, but the degree of sensuality to that nudity and the use of effeminate, dimpled flesh, which allowed for the opening of a dialogue over its propriety. The fact that the sculpture was contemporary allowed for the expression of unease which would eventually, as Johns points out, devalue all sculpted nudity.
...among the emperors and in the niche where the Laocoon is, in such a manner that it would be the first object that one sees on entering.525

This had been the objective in commissioning the sculpture from the beginning. Yet on viewing the sculpture, Napoleon supposedly commented that it was 'trop athletique'.526 Johns takes this comment to refer to anxiety over the nudity, pointing to the contemporary French reaction to a near-nude sculpture of the French General Desaix, 1805-7, by Claude Dejoux.527 As portrait imagery of a deceased sitter, it was less transgressive, but nevertheless was covered up soon after its unveiling in 1810 by Napoleon, just before his own nude portrait imagery arrived in Paris. However, the sculpture was a bronze set at a height in a public square which employed no apparent allegory and did not evoke classical precedents for the viewer. This sculpture would not have been viewed in the context of the antiquities of the Louvre, the majority of which were looted by Napoleon. It was exposed to the uneducated and mixed-gender gaze of the masses, in a public setting.

In order for the reception of the Desaix monument to have influenced Napoleon, he must have considered the Louvre to attract similar viewers to a public square. The middle classes were far more likely to visit the Louvre than could have been anticipated in 1801, owing to cultural changes in the appreciation of art sparked by the public exhibition of work at the Salons.528 French artists were critical of the need to outsource the Emperor's portrait imagery to Rome. It was not the aristocracy who would read overly feminine characteristics into heroic nudity: it was the post-revolutionary lower and middle classes whose concept of masculinity had changed following the French Revolution.529 This explains Napoleon's half-hearted attempt to remove the sculpture from view. The sculpture was not repacked and moved elsewhere, but was simply shielded with a screen. This allowed for limited viewing of the sculpture, ensuring that only one mode of viewing could occur- the supervised and limited gaze which prioritised the sculpture over the potential for prurience.

Thus only those viewers who still considered the classical canon above artistic reproach appreciated the *Napoleon as Mars*. Napoleon's wording, 'trop athletique' is notable. Had the ideal body of the statue been clothed in military uniform, it would still be too athletic compared to his appearance in 1801. Within the parameters of the neoclassical nude, anything less athletic would have bordered on the effeminate. This would have contravened French understandings of the proper portrayal of masculinity. Instead of focusing on the nudity, therefore, which Napoleon had agreed to, it is worth noting that the portrayal of the nudity was left to the sculptor. This chapter posits that Napoleon had assumed that the statue would portray an idealised version of his own body, not an ideal body.

This would better explain his meticulous orders for the transport of a sculpture which he immediately rejected. The statue was transported by barge for most of its journey, with the boat's captain under strict advisement that should enemy ships be spotted, he was to dump his cargo into the sea. Napoleon's assumption that the nudity of his portrait sculpture was idealised, rather than ideal, may have stemmed from his original lack of interest in sitting for the commission, combined with the reception and display of the *Pauline as Venus*. Before considering the reception and display of the *Napoleon as Mars* after the defeat of Napoleon by the Duke of Wellington, it is worth moving to consider the reception and display of the *Pauline as Venus*. Both statues combined portrait sculpture and full-length sculpted nudity of living sitters, thus Napoleon would have taken note of the reaction to his sister's sculpture.

Although the sculpture was commissioned after that of Napoleon, in 1805, it was completed by 1808. Owing to the complexity of moving his statue from Rome to Paris, the *Napoleon as Mars*, although completed in 1806, remained at Canova's studio until 1810. Where the reception of the *Napoleon as Mars* can in some part be attributed to nationalistic biases, the *Pauline as Venus* was located in Rome from conception to exhibition.

The *Pauline as Venus* is notable for attracting a prurient gaze from both genders [Fig. 4.2]. It thus serves as a warning that a male/female binary of viewing is only partially accurate. Of particular interest here is the gossip surrounding the sculpture, repeated by viewers of

---

530 Johns, *Politics of Patronage*, 100, 'The emperor's extreme concern that the statue not fall into English hands possibly indicates continuing concern for the public reception of his portrait as a monumental nude.' The statue would indeed fall into English hands after the defeat of Napoleon in 1815. However, at the time, it is possible Napoleon was simply anticipating a ransom, rather than public humiliation through exhibition of the sculpture.

531 This male/female binary of viewing is also visible in travel literature. Jacqueline M Labbe, "A species of knowledge both useful and ornamental": Priscilla Wakefield's *Family Tour Through the British Empire* in *Romantic Geographies*, ed. Amanda Gilroy, (Manchester University Press, 2000) details how conventional travel literature by women alternated between the expansive male view, and the feminine attention to detail.
various nationalities. Nearly every recorded account of viewing the *Pauline as Venus* commented on the likeness of the body of the portrait sculpture to the body of the sitter—the ideal body and portrait features had been collapsed into one. This was encouraged by the sitter, who invited comparisons between the sculpture and her own body. In so doing, she became part of a limited number of women who harnessed the potential impropriety of viewing the antique to their own benefit. Along with new considerations of gender characteristics and sex as collapsing into the same body, for the British viewer, Pauline Borghese, much like Emma Hamilton, collapsed the antique and the contemporary into her own bodily presence.

Consideration of this process sheds light on changing understandings of gender, propriety and viewing sculpted nudity in Western Europe. It substantiates the idea that the final display context of the *Napoleon as Mars*, shielded from view but not inaccessible, did not result from a sudden dislike of a long-completed statue. Through Pauline Borghese's actions, the combination of portrait head and ideal body became a cohesive whole: a slightly idealised depiction of Pauline's entire body. This was acceptable for the female body, but was not an option in relation to the male body. For Napoleon, this signalled the necessity of restricting access to his sculpture to those few educated viewers who could recognise the original premise of the sculpture. Given the originality of the combination, in being publicly exhibited first, the *Pauline as Venus* set the standard of viewing.

The understanding that the portrait head did not necessarily relate to the ideal body, or the use of the body as a prop, was predicated on an in-depth understanding of the ancient Roman mode of viewing portrait statuary.532 The combination of idealised body and veristic portrait head was normalised in ancient Roman society. Hopkins and Wyke note that, The portrait statues that mirrored the physical reality of imperial bodies consisted of two conceptually distinct parts: the head, in which individual portrait identity and power resided, and the statue bodies, which functioned as props to convey additional iconographic meaning.533 Had the viewing experience in the early nineteenth century still been predicated on scholarship and adherence to classical ideals of sculpture, the *Napoleon as Mars* would have been a success. Instead, Pauline Borghese had offered viewers at Rome a far more enjoyable, and prurient, method of viewing this apparently new form of portrait sculpture.

---

533 Hopkins and Wyke, *Roman Bodies*, 76.
Pauline Borghese as Venus Venetrix

In 1805 Antonio Canova was commissioned to produce a portrait sculpture of Pauline Bonaparte, sister to Napoleon, who married Prince Camillo Borghese in 1803. The marriage was arranged by Napoleon and his mother in an effort to curb gossip of Pauline's improper behaviour following the death of her first husband. Although Pauline at first enjoyed her new position as a princess, she soon tired of Roman society, and of her husband. She complained of his impotence, taking at least one lover. Only a year after her marriage, Napoleon wrote to her,

I was pained to hear that you do not have the good sense to conform to the morality and the customs of the city of Rome; that you expose yourself to the contempt of the inhabitants...534

The idea that Pauline Bonaparte would have been warmly welcomed to a Rome stripped of its antiquities by Napoleon, regardless of her character, exposes Napoleon's innate arrogance. The morality and customs of Rome were considered far more liberal than those of France or England. There was a long tradition at Rome of women taking a lover, or cavalier, and this apparently continued into the nineteenth century. Thomas Broughton wrote in 1817,

Mrs Zagati tells me that Cavalieri Servienti are often provided for in the marriage contract with nobles and that the higher class may change these cavalieri often as they like - whilst those of her set can not have more than one except after a reasonable lapse... Cavaliers were often taken immediately after marriage so that no man can be sure even of his wife's first born.535

Thus the extent to which Pauline Borghese's behaviour was transgressive for Italian society is hard to judge. What is evident is that she spoke openly about taking lovers, which undermined the traditional networks of gossip. Lady Murray considered her to be part of the Roman nobility, commenting that her home, the Villa Borghese, acted as a hub of sociability for Italian women to meet their lovers,

The Corso is the evening resort of all the Roman nobility, who drive till after dark up and down, and go round the obelisk as far as the Piazza Colonna, on which a number of men assemble as on the Exchange. Many carriages stop on the Piazza del Popolo; and the ladies make appointments to meet their lovers there as well in the Villa

535 Add Ms 47234 British Library, Broughton Papers, Vol. XIII, 9, Venice, Wednesday August 6th 1817. On Thurs July 31st 1817, Broughton noted, (p.4) 'Signora Zagati of Venice the drapier's lady who in a country where women gain character by having a cavalier serviente of rank has risen since she has been companion in ordinary to B. It is very amusing to hear her talk about "cattive donne" with the greatest simplicity. Signor Pico her husband visits her on a Saturday & Tuesday & attends another lady.' B appears to be Lord Byron.
Borghese, and converse with them undisturbed. A crowd of men generally stand here in rows, and stare at those who pass. Many of the ladies wear evening dresses. It was here I caught a peep of the Princess Borghese, the beautiful sister of Napoleon. The delicate shape of her nose particularly struck me.536

Lady Murray spent long periods of time at Rome and was perhaps more acclimatised to Roman societal mores. Another British visitor to Rome, Charlotte Eaton, in a rare use of italics, highlighted the impropriety associated with Pauline Borghese,

His sister, the Princess Paolina Borghese, sees only her particular friends; and it is easier, and perhaps more generally desirable to gentlemen than ladies, to be included among them.537

Eaton’s reaction is couched in the language of the scandalised gossip, secure in her understanding that this behaviour would be shocking to the British reader, yet that they might delight in interpreting her barely veiled meaning. It was likely through such gossip that Pauline reputedly gained the nickname the 'Messalina of the Empire'.538 Messalina was the wife of Emperor Claudius of Rome (her first cousin), whose political power resulted in a reputation as sexually voracious.539

Lady Murray’s praise of Pauline’s beauty was echoed by Antonio Canova. His original conception of the portrait sculpture was to depict Pauline as Diana, the goddess of the hunt and sister to Apollo. This would presumably have weakened the allegory of the Napoleon as Mars, as Christopher M.S. Johns points out, but would have been less potentially subversive than depicting Pauline as Mars’ adulterous lover, Venus.540 It is notable that both goddesses symbolised female empowerment, Diana by rejecting men, and Venus by seducing them. Pauline Borghese was a widow on her second marriage. Instead of Diana, she chose the goddess Venus, holding the golden apple awarded to her by Paris, for being more beautiful than either Minerva or Juno. The resulting sculpture caused a stir at Rome.

Pauline was depicted reclining on a sofa, propped up by two cushions [Fig. 4.2]. The smallness of her body in comparison to the sofa, and the softness of her waxed skin against

536 Murray, *A Journal of a Tour in Italy*, Vol. III, 131. At this point Pauline may have held control of the building- Eaton, *Rome in the Nineteenth Century*, Vol. III, 49, ‘The Palazzo Borghese, one of the largest and handsomest palaces in Rome, is now inhabited only by Paolina, the sister of Buonaparte, and the wife of the Prince Borghese, who himself lives constantly at Florence.’
539 All the classical sources on Messalina were written after her death by authors with an opposing agenda. Sources include Pliny the Elder on her competing with a prostitute, Juvenal’s sixth satire on her secret nightlife as a prostitute, Suetonius’ *Life of Claudius*, and Tacitus in *The Annals.*
the plumped up cushions, is clear at first glance. One hand is raised to her head, possibly to hide her ear, which contemporary accounts detail as her only source of anxiety concerning her appearance following a particularly nasty comment by another elite woman. In her other hand she holds the apple which indicates the narrative. Pauline's legs stretch out elegantly on the couch and she is partially draped. Although her breasts are clearly on show, her pudenda, much like Napoleon's genitalia, are only visible to the determined viewer seeking the right angle. Enough is on show to determine that her nudity conforms to the antique ideal female body in that she has no pubic hair. The positioning of her head, although at an angle, faces her body stretched out on the couch. This, and the smaller size of the work, results in the cohesive appearance of Pauline as a whole and heightens the potential prurience of viewing the sculpture. The partial drapery combined with her suggestively delicate hold on the apple, which hovers over her upper thigh, accentuates the sensuality of the work.

The work was well received by the sitter, and was extremely popular among visitors to Rome, who flocked to the Villa Borghese to view it. Their reaction was described by Quatremere de Quincy,

The Venus Venetrix has just enjoyed a new triumph at the Palazzo Borghese, where it was exhibited for a limited time to the public. The procession of amateurs from Rome as well as from abroad continually pressed around it. Daytime visits could not sate their admiration; they got permission to study the statue at night, by torchlight, which, as you know, accentuates and allows one to see the smallest nuances in the handling, and also shows up the smallest faults. It was necessary to set up an enclosure, to protect the work from the crowd which constantly pushed against it.

The account appears somewhat exaggerated, and there is no corroborating account extant, but may it be related to accounts that Prince Borghese limited viewings of the work after its initial debut. In order to create such a furore, access to the sculpture in the studio must have been restricted. There are two references here, pressing and pushing, to the idea that the admiration of the Pauline as Venus translated into a desire to touch the sculpture. The reference to viewing the sculpture by torchlight is particularly relevant, as it suggests that in this viewing of this sculpture two modes of viewing were conflated. In-depth and sustained viewing of the sculpture was prompted not by a new interest in the sculptural object as art,

541 Len Ortzen, Imperial Venus: the story of Pauline Bonaparte-Borghese (Constable, London, 1974): 82. Ortzen comments, 'The original intention was that Pauline would pose only for the face, but when Canova gallantly expressed doubts about finding a model with such harmonious lines as the Princess, she had no hesitation in deciding to be her own model.' Ortzen's information, although fascinating, is unfortunately poorly referenced. The statue is not dissimilar to the Vatican Ariadne in pose.
but by the prurience associated with viewing a sculpted body which was not considered to be ideal, but realistic. The question of the realism of the sculpted figure was the most scandalous aspect of the reception of the sculpture. Johns wrote,

The statue is rather unusual for its type in that the portrait is less idealized than one would expect and the cushions and linens of the couch are rendered with a degree of naturalism worthy of Bernini, elements due, I believe, to the overt eroticism Canova and Pauline Borghese wished to convey to the viewer.543

Ordinarily, there should have been no conception that Pauline Borghese had posed nude for Antonio Canova, and that the portrait sculpture was veristic. At no point was it assumed that the body of the Napoleon as Mars was veristic or realistic. It was the gender of the sculpture and a tradition of ancient sculpted Venuses which allowed for this titillating idea, causing the frenzied viewing of the sculpture by a 'procession of amateurs from Rome as well as from abroad'. The genesis of this myth appears to have been the sitter herself, who had encouraged direct comparison of her body and the sculpture in private viewings. Thomas Moore commented in 1819 that the statue,

...on view privately to only the most select caused an even greater sensation. The Princess herself seemed to encourage speculation about the closeness between her real body and its carved doppelganger, exhibiting her 'beautiful little hand' and allowing her 'matchless' foot to be felt by supplicants granted audience, the favourite being allowed casts of it to treasure.544

The wording is ambiguous here- were Pauline's favourite suitors allowed casts of her foot, or of the sculpture's foot? The act of posing with the sculpture in a private setting mimicked the process of sitting for its creation. Canova also hinted at a correlation between sculpture and sitter,

He has just finished a group of Mars and Venus which is perfectly lovely. Perhaps the hands of the Venus are slightly an exaggeration of potele, and the fingers taper too much. I ventured to ask him if he had seen any hands like that in Nature? He replied: 'Yes, those of the Princess Borghese.'545

Pauline was also able to enhance the likeness by wearing classically-inspired costume.546

Combined with a few sly comments, the idea that she posed nude for Canova became

543 Johns, Politics of Patronage, 116.
546 Neoclassical sheer gowns were a fashion which directly challenged the beauty of sculpted nudity by offering draped living figures to admire. See E. Claire Cage, "The Sartorial Self: Neoclassical
canonical gossip—repeated by visitors to Rome of various nationalities. The Countess Potocka wrote,

Not a woman would have dared to contend with her for the apple which Canova adjudged her after seeing her— if tales be true—unveiled.\footnote{Ortzen, Imperial Venus, 94. The Countess was Polish, thus the gossip reached viewers of every nationality at Rome.}

Her private posing was also apparently curtailed by her husband Prince Borghese, who was reputed to have locked up the sculpture.\footnote{Johns, Politics of Patronage, 116-7, considers Pauline the most likely to have commissioned the sculpture, and follows the reports that Prince Borghese kept control of who might view it.} This was understood to stem not from a desire to protect the chastity of his wife, but that of the marble. Charlotte Eaton reported,

Some years ago, Canova sculptured a statue of this lady, as Venus, and it is esteemed by himself one of the very best of his works. No one else can have an opportunity of judging of it, for the Prince, who certainly is not jealous of his wife's person, is so jealous of her statue, that he keeps it locked up in a room of the Borghese Palace at Rome, of which he keeps the key, and not a human being, not even Canova himself, can get access to it.\footnote{Eaton, Rome in the Nineteenth Century, Vol. III, 50.}

The incongruity of Canova no longer having access to his own work suggests the extent to which the story of the Pauline as Venus had gripped the popular imagination at Rome. Lady Murray commented,

...the work of which Canova seemed the proudest was the statue of the Princess Borghese, which the Prince has locked up, and will not allow to be shewn [sic] to anyone since his disagreement with her. Canova said, in speaking of this statue, "Ce n'est pas du marbre, mais de la chair." He has two engravings of the back and front. The Princess is lying on a couch, in a very graceful attitude, with so little drapery, that a person observed to her, how unpleasant sitting must have been, to which she answered, "Oh, non, la chambre etait bien chauffee."\footnote{Lady Murray, A Journal of a Tour in Italy, Vol. II, 294-302.}

The intimation is clear. Chloe Chard reveals that this gossip was still being repeated in the 1831 novel Crochet Castle, in which the sitter was asked how she could bear sitting to Canova, and replied that 'there was a good fire in the room'.\footnote{Chard, Chloe, "Nakedness and Tourism, Classical Sculpture and the Imaginative Geography of the Grand Tour", Oxford Art Journal, Vol 18, (No. 1, 1995): 14.} The reports that Canova was completely unable to access the sculpture are contradicted by Tom Moore,

At half past five Chantrey and I went by appointment to Canova, to be taken by him to see his beautiful Venere Vincitrice [sic] (the Princess Borghese) at the Borghese Palace: a great favour to be permitted to see it... I saw the statue by candlelight,
Canova himself holding the light and pausing with a sort of fond lingering on all the exquisite beauties of this most perfect figure.\textsuperscript{552}

Moore's account confirms that access to the sculpture was limited, unless Canova was willing to act as guide. His priority was probably to guide fellow artists rather than fellow men, however neither Charlotte Eaton or Lady Murray appear to have viewed the sculpture beyond the engravings of it in Canova's studio, despite their relationships with Canova. The eroticism of the scene described by Moore is striking: three men poring fondly over the sculpture by candlelight, an intimate version of the popular practice of viewing by torchlight. The prurience invoked by the sculpture went further: the idea of Canova sculpting from Pauline Borghese, naked in his studio, caught the artistic imagination, leading to several paintings which are discussed by Christina Ferando.\textsuperscript{553}

Of particular interest is a painting by Lorenzo Valles, \textit{Paulina Borghese in Antonio Canova's Studio}, (undated) which features the sitter assisted by a maid as she redresses [Fig. 4.13].\textsuperscript{554} Her clothing covers her lower half, thus covering the site of transition between marble and flesh: the pudenda. The \textit{Pauline as Venus} adheres to the classical ideal of beauty in lacking any pubic hair. Thus for Pauline Borghese posing beside her sculpture, the crucial site of comparison is also the site of sexuality. The scene takes place in what is clearly Canova's studio, with rows of busts visible over the large curtains which shield the sectioned off area. The equation of Pauline and Venus is complete: the sitter is imagined to have stripped naked in a locus of public sociability.

Ferando wrote,

\begin{quote}
In these nineteenth-century imagining of the artist at work, therefore, the studio becomes a gendered space where at least part of the creative process is indebted to the lure of the female nude.\textsuperscript{555}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{553} Christina Ferando, "Maidservant as Muse: the dramatic reinvention of Antonio Canova", \textit{The Journal of Art Historiography}, Issue 3, (December 2010): 1-25. The paintings which include naked woman posing for Canova in the studio are by Phillipe Jacques van Bree, Pompeo Calvi, Lorenzo Valles and Achille Beltrame. Given that, as Fernado notes (p.15) 'it is highly unlikely any models posed naked at length while he worked on a large scale clay model, much yet the marble block', the range of artists suggests the extent to which the idea permeated artistic society at Rome, and was not considered within the standard training scenario of life-drawing.

\textsuperscript{554} Christina Ferando, "Maidservant as Muse", 13, Fig. 12, 'The intimation is clear: Canova modeled his famous work directly from the body of Paolina herself.'

\textsuperscript{555} Christina Ferando, "Maidservant as Muse", 15.
For the purposes of this chapter, it is worth considering the painting not as evidence of the gendering of the studio space, but as evidence of the gendering of sculpture. It is true that the creative process was 'indebted to the lure of the female nude', but this was a longstanding tradition. The difference in the early nineteenth century rests in the conflation of the elite female body and the marble in the popular imagination. Women who posed for sculpture or life drawing had traditionally been understood to be lower class. J.T. Smith mentions this practice in London in relation to the sculptor Nollekens, writing of 'the abandoned women who sat to him for his Venuses'. However, for Lorenzo Valles’ painting to work, the figure had to be demonstrably wealthy- hence the maid.

Pauline Borghese's actions encouraging the comparison of her body and her portrait sculpture were part of a broader narrative of gendered viewing. Chloe Chard explored the concept of 'travellers who transmute into tourist attractions', with a focus on Pauline Borghese and Emma Hamilton, among others. Emma Hamilton was the wife of the English Ambassador to Naples, and was celebrated by artists for her ability to pose in classical 'attitudes'. Neither are strictly travellers, but parts of Chloe Chard’s theory are useful here. Chard concluded that Hamilton and Borghese 'personify the elevated delights of the classical ideal- an ideal explicitly associated with restraint, and set in opposition to excess. The women become 'fascinating anomalies', which explains their high profile among visitors to Rome and Naples.

If Emma Hamilton and Pauline Borghese, both understood as sexual figures who embodied excess, were conflated with the classical, then the viewing of the classical became problematic. Nineteenth-century viewing of sculpture was predicated on the understanding that the educated gaze dismissed potential impropriety in order to appreciate ideal beauty and to facilitate an emotional response. This may not always have been successful, nor even in

---

556 Margaret Samu, "The Nude in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Russian Sculpture", Experiment I8, (2012): 45, writes, 'In western art capitals such as Paris and Rome, models of both sexes could be found at model markets in the part of town frequented by artists.'
560 Chard Chloe, "Women who transmute", 121.
actuality the most prevalent mode of viewing among eighteenth-century grand tourists, but it was crucial to the continuation of the public understanding of the 'standard of taste' as difficult to obtain. Otherwise, the devaluation of a key aspect of cultural and social cachet, a barrier against the rise of the middle classes, began to occur.

Pauline Borghese had been exploiting the gendered gaze at Rome, attracting the prurient gaze of both genders and collapsing the tacit understanding of the classical or neoclassical as free from impropriety. Her marble figure was understood not as an ideal and imagined body, but as an idealised portrayal of Pauline's own body by the sculptor. Her statue is noted by multiple visitors to Rome as Canova's favourite work. Yet there was no correlating response to the sculpture of Napoleon, which was on display at Canova's studio during this period. Nor was there any notable reaction to another of Canova's more innovative portrait works: King Ferdinand of Naples IV, represented in the guise of Minerva, goddess of wisdom [Fig. 4.14]. Canova does not seem to have been enthused by the commission, which took him from 1800 to 1818 to complete. He wrote,

...sapiate che ho dovuto accettare un nuovo lavoro, la statua di Ferdinando IV.562

The use of the verb 'dovere' reveals the pressure he felt to undertake the statue. The allegory was an unusual choice for a male in a position of political power, a 'gender-bending role', as Johns puts it.563 Despite the gossip surrounding the Pauline as Venus, two equally innovative portrait statues of male political figures by Canova created within the same decade maintained a low profile among visitors to Rome.

As the forerunner of a new genre of portrait sculpture, the Pauline as Venus set a dangerous precedent. The idea that the portrait head married a portrait body placed greater emphasis on the degree of masculinity and verity showcased by the body of the Napoleon as Mars. However, it is worth noting that the intended display context of the two works were very different. The Napoleon as Mars the Peacemaker would be exposed to particular scrutiny as well as vulnerability as an artwork of a powerful male figure. In comparison, the Pauline Borghese as Venus Venetrix was a commission for a private individual, albeit one who moved at the highest level of society, who lived in Italy, not France. Moreover, her

562 Honour and Mariuz, Scritti, 327, and 327, note 69, cited as Bassano del Grappa, Biblioteca Civica, Epistolario Canoviano R6313. The authors comment, 'La frase da l'idea di uno scarso entusiasmo.'
563 Johns, Politics of Patronage, 74. He records that in 1798 a republican mob stormed Canova's studio to destroy the model for the sculpture, but were unsuccessful- this speaks more of political opposition to Ferdinand IV than dismay over the borrowing of feminine virtues in a male portrait sculpture.
femininity, expressed through her sexuality by choice, was not threatened, but rather enhanced by the portrait imagery. The question of whether Napoleon's masculinity would have been threatened by the exhibition of the Napoleon as Mars is more difficult to establish. It is worth examining the reception of the work once Napoleon had been removed from the equation: after the Battle of Waterloo.

The Reception and Display of the Napoleon as Mars in London

The inability of the nineteenth-century viewer to conceptually, or literally, separate head from torso when viewing the Napoleon as Mars was reiterated in the fate of the sculpture.564 In 1815, Napoleon was defeated by the Duke of Wellington at the Battle of Waterloo. Italy immediately began negotiations to repatriate its antiquities. Antonio Canova was chosen by the Pope to act as ambassador for overturning the Treaty of Tolentino and recovering the artworks which had been removed to the Louvre when France annexed Italy in 1798. Among the statues in the Louvre was the Napoleon as Mars. Susan Jenkins has traced the negotiations over the statue, which were complicated by the desire of the French to exchange the Napoleon for the antique statue of the Nile.565 This would appear to contradict the understanding of a negative French reaction to the sculpture. As a well-known antique, the Nile was worth over ten times more. The British Ambassador Sir Charles Stuart seems to have been in favour, but Canova's friend William Hamilton was flatly against it, writing that Britain would not enter into any such scheme,

> The Nile was sent back to Rome because it belongs to the Pope & was taken from him by an act of Injustice. The Statue of Bonaparte can only be received by us in the conviction that the French Government wish to part with it & don't know what to do with it; but if they have any better purpose to put it to than as a Galanterie to the Duke of Wellington-I say, in God's name let them make the best of it & they will never hear any more of it from us: Canova too I am sure will not listen to the proposition you allude to.566

The statue had now become a trophy, or galanterie, representing the defeat of Napoleon. It is unclear whether Canova was concerned with the fate of the sculpture. The idea of Canova's interest in the Napoleon had arisen from Athenase Lavallee, successor to Denon as director

564 Quatremere de Quincy suggested exactly this, following the ancient Roman practice of damnatio memoriae in suggesting that Canova repurpose the statue to show a peacemaking Mars rather than Napoleon. Susan Jenkins, "Buying Bonaparte", Apollo (Nov. 2010): 54.
565 Jenkins, "Buying Bonaparte", 52.
566 Jenkins, "Buying Bonaparte", 53, original correspondence in National Gallery of Scotland, MS6171.
of the Museé Royal, or Louvre, who understood Canova had expressed as much in a letter to Quatremere de Quincy. Hamilton, as a friend to Canova, was adamant that Canova would not hear of his statue as part payment for the French retaining one of their looted antiquities. The original interest probably arose from Canova's concern over the work following the rapid dispersal of Napoleonic imagery from Paris under the rule of Louis XVIII. The statue was purchased by the British from the French at the price of 66,000 francs in 1816 and gifted by the Prince Regent to the Duke of Wellington.

Thus the statue of Napoleon as Mars the Peacemaker ended up, after a brief stint at the Duke of Richmond's Gardens, according to Susan Jenkins, in Apsley House, the London residence of his greatest military rival, the Duke of Wellington.\(^{567}\) It arrived after a long and difficult transportation process on 5 July, 1816. The stairwell where the statue still resides had to be reinforced to hold the 6,500kg sculpture. Wellington had plans to include it in a grand commemorative scheme, which would include a triumphal arch. Hamilton wrote to Canova that this arch would commemorate 'the three great men of our century: the Tyrant, the General and the Sculptor.'\(^{568}\)

The reception of the Napoleon statue in London, primed to dislike any symbol of hubris on the part of Napoleon, was negative. Criticism of the work was disseminated in newspaper accounts of its arrival,

> The attempt is said to have been too daring for the sculptor, who excels beyond any other living artist in the expression and delicate touches of poetical beauty, but who is thought to have been unsuccessful in this hazardous fight to rival the most exalted glories of Grecian art. The work was not liked in Paris, and was hardly unpacked: it was even the subject of sharp criticisms in Rome at the time of its execution.\(^{569}\)

Again, we find Canova's work discussed in terms of the masculine and feminine: delicate touches are his forte. The portrayal of the male body, particularly through the lens of British masculinity, was beyond his talent. There is no discussion of the likeness of the sculpture to the sitter. However, despite the potential for the sculpture to be employed as a symbol of Napoleon's humiliation, this does not appear to have occurred, largely owing to the Duke of Wellington's decision to display it in private.

---


\(^{568}\) Jenkins, "Buying Bonaparte", 55, original correspondence in Archives du Louvre, ALS30.

\(^{569}\) Jenkins, "Arthur Wellesley", 117, cited as the *Morning Chronicle*, Friday 5 September 1817 (ten weeks after the arrival of the Napoleon).
The only prurience associated with the sculpture in London is highlighted by Marie Busco.\(^{570}\) In 1822, the erection of a neoclassical bronze in honour of the Duke of Wellington became conflated with the idea of portrait sculpture [Fig. 4.15]. The general public was under the mistaken impression, possibly owing to Wellington's grand plans for a commemorative arch, that it was a portrait sculpture to match that of Napoleon. The fact that the money for the commission had been raised by women brought the female admiration for Wellington into the sphere of art. The idea of the female gaze, and the commission of a nude version of the Duke, caught the public imagination. The arrival of the *Napoleon as Mars* in London had cemented the genre of the nude male sculpture in the popular British imagination as improper, and immodest, qualities better attributed to their military rivals, the French. The original conception was for a monument to both educate the public in classical taste, and honour the Duke of Wellington. Much like the prurience which arose concerning the idea of Pauline Borghese self-fashioning in the form of nude sculpture, the combination of female art appreciation and nudity caused a scandal.

The monument in question was *The Achilles Monument to the Duke of Wellington*, a 6 metre bronze statue intended to depict the classical hero Achilles. At 6 metres, although the statue was not particularly similar in composition, the statue would dwarf the *Napoleon as Mars* in size, and it was likely also referred to as a 'colossal statue'. It was erected in Hyde Park by the British sculptor Richard Westmacott. The imagery was taken from a classical group at Rome, the *Quirinale Horse Tamers*, and was cast from cannon captured in the war. The public interest in the work was thus partly inspired by an obsession with souvenirs from the Napoleonic wars, including particularly relic-like souvenirs from the battleground of Waterloo.\(^{571}\) The translation of the sculpture into a relic, or souvenir, invoked the idea of nude sculpture as vulnerable to touch.

Three factors combined to create a cloud of scandal around the sculpture. Firstly, the widespread impression among the lower and middle classes of London that the *Achilles* was intended to be a portrait likeness of the Duke of Wellington. Secondly, even those elite viewers who understood from the original commissioner of the imagery, Countess Spencer, that the figure was borrowed directly from a classical precedent, would have been confused by the imagery. Only one figure was taken from a group equestrian sculpture. The figure

---


\(^{571}\) Captured cannon as a souvenir was a sanitary option compared to the craze for collecting scraps of clothing and bone from the battlefield. See Susan Pearce, "The material of war: Waterloo and its culture", in *Conflicting Visions: War and Visual Culture in Britain and France c.1700-1830*, ed. John Bonehill and Geoff Quilley, (Routledge, 2005): 207-226.
lacked a horse, and the active stance of the figure, brandishing shield and sword, was unsuitable for a stand-alone work. The inclusion of a Roman military breastplate beside the figure, which is not covered by the drapery hanging from the arm, served only to highlight the nudity of the figure. In composition, the Achilles was quite similar to the Napoleon as Mars, but with excessive musculature on the torso. The positioning of the upwardly thrusting sword was particularly suggestive. The active pose of the figure belied the idea that it had just taken off its armour. It was simultaneously naked and martial: all aspects which called to mind the Napoleon as Mars.

Finally, the idea of a female agent commissioning male sculpted nudity to be displayed in a public setting touched on British anxiety over the propriety of the female gaze. The idea that the commission was based on a desire to disseminate classical taste was quickly undermined by the reception of the sculpture. Much like the fate of the Monument to General Desaix in Paris, the public setting resulted in a negative reaction to the nudity. The commission had been handed over to a male committee once the money had been raised. This committee took the decision to amend the figure with a large bronze fig leaf. This was intended to shield female viewers from any potential impropriety, but had the effect of creating instant scandal surrounding the figure. Satires immediately appeared in the popular press [Fig. 4.16]. The positioning of the statue and its height, combined with the wide stance of the legs, were particularly suggestive. The number of women, children and pointing hands in the satire all denote the impropriety of the imagery.572

A statue which, as Marie Busco points out, was chosen after a classical model in order to educate the general public, became a focus point for several of British society's concerns at the time. Particularly alarming was the idea that Wellington might be tempted into the kind of hubris which had resulted in the Napoleon statue. The potential effeminacy of certain types of the male nude body in 1811 had transformed into British disregard for any form of sculpted nudity. British viewers of Canova's sculpture by 1822 increasingly found fault with the femininity of both his male and his female sculptures, for example, the Scottish Earl of Minto complained in 1822 of,

572 It is notable that the arrival of the Napoleon as Mars at London does not appear to have occasioned the same artistic response, especially given the contrast between the height of the sculpture and the popular satirical depiction of Napoleon as the diminutive figure of 'Little Boney'.
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The Earl’s reaction is suggestive of a change in sensibility across both genders, not just the female visitors to Rome whose detailed travel accounts have informed this chapter. This was possibly as a result of decades of mixed-gender sociability at the sculpture collections and studios of Rome, as well as new ideas around masculinity in the wake of the Napoleonic War. The nationalistic equation of effeminacy and Frenchness is unsurprising. What is notable is the way in which the female nude began to be equated with licentiousness among living women. This kind of correlation had been precipitated by women like Pauline Borghese and Emma Hamilton, who propagated the idea of the upper class female as model. The rejection of both genders as portrayed by Canova reflected a wider cultural change towards propriety which rendered fleshy works problematic. In England, the sculptor Chantrey began to be praised for his simple works, while in Rome, foreigners celebrated Bertel Thorvaldsen for his more severe neoclassicism.

Conclusion

The *Napoleon as Mars the Peacemaker* and *Pauline as Venus Venetrix* symbolised either sides of a gender divide which permeated social activities at early nineteenth-century Rome, from politics to portraiture. Changing articulations of masculinity in Britain and France, partly owing to new thinking on the difference between gender and sex, resulted in the gendered reception of Antonio Canova's works. His figures became the site of debate among visitors to his studio: his ideal male beauties degenerated into effeminate males for British viewers. The expression of gender characteristics were expected to remain within the boundaries of the individual sex. Canova's ability to sculpt a desirable surface, combined with a new mode of viewing which prioritised the surface through torch-light viewing, resulted in the celebration of his sculpture. His softly moulded *Venus Italica* excited the kind of admiration once reserved for the *Venus de Medici*. But his attempts to sculpt life-like figures, or veined male figures, resulted in criticism. The reception of Canova's sculpture by foreign visitors to Rome thus reveals their cultural and nationalistic biases.

---


574 Yarrington, *Lustrous Trade*, 133, Chantrey's rejection of allegory and simplicity 'untainted by foreign influence' played a large part in his popularity.
This chapter has focussed on the British and the French reception of sculpted nudity. The commissions for the *Napoleon as Mars* and *Pauline as Venus* were made in a context of rapid cultural and political change as Napoleon's power solidified. The combination of portrait features with an ideal body was innovative, but was based on ancient Roman practices. It was the prurient appeal of the *Pauline as Venus*, and the actions of the sitter, which acted to alter the marble figure from an ideal Venus to a portrayal of Pauline as Venus. The ideal body became the idealised representation of a living sitter. This conflation was deliberate on the part of Pauline Borghese, who embraced her sexual liberty as the sole source of social cachet accessible to her. The potential ramifications of this conflation can be seen in the eventual rejection of sensuality in Canova's sculptures, of both genders, by British visitors to Rome in the 1820s.

In comparison, the idea that the body of the portrait sculpture would be compared to his own body was dangerous for Napoleon. His commission was a social blunder in various ways, from the commissioning of an Italian artist, to the nudity, to the allegory of himself as a martial god. The real reason behind his rejection of the sculpture is unclear. But it is evident that Pauline had set a precedent which Napoleon was unable to follow. A decade earlier the potential prurience of the sculpture had been minimal. By 1811, a wider demographic of citizens were likely to view the work, and the distancing effect of a classical narrative was weakened. Art appreciation was no longer the preserve of the wealthy male. Napoleon faced numerous battles in his career and could not afford to cause a disruption to his carefully crafted image as a man of the people. At the age of 42, his youthful arrogance and disinterest when sitting for the commission, combined with a different viewing public, resulted in his setting aside the sculpture. It is unclear whether he was expecting an ideal or an idealised version of his own body to appear in sculpted form.

The differing reception of the *Napoleon as Mars* and the *Pauline as Venus* sheds light on the complexity of viewing sculpture at Rome. Italian, French and British conceptions of gender all differed, although each nation was becoming more conservative. Canova's studio acted as a single point of reference in a melting-pot of nationalities and cultural biases. Two conflicting modes of viewing, loosely based on gender, and the complex reception of innovative sculpted nudity by Canova, reveal the early nineteenth-century concern with how best to self-fashion according to gender and status.
Conclusion

On 24 February 1773, Andrew Caldwell wrote from Dublin to his friend James Caulfield, Lord Charlemont, whose influential self-fashioning at Rome in the early 1750s was discussed in Chapter One. Caldwell described how, at Charlemont's request, he had assigned two workmen to clean Lord Charlemont's medal room. The men worked for ten days, and created such a mess that they were dismissed 'in a passion'. Following their departure, it was discovered that they had embellished Charlemont's full-sized copy of the Venus de Medici, which he had acquired on his grand tour. The ensuing description of the damage is worth quoting in full:

It is not to be suppos'd that two Garcons, fresh and healthy could be so long shut up there and not sensible to the charms of the Venus, your Lordship will find whatever the Sculptor might have omitted the Pencil has now amply supplied, nay I am not sure but the same accident has happen'd to the Venus de Charlemont that happened long ago to the Venus of Praxitiles, which old story yr Lordship knows they have vamp'd up at Rome relative to a Statue on the Tomb of one of the Popes, the worst of it is, it will bring great inconvenience on Prudes before company, I mean yr Venus, my Ld.

The pencil presumably supplied nipples and pubic hair, an act which stripped the Venus of her ideal aspect, rendering her a naked woman. The potential eroticism of sculpture which moved from ideal form to idealised reality when viewed was discussed in Chapter Four.

According to Pliny, one viewer of the Aphrodite at Knidos became so enamoured of the statue's beauty that he snuck in at night to couple with the statue and left a stain upon her thigh. In his letter to Lord Charlemont, Andrew Caldwell is suggesting that the Charlemont Venus was subjected to the same treatment. He thus acknowledged that the sculpted body could act as a symbol of nakedness or nudity, pornography or art, depending

---

575 Andrew Caldwell, 1733-1808, Irish barrister and later MP, friend to Charlemont and member of the Royal Irish Academy.
576 This Venus is the copy of the Venus de Medici acquired by Charlemont from Joseph Wilton while on his grand tour.
579 Pliny the Elder, Naturalis Historia 36, 21.
on the gaze it was subjected to. Despite the damage to an expensive sculpture, Caldwell considered the actions of the workmen to have stemmed from placing 'fresh and healthy' young men in close contact with it. Caldwell's understanding that the statue of Venus would naturally appear obscene to such men is further elucidated,

...many a hearty but I hope involuntary Curse I foresee your Lordship will bestow on me for the scrape I have involv'd you in, by discovering your belle inconnue to the Vulgar gaze.

Caldwell's closing remarks play on the original narrative of the sculpture, in which Venus attempts to shield her body from the unexpected viewer. The anecdote reveals an acknowledged gap between the performance of a natural, uninformed response to the sculpture, and the demands of polite sociability. The need to repair the damage to the sculpture is only necessary owing to 'prudes' who would not appreciate the joke between two elite men in private correspondence. The extent to which the presence of the Vatican Ariadne in portraiture by Batoni was part of a similar humorous acknowledgement of the potential eroticism of classical sculpture, intended to be unpacked by male grand tourist viewers, was discussed in Chapter Two.

This kind of reception of classical sculpture was not unique to Charlemont's Venus. In Then and Now: Collecting and Classicism in Eighteenth-Century England, Joan Coutu delivers a persuasive argument as to the role of collecting in the pursuit of political aims. She notes the impact of casts in the entrance hall at Wentworth Woodhouse in England, or Charlemont House in Dublin, writing, 'erudition and exemplum are evoked by instant recognition of great classical statues, set within the context of the whole room.' On the following page, she notes,

The nudity of the sculptures is also a critical component; the suppleness of the smooth marble bodies plays into the elegance of sophisticated refinement and, on a more physical note, must have gone some way toward satisfying a young man's sexual yearnings. The young Duke of Richmond's exclamation that "I am in love with the Venus and take great pleasure to stroke her bum and thighs" likely rang true for most of his generation.

---

580 This argument is most memorably articulated in the work of John Berger, Ways of Seeing. (Penguin, 1972).
583 Coutu, Then and Now, 66.
584 Coutu, Then and Now, 67. The quotation is cited as Richmond to Henry Fox, 3 May 1755, quoted in [M.M] Reese, Goodwood's Oak, 53.
The eventual slippage between marble and flesh which this kind of viewing encouraged was
capitalised on by Pauline Borghese in her portrait sculpture by Antonio Canova, discussed in
Chapter Four. Both anecdotes are from private correspondence, and deal with contemporary
sculpture in a domestic setting. In public collections at Rome, the introduction of the female
gaze, or the increase in mixed-gender sociability, altered the way in which sculpture was
viewed within the space. Changes in sensibility can be seen in the popularity of the
torchlight visit, the studio visit and travel accounts by female authors, discussed in Chapter
Three.

One practical change was at the Vatican, which clearly interpreted the introduction of the
female gaze as an indication that any potential prurience should be definitively curtailed.
Johann Joachim Winckelmann wrote in 1759 of the decision at the Vatican to cover the
genitalia of the male sculptures with tin fig leaves.\(^{585}\) The female sculptures were not
considered a threat to either gender's modesty. The decision exposes the awkward transition
from male grand tourist sociability to mixed-gender viewing of sculpture. However, a
male/prurient and female/Romantic binary of sensibility or sociability is not fully accurate.
Chloe Chard relates in her discussion of joking as a method of navigating society abroad that

Henry Matthews finished his account of the Vatican sculpture by remarking,

> Nothing can be more ridiculously prudish. That imagination must be depraved
beyond all hope, that can find any prurient gratification in the cold chaste nakedness
of an ancient marble. It is the fig-leaf alone that suggests any idea of indecency.\(^{586}\)

Michael Squire argued for a similar reading of the fig-leaf in his study of the eighteenth-
century reception of classical sculpture.\(^{587}\) It was arguably the fig-leaf which brought the
potential scandal surrounding the female commissioning of the *Achilles* monument in Hyde
Park, discussed in Chapter Four, to the forefront of public debate in the form of satirical
imagery.\(^{588}\)

Henry Matthews viewed the sculpture in 1820, and was thus joined in the space by men and
women, whose modesty he evidently felt would not be threatened by ancient and idealised

\(^{585}\) Winckelmann, 28 July 1759, in Hans Diepolder and Walther Rehm ed., *Brieie*, 8 Vol.s (Berlin,

\(^{586}\) Chloe Chard, ""Fog in the Channel": Joking, Laughing and Travelling" in *The Legacy of the Grand
of an Invalid, Being the Journal of a Tour in Pursuit of Health in Portugal, Italy, Switzerland and

'....art' is allowed to break usual social conventions, even if the fig-leaf simultaneously recalls them.'

\(^{588}\) Sir Richard Westmacott, *The Achilles Monument to the Duke of Wellington*, 1822, 6m, Hyde Park,
London.
sculpted genitals. Instead, his own modesty came under threat, as his protestations resulted in the opposite effect he intended,

I was complaining loudly of this barbarous addition, when an Italian lady of the party assented to my criticism, and whispered in my ear, -that I must come again in the Autumn. 589

The use of the word 'prude', which Caldwell also employed when writing about Charlemont's Venus, is striking. In private correspondence between men, prudes were those who would not appreciate the humour behind acknowledging the potential impropriety of ancient sculpture. In a public mixed-gender scenario, by professing himself against prudishness, Matthews exposes himself to a joke which suggests his desire to see beneath the fig leaf.

The hidden balancing act behind the British viewing of sculpted bodies which supposedly contradicted cultural mores is evident in the following account of viewing sculpture by Lady Murray, a British woman travelling abroad in the early nineteenth century whose Journal has informed much of Part II of this thesis,

In the library I observed a pretty figure of Psyche, in plaster, by Galli; and on saying to the Cavaliere it was a pity not to have it done in marble, he replied, "As it was a naked figure it would not do to have it placed in a house where there were young people." I held my peace, but could not help thinking inwardly that young Neapolitans were pretty well accustomed to see their own species in a state of nudity, and a drive along the Marina or Chiaja would, in that respect, offer more objections than the inspection of any gallery of statues. 590

Lady Murray is defending the practice of viewing sculpture from an accusation of impropriety, employing Italian societal norms as a negative comparison point to British culture. The quote indicates the correlation in the nineteenth-century imagination between marble and flesh: transmuting the sculpture to marble would increase its sensuality for the viewer, tempting younger viewers to touch. As she inwardly corrects her male guide, Lady Murray adheres to British societal expectations of gender and sociability in not verbally contradicting him, yet her printed words expose her own objectionable viewing in Italy.

The quotes employed here demonstrate the complicated nature of British engagement with classical sculpture in the second half of the long eighteenth century, on the part of both genders. What is evident is that British visitors to Rome employed classical imagery in the formation and articulation of their own pictorial identities in a complex and nuanced manner.

589 Chard, "Fog in the Channel", 3.
The extent to which this involved publicly suppressing potential impropriety in favour of maintaining elite British cultural norms is impossible to say. However, in their reception of nude portrait sculpture, the British revealed a highly gendered approach to the sculpted body, which indicated the conflation of their national biases and their aesthetic judgement.

Summary of Chapters

This thesis moved to interrogate portraiture within a highly specific chronological and geographical framework. Over the course of four chapters, portraiture commissioned from 1740 to 1830 has been subjected to detailed visual analysis, questioned within a context of self-fashioning, sculpture, and sociability at Rome, and placed into the context of primary written evidence of the experience of visiting Rome. The overall objective was to treat British, and subsequently European, portraiture as part of self-fashioning at Rome: reflective not only of engagement with classical sculpture, but revealing the ways in which that engagement was governed by cultural and national biases. The focus on self-fashioning revealed the significance of the portrait object, the focus on sculpture revealed the ways in which the studio and the museum began to be conflated, weaving the sitter's imagery into the visual tapestry of Rome, and the focus on sociability revealed the extent to which the display context of the studio could be of primary importance to the sculptor, and presumably, some sitters. Each chapter investigated portraiture which had not been fully unpacked by scholars, often adding a new angle or argument to the existing scholarship.

Part I investigated the development of a grand tourist-specific pictorial identity in the work of Pompeo Batoni, from the first innovative appearance of the Colosseum within the portrait space discussed in Chapter One, to the elaborate construction of the sitter fashioning himself as standing amongst a personalised canon of classical sculpture in Chapter Two. It argued that the portraiture of Pompeo Batoni, long established as illustration of British grand tourists, reveals more about the realities of British sociability at Rome than has previously been realised by scholars. By focussing on Irish sitters in Chapter One, including Lord Charlemont, who had undertaken extensive travels, and exploring their impact on the pictorial record of grand tourism in 1750s Rome, it became evident that the priority for the British was to self-fashion as a cohesive group at Rome. Through in-depth analysis of portrait imagery, an understanding of the materiality of the sculpted object within the painted portrait space, and an investigation of the extent to which the grand tourist mode of viewing sculpture affected their understanding of art, and in particular, themselves as art, the Batoni
portrait which referenced antiquity was presented as a complex symbol of personal and collective identity in Chapter Two.

The idea of collective identity, first established in Chapter One in an investigation of group caricature at Rome in 1751, as part of the visual record of British sociability, is extended in relation to the painted portrait in Chapter Two. In referencing a particular piece of antiquity, the sitter was not only expressing his sense of taste in accordance with the rituals of self-fashioning as a grand tourist, but was creating a symbol of a shared experience which was meaningful to another viewer who had visited Rome. The increasingly sensual depiction of the \textit{Vatican Ariadne} revealed the extent to which sculpture performed as a readable object, which by the 1770s could be visually transmuted by the viewer into a real woman in the portrait of Thomas Coke. This slippage between the viewing of marble bodies, and the real flesh of Italian conquests, was largely unproblematic in the context of male sociability.

Part II explored the early nineteenth-century social geography of Rome, as established by the emergence of the feminine authorial voice in travel literature. The written record revealed the culmination of a slow change in the demographics and sensibilities of British visitors to Rome from the 1780s onwards. The perceived all-male sanctity of the sculpture collection gave way to a broader form of sociability, including a different mode of viewing. The use of the term 'elite' became more complicated in Part II, as the demographics, and particularly gender, of British visitors to Rome under discussion had changed. The sociability governing the viewing of sculpture evolved, as a conflict occurred between the grand tourist gaze, which embraced female sculpted nudity, and the gaze which sought an emotional connection with sculpture in accordance with Romantic ideals of sensibility. A new argument for the increased detail in portrait busts commissioned at Rome was presented in Chapter Three as part of an effort to recreate the studio of Christopher Hewetson.

Viewing classical sculpture by torchlight, and viewing sculpture up close in the studio, were practices which provided an opportunity for the viewer to divert away from the traditional narratives of the grand tourist/patron. Instead, the viewer controlled the viewing experience, seeking a meaningful connection to the sculpture, and in the case of the studio, offering aesthetic judgement based on their viewing experience, whether out loud, or in written form after the fact. The experiences of both Charlotte Eaton and Lady Murray, who travelled to Rome following the end of the Napoleonic War, revealed the extent to which a friendship with a well-known sculptor was a form of social cachet, replacing the traditional artist-patron relationship. For Eaton, this resulted in increased access to the collections of Rome, while for Lady Murray, it was a source of great pride, to the extent that she requested a souvenir of
Canova's actual body, instead of purchasing one of his works. This trend was Europe-wide, as the commissioning of art, and slowly the viewing of classical art, began to be influenced by the expectations of the majority over the minority.

This resulted in increased susceptibility to social and cultural change, such as the 'gender panic' which swept Britain from the 1780s. Antonio Canova, feted for his ability to sculpt sensual figures who belonged in the canon of classical sculpture, found in the reception of his work the articulation of national and cultural anxieties. The reception of his nude portrait sculpture, discussed in Chapter Four, was representative of societal conflict over the potential prurience of viewing the sculpted body. By capitalising on the idea of her portrait sculpture as a performance of the self as art, Pauline Borghese collapsed the distance between the marble and her flesh, and set the standard for the viewing of nude portrait sculpture of a living sitter.

When placed into the context of Canova's preferred male bodies, it is evident that the Napoleon as Mars achieved a naturalism that was difficult for Canova, contravening the idea of its being subversive in its nudity. The sculpture was in fact a success when viewed solely as an example of a Roman heroic nude portrait statue. But while viewing the Pauline as Venus, or more accurately, Pauline in the nude, was titillating, viewing the Napoleon as Mars, which offered an obvious visual disconnect between head and body, was confusing. The statue failed to fully articulate either genre of sculpture: the neoclassical or the portrait. British males, sceptical of Canova's attempts to sculpt hyper-masculine bodies, and uneasy at Canova's lithe, effeminate bodies that seemed to advocate the lustful gaze of men towards male bodies, questioned their cultural dependency on celebrating historically homosexual figures like the Belvedere Antinous. They signalled in their collective repudiation of Canova a move away from the veneration of antiquity, a trend which would reach a climax during the Victorian period in Britain.
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