GRAND TOUR PORTRAITS OF WOMEN

A Thesis

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree Master of Arts in the

Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By

Courtni Elizabeth James, B.A.

*****

The Ohio State University
2001

Master's Examination Committee:

Dr. Arline Meyer, Adviser

Dr. Pamela Fletcher

Approved by

Adviser

Department of History of Art
ABSTRACT

This paper answers the question of whether or not there are Grand Tour portraits of women. Traditionally, the Grand Tour was considered an integral part of the education of young British aristocratic men, and women have been excluded from discussions of the subject in scholarly literature. A survey of the Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy, 1701-1800 indicates that approximately one-third of the travelers were women. In addition, I discovered reproductions of twenty-nine portraits of British women painted abroad, which document their participation in the Grand Tour. These facts demonstrate that an updated definition of the Grand Tour is needed.

This paper also attempts to advance understanding of women's experiences in the eighteenth century. The first chapter examines reasons why women went abroad and studies their activities while on the Grand Tour. I consider the implications of their travels, especially in relation to women's education in the eighteenth century. The second chapter traces the development of the portrait genre in England to provide a foundation for understanding the format and poses used in Grand Tour portraits. The third chapter deals with the Grand Tour portraits of women, analyzing them in terms of traditional representation of females in portraiture and also comparing them with Grand
Tour portraits of men. The most successful portrait painters are discussed, including Pompeo Batoni, Anton Raphael Mengs, Angelica Kauffman, and Rosalba Carriera, as well as some lesser-known artists including Robert Fagan, Charles Grignion, and Louis Gauffier.

The portraits in this study reveal differences in how men and women were portrayed. In Grand Tour portraits of men, recognizable architectural monuments, classical statues, or distinct landscape elements are a defining feature, but these elements are rare in Grand Tour portraits of women. It is unusual to see a Grand Tour portrait of a man as an allegorical figure, while women are commonly depicted in the guise of Diana, Flora, or a shepherdess. Grand Tour portraits of women are valuable for providing evidence of women’s presence abroad, but in terms of format, they generally adhere to the well-established, traditional styles of representation used in the eighteenth century.
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INTRODUCTION

The existence of portraits of British women painted in Italy is evidence that females participated in the eighteenth century Grand Tour, an event typically associated exclusively with males. Using these portraits as a primary source, this paper attempts to advance understanding of women’s experiences in the eighteenth century and to correct the general neglect of female travelers in Grand Tour literature. I will also examine the Grand Tour portrait within the context of the English portrait tradition, and analyze a selection of portraits of women painted abroad.

In the eighteenth century increased numbers of British men and women were traveling abroad for pleasure, but because passports were not required at that time and reliable records were not kept, accurate figures for the number of tourists are not available.¹ In 1997 the information accumulated in the Brinsley Ford Archive of research on eighteenth century tourists was made available by the publication of the Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy, 1701-1800.² This is perhaps the most useful resource for exploring the topic, containing data on some 6,000 travelers. Approximately one-third of the entries are for females, and even more women travelers are briefly mentioned within entries of their husband or other male relatives. Although at least 2,000 women
were likely to have been abroad in the eighteenth century, no published scholarly literature to date specifically addresses this group.

In researching the Grand Tour, several types of sources provide useful information. The best primary sources are letters and diaries or journals written by tourists, but the few of these that are published are often heavily edited. Jeremy Black tells us “much tourist correspondence is poorly catalogued and scattered in general political or family correspondence, and in consequence, difficult to find. By ignoring the vast bulk of unprinted material and concentrating on a relatively small number of familiar texts, a somewhat narrow conception of eighteenth century tourism has developed.”\(^3\) This lack of material is partly responsible for the problems in defining the Grand Tour. In the present study, an attempt has been made to use portraits as a primary source, largely because textual evidence is rare and inaccessible.

A review of relevant scholarly texts to date reveals that a serious and systematic study of the Grand Tour portrait has yet to be undertaken. Aside from a few short articles that deal with specific portraits or collections, the research presented here draws from historical reviews and exhibition catalogs. In the traditional document based account used by historians, the letters and travel journals of the tourists are heavily quoted as primary sources of information integral to understanding their activities on the Tour. These types of books tend to use portraits to illustrate the accounts given by the sitters. The only discussion of the portrait is usually relegated to a few sentences, a small paragraph, or a caption for the image.
An example of this type of source is Hibbert's book *The Grand Tour*, in which he gives a step-by-step account of what the tourist was expected to do in every city, which hotels were the most desirable, what types of clothing one should purchase and how much one should pay, and so on. Surprisingly, he does not describe the experience of sitting to an artist for a portrait. He singles out only one artist, Pompeo Batoni, in two brief mentions: once in a caption to a conversation piece where he says that "the Tourist was expected to bring home from Rome a portrait of himself painted against the background of one or other of the city's notable antiquities, preferably by Pompeo Batoni." Later, he tells us again "what [the tourist] usually wanted in Italy was some personal record of his visit, a portrait done in Rome—preferably by Pompeo Batoni with a ruin, the Colosseum perhaps, in the background." 4

Jeremy Black provides accounts similar to Hibbert's, supporting his points with quotations from or about specific travelers. In his two books on the Grand Tour, he includes a chapter on the arts of music, painting, and architecture. 5 However, he devotes only a paragraph to portraiture specifically, and instead, he focuses on issues such as collecting and on tourists' impressions of the major art monuments in Rome. In his book *Venice and the Grand Tour*, Bruce Redford makes interesting observations on the differences between the portraits painted by Pompeo Batoni in Rome and Rosalba Carriera in Venice. 6 However, the purpose of his discussion of these portraits is to characterize the differences between the two cities.
Exhibition catalogues are the second major source for learning about Grand Tour portraiture. In the early 1980s, two exhibitions focused on the Grand Tour. The 1982 exhibition *Souvenirs from the Grand Tour* includes view paintings, landscapes, furniture, conversation pieces, religious paintings, and several portraits by Batoni, Carrera, Dance, Mengs, Nazzari, and Vigee Le Brun.\(^7\) Sponsored by the National Trust of England, this exhibition was a showcase for objects in English collections. In the following year, the exhibition *Views from the Grand Tour* was displayed in New York.\(^8\) As its title suggests, this exhibition consisted of landscapes and view paintings by Canaletto, Bellotto, Guardi, Panini and others. The short introduction to the catalogue touches on other issues related to the Grand Tour, but overall the exhibition is not relevant to the study of portraiture.

The catalogue for the comprehensive 1996 exhibition *Grand Tour: the Lure of Italy in the Eighteenth Century* discusses many important aspects of the Grand Tour, such as the journey, the places, festivals and folklore, the antique, and the travelers.\(^9\) These topics are explored via drawings, caricature, landscape painting, portraiture and other art forms. Although portraits of female travelers are included, the catalogue entries do not specifically address the issue of women on the Grand Tour. The latest publication in this field is the catalogue from the 2000 exhibition, *Art in Rome in the Eighteenth Century*.\(^10\) The catalogue is a massive survey of art made in Rome, including architecture, decorative arts, sculpture, paintings, drawings, and prints. It offers the most complete characterization of the cosmopolitan nature of that city, and although it draws on
the most recent scholarship and less familiar subjects, this study also neglects to discuss women's lives in Rome in the eighteenth century.

Finding reproductions of portraits of British women painted abroad posed a challenge. Biographies of women known to have traveled abroad often include portraits of the subject to illustrate their story, and provided me with some examples. However, I had far greater success by investigating the work of artists known to have painted Grand Tour portraits of men. In all, I discovered only twenty-nine reproductions of portraits of women painted abroad. Certainly more exist but reproductions were unavailable or untraceable. This number is surprisingly small, considering that there are literally hundreds of known examples of portraits of men painted abroad.

Examining the portrait career of Pompeo Batoni (1708-1787) illustrates the disparity in the number of female sitters. Batoni was the favorite of English tourists, who comprised seventy-five percent of his clients. However, out of 184 identified British sitters, Batoni only painted seventeen women.\(^\text{11}\) That proportion seems unbalanced considering that approximately one-third of British tourists were female. In examining portraits by the better-known artists working in Italy in the eighteenth century, the majority of subjects are males—surviving examples of female portraits by only a few artists are known. The fact that it is so rare to find portraits of women abroad in spite of the large number of female tourists begs for further investigation.
CHAPTER 1

THE GRAND TOUR

Defining the Grand Tour is a difficult task. John Reeve says the Grand Tour “was made by the classically educated male members of the northern European ruling class to complete their education, to acquire manners and languages and to attain an understanding of the politics of other countries, their economies, geography and history.”\textsuperscript{12} Jeremy Black uses the phrase “Grand Tour” to imply a set purpose and a distinct itinerary. Chloe Chard considers the Grand Tour in terms of its topography, which “has no clearly fixed borders, but is defined by the assumption that travel on the Grand Tour entails a movement from Northern to Southern Europe, is primarily concerned with Italy, and necessarily involves a visit to Rome.”\textsuperscript{13} Because Chard’s definition allows for a broad view of the Grand Tour, it is the most satisfying for the context of the present study. A rigid definition of the Grand Tour is misguided because of the myriad variations of the Grand Tour. For example, many tourists did not take the full Grand Tour, and a number of British decided to settle abroad instead of returning home.\textsuperscript{14} The phrase “Grand Tour” is usually tied to the idea of a British gentleman’s education, but its frequent usage in scholarly literature, biography, and travel writing as an expression to indicate travel to the continent
notwithstanding destination, purpose, or gender makes a precise definition impossible; one must simply consider the context of the widely used phrase “Grand Tour” in order to determine the writer’s intended meaning, which is seldom very specific.

Between the years 1720 and 1790, it was customary for young aristocratic Englishmen to complete their education by traveling abroad. These tourists often traveled with a tutor, for the purpose of cultivating taste. Although the majority of travelers were British, the Grand Tour was not a uniquely British phenomenon, and people from all over Europe and even farther afield made the Grand Tour as a right of passage. The tourists spent time in France, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Germany, but their main destination was Italy, specifically Rome, the pilgrimage site for revisiting the classical past.

The period between 1764 and 1796 signified a long period of peace in Europe, between the end of the Seven Years War and the beginning of the Napoleonic Wars, and was called the “golden age” of the Grand Tour. During this time, the number of travelers increased, but the proportion of women travelers especially grew. Also during this time, anxiety about keeping British women contented within the domestic sphere was deepening as more and more of them became active outside it. After 1776, the determination to regulate women’s freedom of action increased, as evidenced by the emphasis in print, art, and the spoken word on the need to exclude women from public life. In this chapter, the activities of women while abroad will be examined, especially in
relation to education, in order to augment the recent argument that men and women did not in fact live in "separate spheres" in the eighteenth century.¹⁷

Men and women both traveled to Italy for a wide variety of reasons. Commonly, men were motivated to travel to advance their social and political or professional careers by making contacts in Italy. Another reason to go abroad was to spend time in a warmer climate which was recommended for people prone to ill health. For some, travel was simply a remedy for restlessness and boredom.¹⁸ By the 1760s, the social practice of "companionate marriages" became more common, and therefore husbands and wives were traveling together for pleasure.¹⁹ Some women traveled to Italy with husbands and other family members on a marriage tour, such as Lady Mary Fitzpatrick Fox, and Countess Georgiana Spencer.²⁰ Women also went abroad for a few reasons men did not share. For example, sometimes widows went abroad to live out the rest of their lives, and some women traveled abroad to conceal illegitimate pregnancies, such as Georgiana, the Duchess of Devonshire and Lady Elizabeth Foster, or to escape from uncomfortable situations such as a forced marriage, like Mrs. Fitzherbert, the Catholic widow and love interest of the Prince of Wales.²¹

One author explains that few women traveled due to a lack of comfort and safety.²² In spite of improvements made by the eighteenth century, travel was still slow and rough, and there was always the risk of robbery or accident. The correspondence of Lady Mary Wortley Montague, a prominent early female traveler, relates several dangerous experiences from being violently tossed in a
weak vessel while crossing the channel to a chaise accident en route to Naples. Lady Mary Wortley Montague was one of the most well known widely traveled women. She traveled all through the continent as well as Turkey. Her travels provided the influence for her advanced ideas and opinions, especially in regard to education. She noted that in Italy, women’s achievements were a source of pride and respect, and that “there is no part of the World where our Sex is treated with so much contempt as in England . . . I think it the highest Injustice . . . that the same Studies which raise the character of a Man should hurt that of a Woman. We are educated in the grossest ignorance . . . if some few get above their Nurses’ instructions, our knowledge must rest conceal’d and be as useless to the World as Gold in the mine.”

Women did not yet have the same formal educational opportunities as men. In the eighteenth century education was gender specific. For upper class males, the purpose of schooling was “to produce men with a particular style of body, mind and character, men able effectively to head the social and gender order.” For girls however, the primary reason for education was to improve their chances on the marriage market; an educated woman made a better companion for a husband. Boys were subjected to a classical curriculum. In grammar school they studied arithmetic, writing, geography, navigation, mathematics, languages, and drawing. By age thirteen, they would often be sent to boarding school, with Eton setting the standard. Generally, boys would spend twenty-one hours a week studying Latin and Greek, while also studying geography, algebra, French, drawing, dancing, and fencing. Following boarding
school boys went to university, where their primary purpose was to secure social contacts. After attending university, men were expected to go on a Grand Tour, often lasting two to three years. Sometimes, going to university was replaced by taking the Grand Tour, which “was a crucial formative aspect of English upper class manhood.”27 The purpose of the Grand Tour was to become a man. It was an exercise in social finishing where one would acquire knowledge and artistic taste, then obtain standing in one’s local society.

Through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, girls were thought to be uneducable by nature. They were excluded from schools, or only allowed to stay until age nine or ten. Some daughters of the aristocracy had tutors at home to teach them the classical curriculum, but many were self-educated. A number of boarding schools were available to girls in the seventeenth century, but these taught finishing school curriculum: reading, writing, dancing, music, needlework, religion. After the Restoration, French was added to the curriculum, as it became the fashionable language.28 The eighteenth century saw increasing numbers and variety of girls schools, but most followed the finishing school pattern, with academic subjects such as classical languages, Italian, astronomy, and arithmetic only added to the curriculum by the end of the century.29

The education of Georgiana Spencer, later Duchess of Devonshire, is a case in point. Taught in the home by private tutors, she studied etiquette, dancing, harp playing, singing, drawing, horsemanship, religion, writing, geography, French, Latin, and Italian, with the aim of making her “polished but not overly educated.”30 The inclusion of Latin is significant. Latin was
considered “the foundation of the making of the rational man and a necessary mark of status.” Between 1600 and 1800, Latin “became firmly installed as the male elite’s secret language.” It signified a mark of learning and superiority, especially relating to class and gender difference.

By the eighteenth century, it had been realized that girls were capable of successfully learning in the same areas as boys, when provided with the same opportunities. However, these subjects were considered to be masculine and parents did not want to take time away from their daughter’s learning of “the appropriate feminine virtues.” It was thought that an academic or intellectual education would replace a woman’s modesty with pride instead. Educated women were not admired for scholarship if that was their only accomplishment. The seventeenth century disliked intellectual women because they caused tension in the traditionally male dominated society. It was felt that the only way to keep women content with domestic activities in the home was to put constraints on the education they had available to them. In the eighteenth century, it gradually became acceptable for women to indulge in intellectual interests as long as it did not interfere with their domestic duties.

Women who traveled abroad in the eighteenth century participated in many of the same activities as men, such as intellectual entertainment in the form of scientific lectures and studies of antique statuary and architecture. A drawing from 1793 by Guiseppe Cades (1750-1799) depicts the well-known artist and excavator Gavin Hamilton leading a group of British on a tour to the archaeological site at Gabii (Figure 1). This drawing documents women's
presence on the popular tours of the excavations of ancient sites that were in progress. It also shows that the women in the group rode donkeys while the men walked along side them. Although the drawing is too small to determine the likeness of individuals, it provides valuable evidence for this study.

In spite of some curtailed sections, Lady Holland’s journal provides an extensive record and details of her travels and experiences, which typify a woman’s activities abroad. She had implored her husband, Sir Godfrey Webster, to take her on a Grand Tour, and so with their two infant sons, they left England in June of 1791. They spent some time in Paris and Switzerland before arriving at Turin in May of 1792. Spending a month there, she attended chemical lectures and met Lady Bessborough and Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire. Then the Websters went to Milan, Dresden, Vienna, Venice, and on to Naples, where she gave birth to their third son in February of 1793. In Naples, she again spent time with the Duchess, and visited Pompeii and Paestum. In May, they moved on to Rome, where Lady Holland studied antiquities under Colin Morison. In June, they went to Florence, where she went to the opera with Lady Foster and her brother Lord Hervey and his wife. From Florence, the Websters returned to England, ending their first continental tour.

Lady Foster traveled abroad a number of times. In 1782, Lady Foster took young Charlotte, the illegitimate daughter of the Duke of Devonshire, on a continental tour. After a year and a half abroad, Lady Foster returned to the Devonshire household, where her affair with the Duke resulted in a pregnancy a few months after her return. She hid her pregnancy from the Duchess and
society by returning to Italy, traveling with her brother Lord Hervey and his wife, and then moved to Ischia to have her child in secret. The portrait by Kauffman discussed below was painted a few months after the child’s birth. Lady Foster’s melancholic expression, the portrait of Georgiana, and the view of Ischia reflect these events.

Lady Foster left England for the continent a third time to accompany her friend Georgiana, who had become pregnant illegitimately by Charles Grey, the future Prime Minister. After the baby was born in Aix in February of 1792, the Duchess and Lady Foster traveled for over a year with the Duchess’s mother Countess Spencer, and sister Lady Duncannon, later Lady Bessborough. In March of 1793, Patrick Moir instructed the four women in antiquities. In Naples in April, they studied minerals and dined at La Caserta. In May, the Duchess and Lady Foster returned to England while the Countess and Lady Bessborough remained in Italy for the latter’s health.

Mrs. Swinburne traveled with her husband “to increase their store of knowledge by traveling.” The Swinburnes were a middle class Catholic couple who married for love after meeting in Paris while Henry was returning to England from his first Grand Tour. Martha was said to have possessed “considerable personal beauty, graceful manners, and a highly cultivated mind,” and she knew Greek and Latin and modern languages. In one of his letters, Henry proudly stated, “my wife has the same propensities as myself for antiquities.” She had friends of considerable influence, including the Countess of Albany, Marie Antoinette, and Queen Charlotte. In 1780 in Vienna, Empress Maria Theresa
conferred upon Martha the medallion of “La Croix Étoilé,” a religious order for noble ladies instituted in 1668 by Empress Eleanor and sanctioned by a bull from the pope.

Seeing the masterpieces of art housed in Rome was of great importance, and tourists often dedicated many pages of their diaries to describing in great detail what they had seen. Some of the tourists were interested in collecting classical antiquities, and many commissioned paintings, including reproductions of famous paintings they had seen and admired in Italian churches and palaces, but more frequently landscapes and view paintings of places they had visited and things they had seen. Many tourists commissioned portraits of themselves in front of backgrounds intended to be recognized, as proof of their Grand Tour.
CHAPTER 2

PORTRAITURE IN BRITAIN

Before examining portraits painted abroad in more detail, it is important to understand the evolution of the British portrait tradition. By the eighteenth century in Britain, the taste for portraiture became an obsession of proportions unmatched by any other nation. The genre's popularity with the British can be attributed to several factors—the rejection of religious subject matter after the Reformation, the spread of Puritan sensibilities, and an over-conscious sense of caste and dynasty. Because Protestants eschewed the use of religious imagery, England did not develop a reputation for painting in this period as did those countries where the Catholic church played a prominent role as a patron of the arts. However, portraits served a social function—as a way to establish status, confer dignity, and confirm worth, permanence, and intellectual respectability. The decorative function of the portrait was superceded by the importance of the likeness of the individual, which was absolutely necessary to satisfy its commemorative purpose.

The portrait genre was served by Dutch, Flemish, and German artists who were asked to work in England, because no native artists had comparable training. In the sixteenth century Hans Holbein, Hans Eworth, Marcus
Gheeraerts the Younger and others were largely responsible for setting the standard for British portraiture. By the second half of the sixteenth century the bust and three-quarter length single portrait styles were established, as well as pendant portraits of husbands and wives. The full-length portrait became more common in the late Elizabethan and Jacobean periods.

In the seventeenth century, foreigners still dominated as painters of the English court. Daniel Mytens, the Dutch artist who served as court painter to James I, foreshadows some elements of the Grand Tour portrait in the pendant portraits he painted of Lord and Lady Arundel in the Long Gallery of Lundley Castle (1618). Lord Arundel, a great collector and supporter of the arts, is shown in full-length on the left side of the painting, seated at the entrance to his sculpture gallery, gesturing toward his collection of classical statuary. His wife is shown in a similar pose, at the entrance to the portrait gallery shown in the background. These portraits precede not only the portraits by Batoni that make use of classical statuary, but also the work of Jonathan Zoffany, especially his paintings of Charles Townley and his collection of antique marbles.44

Anthony Van Dyck (1599-1641) was the most dominating influence on British portraiture, the force of which lasted throughout the eighteenth century. A pupil of Rubens, Van Dyck worked in Antwerp and Genoa before arriving in England to serve as court painter to Charles I from 1632 until his death. Van Dyck had studied the work of the great masters in Italy, especially Titian; he was the most sophisticated artist working in London to date. Although he had gained an international reputation as a history painter, his English patrons demanded
portraits and these predominate in his work. His studio of assistants functioned like a factory production line for portraits, a practice that was continued by later artists. He had a fondness for representing his sitters in “fancy” dress, for example, in the guise of shepherd. These guises related to the masques that were popular during court festivities, and were then copied, as they became associated with people of elevated social rank.45

After the Restoration, Sir Peter Lely (1618-1680) came from Holland to serve as court painter to Charles II. He avidly collected paintings by Van Dyck, and tried to recapture the Van Dyck mode in his portraits. Like Van Dyck, Lely ran a successful studio of assistants that worked like a factory to produce portraits such as the series of “Windsor Beauties,” depicting the ladies of the court in three-quarter length. After Lely’s death, the German artist Godfrey Kneller (1649-1723) served as court painter to James II. Kneller also painted a series of full-length portraits of the ladies of the court known as the “Hampton Court Beauties.” However Kneller had more skill at painting men than women, and he is remembered for his series of Kit-Kats, portraits of Whig leaders dressed in plain clothing and wearing large wigs, identical in size and format: half-length poses including hands.46 Since Lely and Kneller both worked in series using stock poses, their portraits do not portray much individuality.

Following Kneller, Jonathan Richardson became court painter to Queen Anne. His Essay on the Theory of Painting (1715) provided the first theoretical approach to the portrait genre, using Aristotle’s theory of dramatic poetry as its model in the same way that it had been used to define the hierarchy of genres
and Renaissance artistic theory. His rules for portraiture emphasized the use of antique dress, and appropriate characterization. This early attempt to elevate the status of the portrait genre did not see its fruition for about fifty years, until Joshua Reynolds came to the forefront of British art, serving as the Royal Academy's first president. It was Richardson's writings that inspired Reynolds to become a painter, and Reynolds echoes many of Richardson's views in his own Discourses to the academicians as well as in his portraits in the grand manner.

In the 1730s, two publications had a significant influence on the conventions of British portraiture, and also reflected France's position as the leader of European manners. François Nivelon's *Rudiments of Genteel Behavior* appeared in England in 1737. The subtitle, *An Introduction to the Method of Attaining a Graceful Attitude, an Agreeable Motion, an easy Air and a genteel Behavior*, defines the purpose of the work, which provided a method to create meaning from appearances in life and in art. Furthermore, its engravings by Bartholomew Dandridge illustrating poses and gestures served as a model for artists in achieving certain attitudes. The second publication, by Gérard de Lairesse, appeared a year later under the title *The Art of Painting in all its branches: social etiquette and distinctions between classes*. This work devotes a chapter to portraiture, and like Nivelon's, served as a manual of style for the gentry and the artist.

The works of Lairesse and Nivelon were published at the time when artists Thomas Hudson and Allan Ramsay were beginning their careers in London. Hudson, who had been trained by Richardson, saw the height of his career in the
1740s. A collector of Van Dyck drawings, Hudson worked in the conventional and standard mode of Lely and Kneller, with a studio of assistants. Like his predecessors, Hudson used stock poses and his portraits lack individuality. In his portraits of women, he reused not only the same poses but even identical costume and jewelry. In fact, it was his drapery painter Van Aken who created the more interesting swagger elements in Hudson’s male portraits, such as the extravagant waistcoats. Ramsay also used the services of Van Aken as his drapery painter, but he was more extravagant and intellectual, protesting against the bourgeois sentimental style. With Hogarth, Ramsay pioneered the development of the informal portrait, but unlike Hogarth, his work appealed to the world of fashion. Ramsay was also preferred as a painter of women, a subject that gave Reynolds, for one, difficulty. Ramsay’s portraits can be characterized by the use of classical poses tempered by rules of deportment.

By this period, it had become customary for artists to travel to Italy to study antique sculpture as well as the paintings of the great masters. Ramsay first traveled to Rome in 1736, staying for two years. He studied under Imperiali, who was also Batoni’s teacher; however, Batoni had the more decisive influence on Ramsay’s style, especially in his drawing. Hudson traveled to Italy as well, but his was a very short trip, from July to October of 1752. It is not known whether Hudson had any contact with Batoni while in Italy, however, it has been noted that Batoni’s portraits do show a connection to Hudson’s portraits. Many of Hudson’s portraits were engraved (forty by John Faber between 1739 and 1756, and twenty by James Mc Ardell between 1748 and 1765) which makes it likely
that they would have been circulated and known by Batoni. Hudson’s masterpiece, the 1746 Portrait of Theodore Jacobsen (Figure 2), shares a number of features with Batoni’s later full-length portraits, including the use of antique fragments in the foreground, the landscape background with identifiable buildings, and most notably, the nonchalant, cross-legged pose. Commissioned for display in the Foundling Hospital he designed, Jacobsen is depicted standing in full-length, leaning against a plinth with relief carvings, holding a scroll showing his plan for the hospital building.

In Jacobsen’s portrait, Hudson made use of what Waterhouse called the “foolish cross-legged style” that haunted British portraiture for the next forty years. Hudson probably borrowed the pose from Ramsay’s 1740 Portrait of John Campbell, 2nd Duke of Argyll, which was engraved by Faber. Two monuments in Westminster Abbey use the same pose: the 1727 Monument to James Craggs by Giovanni Battista Guelfo which depicts the figure in classical drapery, and the 1741 statue of Shakespeare, dressed in a cross between Elizabethan and Van Dyck costume, by Pieter Scheemachers. It is interesting to note that William Kent, who had himself been portrayed in the same pose in a full-length portrait by Aikman, designed the Shakespeare monument. Ramsay repeated the use of this pose again in later works, and it also appeared in some of Reynolds’ early portraits. However, it probably appears most frequently in the work of Batoni.

Quotations of classical statues were frequently employed in fashionable portraiture in the eighteenth century. The cross-legged pose has several
classical prototypes, including the *Faun with Pipes* that was in the Villa Borghese in the eighteenth century, the *Satyr* attributed to Praxiteles from the Capitoline Museum, and the *Uffizi Mercury*. Reynolds based his *Portrait of Captain Keppel* on the *Apollo Belvedere*, and Closterman's double portrait of *The Third Earl Shaftesbury and his Brother* derives from the statue of *Castor and Pollux*. Classical quotations such as these are just as frequent in portraits painted abroad, for example, in Batoni's portrait of *Thomas Dundas, later first Baron Dundas* (Figure 3), the pose is based on the *Apollo Belvedere*.

The Grand Tour enabled artists to become familiar with classical statuary in several ways. While it was customary for artists to travel to Rome to study and draw from the original antique sculptures, there were also opportunities for study in Britain. A number of rich British tourists, such as Charles Townley, purchased various antiquities while on the Grand Tour, and built significant collections at home. In the next chapter, I will examine Batoni's portraits of British tourists, as well as those painted by British artists on the Grand Tour.
CHAPTER 3

PORTRAITURE IN ITALY

The strict hierarchy of genres followed by the Academy exalted history painting above all, and serious artists were encouraged to work in that mode. History painters enjoyed a more distinguished reputation than portrait painters did, but the business of portraiture was enjoying great success. The English in particular were fond of having their portraits painted, and comprised the large majority of the market for the portrait trade. Although the genre was held in low esteem throughout Italy,\textsuperscript{57} in England, portraits comprised the largest percentage of works annually exhibited by the Royal Academy, especially between the years 1781-1785.\textsuperscript{58} For this reason, commissioning portraits in Italy was considerably cheaper than in London, which motivated great numbers of tourists to sit for a portrait. In addition, artists looking to make a living were attracted to the large number of tourists in concentrated areas of Italy where there was great potential for such commissions. But regardless of price or social value, many of the portraits were valued based solely on the painter's skill.

The tourists patronized a number of artists through the century. In Rome during the 1720s, Francesco Trevinsani (1656-1746) laid the foundation for
Grand Tour portraiture. In the thirties and forties, the artists Antonio David (c. 1680-1738), Domenico Duprà (1689-1770), Louis-Gabriel Blanchet (1705-1772), Andrea Casali (c. 1680-c. 1738), Agostino Masucci (c. 1691-1758), and Marco Benefial (1684-1764) were all active in painting English tourists. In the 1750s, Pompeo Batoni was the most popular portraitist in Rome. The German artist Anton Raphael Mengs (1728-1779) was known to paint portraits of tourists while residing in Rome, and Pierre Subleyras (1699-1747) was a noted French portraitist in Rome. The French painter Louis Gauffier (1762-1801) painted tourists in Florence toward the end of the century. A number of British artists went abroad on Grand Tours of their own, during which they accepted commissions for portraits of their fellow countrymen. The British artists who painted portraits in Rome include Nathaniel Dance (1735-1811), Gavin Hamilton (1723-1798), Joseph Wright of Derby (1734-1797), Joshua Reynolds (1723-1792), H.D. Hamilton (1740-1808), Charles Grignon (1752-1804), and Robert Fagan (1767-1816). Tourists sometimes sat for portraits in Venice to Rosalba Carriera (1675-1757). In Naples, they sat to Francesco Solimena (1657-1747) earlier in the century, and other artists toward the end of the century, including Elizabeth Louise Vigee Le Brun (1755-1842).

These portraits commemorated the traveler's Grand Tour, and were displayed at home to validate one's aristocratic status. Because they served this purpose, it was essential that the portraits include elements that immediately place the setting in Italy. The most common and distinctive Grand Tour portrait follows a format developed in the Renaissance where the patron stands or sits
centered within elements of classical architecture like a fluted column and a pulled-back curtain or drapery swag. A landscape can usually be seen in the background, sometimes with recognizable Roman ruins. A standard repertoire of well-known sculptural monuments or fragments often fills in the space around the sitter.

Another interesting feature common in British Grand Tour portraits of men and women are dogs. English travelers often brought their own dogs with them on the Grand Tour, and liked to include their dog in their portraits. Essentially, the dogs' likenesses are also taken—they are not simply a stand-in prop comparable to reused antique fragments kept in an artist's studio. In fact, in England some painters specialized in animal pictures often depicting dogs. Including one's dog in a portrait was a codified way of depicting one's rank. Gentlemen's dogs were greyhounds, hounds, and spaniels whose ownership was by law confined only to persons above a certain social level. Pet dogs indicated class, and began to be kept by ladies of rank by the end of the Middle Ages. From the time of Holbein, dogs were given prominence in portraits, with the spaniel being the most common.  

Pompeo Batoni dominates discussions of the Grand Tour portrait. In the 1750s, Batoni began developing what became the standard for Grand Tour portraiture format. He created a formula of repeatable yet variable conventions, most often representing his sitters in full- or three-quarter length poses, standing but relaxed, dressed in the elegant fashion of the day, and surrounded by antique sculpture or architectural ruins. Batoni's extensive drawing of classical statues in
his early training accounts for the sculptural quality of the forms in his paintings.62 Batoni’s poses and attitudes derive from Van Dyck, as do the baroque trappings of curtain, pillar, and costume. Batoni would have known Van Dyck’s English portraits through engravings and descriptions provided by his sitters, and he also knew the prototypes for Van Dyck’s portraits, especially the work of Titian.63 Some of Batoni’s standing poses appear to derive from Hudson, as well as from antique sculpture.64 A characteristic example of Batoni’s typical style is the 1764 Portrait of Thomas Dundas, later first Baron Dundas (Figure 3). Dundas stands in a pose echoing the marble statue of the Apollo Belvedere behind him, gesturing toward the Vatican Ariadne. The Laocoön and the Belvedere Antinous are also in the background. Dundas, fashionably dressed, stands in front of a fountain from which his dog takes a drink.

In addition to his talent as an artist, part of Batoni’s success resulted from the relatively low prices he charged for his portraits. In the 1750s and 1760s, a half-length Batoni cost about £15, about three-fifths of the price Reynolds and Hudson were charging in London. In the 1760s, a full-length Batoni cost £25 compared to Ramsay at £84 and Reynolds at £150. By the 1780s, Batoni was charging only £80 for a full-length, compared to Reynolds who charged £200.65

Some types of Grand Tour portraits are less obvious, for instance, the bust-length portrait. Used for individual portraits or pairs, the bust-length portrait is one of the most popular formats used in the genre. Its dominance is largely due to its classical association with the sculpted bust, but they were also less expensive to commission than larger formats. Not everyone could afford to be
painted in the swagger style or the grand manner, and some people just preferred the simple, concise format of the portrait bust. Since the bust-length portrait does not include attributes or setting, one must rely on other information to place the sitter abroad in order to call it a Grand Tour portrait. Examples of bust-length portraits painted by Batoni provide important evidence that women as well as members of the middle class traveled abroad.

Batoni painted bust-length oval and rectangular portraits throughout his career. Each one clearly depicts an individual likeness, but as a whole his bust-length portraits are rather unremarkable when compared to his three-quarter or full-length portraits. Batoni’s earliest pair of bust-length portraits dates to 1750, depicting the Honorable Thomas Barrett-Lennard and his wife Anna Maria, later Lord and Lady Dacre (Figures 4 and 5). The couple traveled abroad after the death of their nine year old daughter Barbara Anne, distracting themselves from their grief with a busy schedule of viewing antiquities. He continued working in this mode for the next thirty years. Batoni’s pendant portraits of Henry and Martha Baker Swinburne (1779) are another example of this style (Figures 6 and 7). Although the Swinburnes had many friends in high places, they were still middle class, and no doubt the Batoni portraits were commissioned as an attempt to elevate their status. Solkin explains “many who felt themselves improperly equipped to take their place in polite society found portraiture a useful symbolic means of asserting their claim to gentility.” The couple spent a great deal of time traveling the continent. Henry published his memoirs of travels in
France, Italy and Spain in two volumes called *The Courts of Europe*, which also elevated his status to a respected antiquarian, philosopher and scholar.  

James Byres, an agent, banker, and dealer at the service of many English tourists referred the Swinburnes to Batoni. He recommended Batoni to many of his clients and was responsible for securing many commissions for the artist. In 1781 Byres commissioned Batoni to paint an oval half-length portrait of his sister Mrs. Robert Sandilands to hang in his dining room (Figure 8). In the portrait, Mrs. Sandilands is shown in a pose looking over her left shoulder. She wears a turban, which became fashionable in the later eighteenth century and is seen in many portraits of this period. Batoni’s 1778 *Portrait of Marcia Pitt* (Figure 9) is another example of the use of this costume. Marcia Pitt traveled to Italy with her parents before she married George James Cholmondeley in 1790. Her half-length portrait has a plain neutral background, and the sitter’s only attribute is the dog in her arms.

Batoni’s greatest rival in Rome was the German painter Anton Raphael Mengs. Although Mengs was widely traveled, having worked in the courts of Dresden and Madrid, he never visited Britain. Mengs spent almost a decade in Rome, from 1752 to 1761. During this time, he painted thirty portraits of British travelers, the majority between 1756 and 1760. Most of these portraits are half-length; there are only three known full-length portraits by Mengs. Generally, Mengs preferred simpler settings, costumes, and poses for his portraits. Dignified and intellectual, Mengs’ portraits were not intended to be regarded as “aristocratic status symbols,” like Batoni’s portraits were. Though the two
artists' studios were not far from each other, they “avoided coming too close to each other,” their silence suggesting mutual tolerance and respect.\textsuperscript{74} One wonders if Batoni's success would have been as great if Mengs had not left for Madrid in 1761. Although they were certainly rivals, their styles were different enough that some sitters sat to both artists. It seems that Mengs was less interested in obtaining portrait commissions until his salary as the Senior Court painter in Dresden stopped during the Seven Years' War, and economic necessity forced him to earn his living with them. Early on, he charged much more than Batoni for his portraits (Arabella Swimmer's portrait was 300 scudi, while Batoni's half-length portraits of the same time were only 50 scudi), which Roettgen suggests was to discourage clients, but he later adapted his prices to Batoni's.\textsuperscript{75} Like Batoni, Mengs painted few women.

In 1753, Mengs painted his first British sitters, Mr. and Mrs. Swimmer.\textsuperscript{76} Unfortunately, Mr. Swimmer's portrait is now lost, though a description notes that he is “shown seated at a table and with account books as mercantile attributes.”\textsuperscript{77} The pendant portrait of Arabella Swimmer depicts the sitter in the courtly style, dressed in a very elaborate and beautifully rendered pink ball gown with lace and beadwork, and a lace collar around her neck (Figure 10). In her right hand she holds a Carnival mask,\textsuperscript{78} while her left hand is poised in an elegant gesture in front of her waist. Mrs. Swimmer is shown in three-quarter length, standing in front of a stone balustrade and an unidentified relief sculpture. The background is a Roman landscape, with architectural ruins of the Imperial palace on the Palatine hill and the Temple of Romulus. This portrait characterizes Mrs.
Swimmer with elegance, refinement, and restraint, qualities that typify Mengs' Neoclassical style. His contemporaries criticized Mengs' juxtaposition of the courtly ball gown with the landscape setting; conventionally, it was considered more appropriate for women depicted in landscape settings to be dressed in classical costume.

Comparing Mengs' Portrait of Mrs. Swimmer with Batoni's three-quarter length standing Portrait of Lady Mary Fox (Figure 11) from 1767 reveals perhaps unexpected contrast. The background is rather sparse in the portrait of Mrs. Fox—she stands in front of a red curtain behind which only the base of a column can be seen. The sitter is dressed in a simple gray silk skirt and jacket with long sleeves and a hood, accentuated with ruffled hems and pink and white striped bows. Adapted from men's riding clothes, her dress is a traveling costume called a German habit or a Brunswick. Although this is the only example of a traveling costume I have seen depicted in a Grand Tour portrait, the Brunswick does appear in some English portraits. In her arms, Mrs. Fox holds a lively black spaniel that animates the portrait, as it seems to squirm about in an attempt to escape her grasp.\(^7\) The formal architectural setting of Batoni's portrait seems to call for a more elegant costume than the Brunswick; it is surprising that Batoni does not make use of flashy fashions of the style seen in his portraits of men. In the portrait of Mrs. Fox, Batoni has done away with all of his usual trappings (aside from the dog), so that the only element that identifies this as a Grand Tour portrait is the traveling costume. It is surprising that in Mengs' portrait of Mrs. Swimmer, he uses all of Batoni's usual conventions: the relief carving, the
landscape with recognizable architecture, the fashionable dress, while Batoni uses none of those elements in his portrait of Mrs. Fox.

In fact, Batoni's 1764 Portrait of Georgiana, Countess Spencer is his only portrait of a woman that shares conventions with some of his more formulaic Grand Tour portraits of men (Figure 12). The Countess, shown in three-quarter length, is seated in front of a rich red drapery swag and a fluted column. Through a window on the left, the Coliseum is visible in the background. The lute placed on the table next to the Countess and a sheet of music held in her left hand suggest her musical interests. She wears a fashionable gold-colored gown with a lace collar. This composition is based on Hudson’s Portrait of Grace Parsons, later Mrs. Lamard, where the sitter is shown seated in three-quarter length, leaning on a harpsichord and holding a sheet of music on her lap. In both the portraits of Mrs. Fox and Lady Spencer, the position of their cradled hands is borrowed from Van Dyck’s Portrait of Queen Henrietta Maria (1632). Countess Spencer’s reputation and influence probably accounts for her special treatment. Self-taught and respected for her intellect, Countess Georgiana Spencer (1737-1814) first went to Italy from 1763-4 on a marriage tour with her husband, Viscount John Spencer, one of her young daughters, a tutor, a chaplain, a physician, and eight servants. They spent the winter months in Naples for the benefit of Lord Spencer's health. In the spring, they spent three months Rome, where Lady Spencer apparently enchanted Winckelmann as well as Cardinal Albani who called her "the most accomplished lady in the world." Horace Walpole referred to her as "the goddess of wisdom."
Another of Batoni’s contemporaries was Nathaniel Dance. Dance was a British history painter who was in Rome from 1754-1766. He is also known for his portraits and conversation pieces of British travelers. In 1762, Dance was commissioned to paint the pendant portrait to Batoni’s half-length Portrait of George Craster, which depicts the sitter wearing his uniform of the Horse Grenadier Guards against a neutral background. Dance was almost not willing to accept the commission because he did not want his work to appear in comparison or competition with Batoni, but afterward he considered his portrait to be a success.\textsuperscript{81} The Portrait of Mrs. Craster (Figure 13) is oval while Mr. Craster's portrait is rectangular. Dressed in an elaborately patterned gown and headdress, Mrs. Craster holds a pet squirrel. The Crasters traveled together through Italy from 1761 to 1762.

Historically in the eighteenth century, portraits of women were painted in the allegorical mode, that is, in the guise of certain mythological characters easily identified by symbolic attributes. Favorites included Diana, Hebe, the muses, generic pastoral figures such as the Shepherdess, or personifications of the seasons or virtues. Eighteenth century court festivities often included elaborately staged masques where men and women would play-act as these types of characters. These types of portraits are simply “visual fictions” that are not meant to be interpreted.\textsuperscript{82} Another reason women were represented in the allegorical mode was to alleviate the problem of a female sitting for a male artist, which was considered to be an inappropriate intimate exchange. The idea of a woman posing for an artist of the opposite sex created an “inherent moral
dilemma. By acting the part of a goddess, the woman did not reveal her intimate self. The allegorical mode is often associated with French painters like Nattier, who tried to elevate the status of portraiture by uniting it with themes from history painting and adopting mythological guises for his sitters during the 1740s and 50s. This practice influenced the later portraits of Reynolds, whose use of the allegorical mode simultaneously elevated the aesthetic status of the portrait and the social status of the sitter.

Batoni’s earlier portraits of women are in the allegorical mode. In 1751, the Irishman Joseph Leeson, first Earl of Milltown, commissioned two portraits which Batoni painted from miniatures carried by his patron, since the women did not accompany him abroad. The Portrait of a Lady of the Milltown family as a Shepherdess may represent the Earl’s his second wife, Anne, first Countess of Milltown. The Countess is painted in the guise of a Shepherdess, petting a lamb and with a staff resting on across her body. As a pendant to his wife’s portrait, Leeson also commissioned a Portrait of a Lady of the Milltown family as Diana. Diana is identified by the half moon over her head, and a dead rabbit on the ground next to a bow. She also has a quiver of arrows on her back, and two leashed dogs next to her. The sitter in the Diana portrait has not been identified. In these portraits, the landscape background is similar in both, with foliage and mountains in the distance, and the women in both portraits are dressed in imaginary pastoral costume (Figures 14 and 15).

In 1751, Batoni painted a pair of portraits depicting Lady Caroline Sackville Damer, and her husband Joseph Damer, later Lord and Lady Milton.
Lady Damer is dressed in the imaginary pastoral drapery costume used in the Milltown portraits, against an outdoor background of foliage (Figure 16). Her costume “is a rather uneasy mixture of the fashionable, pointed waistline and the imaginary pastoral dress.” Lord Damer is also depicted in front of a similar background, though his image is of a hunter, with a gun and a dead rabbit, and bird, and a hunting dog. He holds a riding cap in his lap. Both figures are seated in three quarter length, in almost mirror image poses. This pair anticipates Batoni’s style in the large group of portraits at Uppark discussed below.

In 1751, Sir Matthew Fetherstonhaugh commissioned nine portraits from Batoni while on a marriage tour with his wife Sarah and several other relatives. The series is now at Uppark, and they are all conceived in a romantic, fanciful, allegorical and arcadian mode. The nine portraits seem to be split into two distinct groups. The first group has a hunting theme. Sarah, Lady Fetherstonhaugh (Figure 17) is painted as Diana, identified by the half moon on her head and the bow she holds, as well as the hunting dog she pets at her side. Her portrait is a pendant to a portrait of her husband, Sir Matthew, who holds a spotted dog and a pointed spear (Figure 18). The other two portraits in this group are pendants of two of their travelling companions, Sarah’s brother Benjamin Lethieullier, and half-brother Lascelles Raymond Iremonger. Both men have dogs and spears as in Matthew’s portrait. It is immediately apparent that Sir Matthew is portrayed as himself, while his wife’s portrait shows her playing a mythological role. Wilton explains that “men enjoyed clear social identities which
themselves provided the artist with his subject matter... Women, rarely involved in professional or even artistic activity of any significance, were simply women.  

The second series consists of five portraits. In the second group, Sarah, with a wreath of fruit adorning her head, holds a branch and picks a pear from it (Figure 19), while Matthew holds a fruited wreath and reaches for a shaft of wheat to his left. A second picture of Lascelles fits in here, showing him holding wheat, with a wreath of flowers behind him. The other two portraits in this series depict the Reverend Ulrick and his wife, Katherine Fetherstonhaugh. Katherine wears a wreath of flowers on her head and holds a basket of flowers (Figure 20). Her husband holds a lyre or harp, and makes a blessing gesture with his right hand.

Even as late as the 1770s, Batoni was still doing portraits in the same mode as the Fetherstonhaugh group. His 1777 portrait of Mrs. James Alexander (Figure 21) depicts a woman standing in a landscape holding a branch, probably the evergreen myrtle, a symbol of conjugal fidelity and eternal love since the Renaissance. This symbolism was not used in Batoni’s earlier allegorical portraits, where such attributes were purely decorative. This portrait seems more serious and individualized than the earlier ones. Mrs. Alexander’s costume is an interesting mix of the pastoral and exotic, with the introduction of the turban which became fashionable in the later eighteenth century and is seen in many portraits of this period. Although Mrs. Alexander was traveling with her husband in Rome, it is not known if he sat to Batoni or had any one else paint his portrait abroad. The half-length Portrait of Mrs. Frances Browne from 1778 (Figure 22)
depicts the sitter in the guise of an unidentified Muse holding a book of music and a laurel wreath. Mrs. Browne traveled to Italy with her husband Lyde Browne, the director of the Bank of England. It is not known if Lyde Browne sat for a portrait while abroad.

Batoni's portraits of women in the allegorical mode show the influence of the earlier Italian artist Francesco Trevisani. Out of Trevisani's twelve Grand Tour portraits, three depict women. Two of the women are shown in the guises of Flora and the third as Diana. All three pictures use the exact same pose and expression, and the women are dressed in very similar costume. The portrait of a Lady as Diana (Figure 23) depicts the sitter against an outdoor background of trees and foliage. She holds a bow and arrow. The Lady as Flora (Figure 24) is almost identical to the Lady as Diana, except Flora holds a sprig of flowers, and is set against a plain interior background. Both Flora and Diana have been identified as Mrs. John Hay (Marjory Murray), and if that is correct, then the Flora may be a companion piece to Trevisani's portrait of Colonel John Hay, which was kept in the same collection as Flora. With the Flora on the left, their poses almost mirror each other, and they are both set in a plain interior with a table. If placed together in the manner suggested, it would be as if they were standing on opposite sides of the table. The two pictures also have the exact same dimensions.

The third female portrait by Trevisani depicts Mrs. John Hay (Marjory Murray), Lady Inverness in the guise of Flora (Figure 25). While her pose, costume, and expression is similar to the other portrait of a Lady as Flora, the
likeness is different. This portrait acts as part of a group of three companion portraits, joining Trevisani’s portraits of Mrs. Hay’s two brothers James Murray, titular Earl of Dunbar, and David Murray, Lord Stormont. All three portraits date to 1725, and are set in the same plain interior with a table that was used for the portrait of a Lady as Flora and Colonel Hay. In Mrs. Hay’s picture, she holds a flower in her right hand, and a vase of flowers sits on the table to her left. All of the members of this group were associated with the Jacobite court in Rome: Mrs. Hay was rumored to be the mistress of James III, while her husband was his Secretary of State. Mrs. Hay was described by Lockhart as “a mere cocquet, tollerably handsome, but withall, prodigiouslie vain and arrogant,” and Colman said she “had so absolute a power with the Pretender, that everything was disposed of in the way she would have it.”

None of the artists who painted British tourists abroad in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century had the lasting fame of Rosalba Carriera. She was the only distinguished and important portrait painter in Venice. She began her career as a lace maker and painter of portrait miniatures, and later worked in France painting pastel portraits. Carriera had an agent in England as well, so many British visitors knew her reputation and when in Venice, made it a priority to sit to her. The pastel medium gave her paintings a bravura effect, as well as the advantage of being executed much more quickly than oil paintings, which helped lead to Carriera’s success. Also, instead of spending time creating painstaking details, Carriera painted her subjects against a neutral ground, and only at bust length. The costume of her subjects is fashionable, often elaborate
patterned brocades, but without ostentatious ornament. Her portrait of Charles Sackville relies on subtle costume variations to reflect the Venetian carnival (Figure 26). However, props that make overt reference to the tourist experience, like the mask in Sackville's portrait, are rare in her work.

Many of her portraits of women are in the allegorical mode, and it is often difficult to tell if they are an invented character or a person's true likeness. There are also no visual clues to identify a sitter's nationality. Carrera's portraits are characterized by intimacy, charm and femininity, and by capturing a good likeness without commenting on the personality of the sitter. They are usually considered to be in the Rococo mode. Her Portrait of a Girl with a Parrot (Figure 27) shows elements of the Rococo taste, in the use of small and exotic animals, a love of play and taste for the exotic and sensual pleasure. The woman wears a pearl necklace and a blue dress that is open at the front and appears to be in disarray. The parrot holds an edge of the gown in its beak. This idea of the parrot pulling on a woman's blouse to reveal her breast is a theme Rosalba used in other works as well. This particular woman is said to be probably English, although no specific identification has been made. Compared to her other works, however, this example is outrageous in its sexual overtones and surely the average British sitter did not choose to be represented in this fashion. Also, Carrera's portraits in general were smaller and more private images rather than large stately portraits meant for public display to glorify the sitter.

More the norm is something like the 1741 portrait of Lady Sophia Fermor (Figure 28). This is the only certainly identified portrait of an English woman
painted by Carriera. Lady Sophia (1721-1745) went on the Grand Tour with her parents, the Earl and Countess of Pomfret, and her younger sister Charlotte. Horace Walpole frequently acknowledged her beauty and charm in his correspondence. She is painted allegorically as Juno, suggested by a peacock drawn in the background. It is a bust length portrait, and the composition is designed with the sitter on a diagonal. Carriera used this diagonal design in an earlier portrait of an unknown lady (Figure 29), dating to the 1720s-30s. The fact that this portrait was once in a British collection signifies that the sitter was probably English. Carriera went blind in 1745, ending her career as a portraitist.

After Batoni's death in 1787, the most influential portrait painter working in Italy was Angelica Kauffmann. Although Kauffmann worked in the same mode as Batoni, her sitters are generally more natural and relaxed in pose, demeanor, and costume (although this was probably due to changing styles, not the artist's invention). Kauffman's male portraits are clearly influenced by Batoni, for example, her 1764 *Portrait of John Byng* which depicts the man standing in a hand-on-hip pose, with an open volume on the table in the foreground, in front of a window opening onto a view of Naples harbor (Figure 30). Kauffman made two trips to Italy, and on her first trip, her patrons were nearly all men. From Italy, she went to England where she attracted female patrons as well, and when she returned to Italy she painted both men and women. The relation of Kauffman's gender to her success as an artist has not yet been fully explored.

Kauffman standardized a format for the three-quarter length seated life sized portrait. This format was used most often for female sitters, who are often
shown with one elbow leaning on a stone or a plinth and the other hand on the lap. The classical statue of the Seated Agrippina from the Capitoline Museum may have provided the artist with the idea for this pose, which appears frequently and with little variation in her work. For example, in 1785, Lady Elizabeth Foster sat to Angelica Kauffman for one of the artist’s most attractive portraits (Figure 31). She is dressed in a light, flowing ivory colored dress, belted at the waist with a gold trimmed black sash, with three-quarter length sleeves, ruffled at the wrists and around the neckline. She wears a large floppy straw hat with black ribbons and white plumes, and her curly, powdered hair falls onto her shoulders. Around her neck she wears a pendant with a portrait miniature of her intimate friend Georgiana, the Duchess of Devonshire. She is seated on a rock ledge in front of trees, with a view of the Bay of Naples and Ischia in the distance.

A number of artists in England and abroad also began using this mode for female portraiture. For example, in 1793 the English artist Robert Fagan painted a portrait of Lady Elizabeth Webster, later Lady Holland, shown seated in front of a balustrade and fluted column with foliage (Figure 32). Dressed in a simple ivory gown with long sleeves and a pleated bodice tied at the waist with a wide blue sash, Lady Webster’s style of fashion is similar to that seen in the portrait of Lady Foster. She wears several gold necklaces and an oval pendant around her neck, and holds her spaniel on her lap. Her hair is curled in ringlets cascading onto her shoulders, and she wears no hat or headdress. At twenty-two years of age, she is an image of youthful beauty, with rosy pink cheeks and slightly parted lips. In the background of the painting, one sees the smoking Mount Vesuvius,
the Bay of Naples, and the Castel dell’ Ovo. Lady Webster’s favorite place was Naples, as evidenced by this poetic journal entry from May 7, 1793:

I never in my life experienced the degree of happiness enjoyed: it was the gratification of mind and sense. The weather was delicious, truly Italian, the night serene, with just enough air to waft the fragrance of the orange flower, then in blossom. Through the leaves of the trees we caught glimpses of the trembling moonbeams on the glassy surface of the bay; all objects conspired to soothe my mind and the sensations I felt were those of ecstatic rapture. I was so happy that when I reached my bedroom, I dismissed my maid, and sat up the whole night looking from my window upon the sea.\textsuperscript{96}

Fagan himself did not visit Naples until four years after painting this portrait,\textsuperscript{97} which demonstrates the influence that patrons must have had on dictating the specifications of their portrait.

Fagan would have had plenty of material to look to in painting Vesuvius without ever having been there, as painted views of Vesuvius were very popular throughout the century, and it was also a popular background to use in portraiture. For example, Kauffman’s 1764 Portrait of Brownlow Cecil, 9\textsuperscript{th} Earl of Exeter, depicts the Earl in front of an architectural setting that frames a view of the smoking Mt. Vesuvius in the background (Figure 33). The date of this portrait is significant because it marks the year that Vesuvius became active again after a period of dormancy. It is a half-length standing portrait, and the Earl is fashionably dressed. He holds his hat under his left arm and a walking stick in his right hand, possibly a reference to having climbed the volcano in the background, a popular tourist activity in Naples.

Charles Grignion offers a twist on the allegorical mode in his Portrait of the Honorable Charlotte Clive, painted in 1787 (Figure 34).\textsuperscript{98} This portrait shares a
similar pose, tone, and background with Lady Foster’s portrait, but has another level of meaning. Lady Clive is seated, shown in three quarter length in front of a landscape setting and a sky filled with the pink clouds of a scenic setting sun. Her head is turned to her right and she gazes off into the distance with a soulful look. Her left hand rests on a portfolio, a sign that she probably had a talent for drawing. She wears a light blue-gray, flowing dress with a double row of white ruffles at the neckline. The dress is belted at the waist with a blue ribbon, and tied with matching bows around her upper arms and elbows. Blue ribbon also accents her large straw hat. Her powdered hair is worn in a looser style than in the portraits from the 1750s and 60s, with wavy strands reaching her shoulders. She wears an elbow-length brown leather glove on her right hand, and holds the left glove in her right hand.

Grignon’s portrait composition for Lady Clive is directly based on Kauffman’s Allegory of Imitation (Figure 35) painted some seven years earlier, c. 1780-81. It is uncertain whether this was the sitter’s or the artist’s idea. Kauffman’s painting depicts an allegorical female figure in ancient dress, seated in three-quarter length with her left hand resting on a portfolio showing a drawing of a woman looking into a mirror representing Prudence. Although the personification of Imitation usually holds a mask and brushes, this figure holds a spur in her left hand and a porte-crayon in her right hand resting on her lap. She gazes out over her right shoulder. The background is a red curtain and fluted column. Grignon depicts his sitter in an identical pose. Clearly, Lady Clive is intended to represent a contemporary version of the allegory of imitation to
emphasize her own artistic talent. Yet there is another layer to this comparison, as Grignon also makes an ironic comment (or compliment) by imitating a painting of a figure called Imitation. The idea of women representing allegorical or mythological figures has already been discussed, but these images add new meaning to the mode because the sitter uses the guise to represent her own talent, and does not just adopt a generic pose.

In English portraiture, there are some striking differences in how men and women are portrayed. Van Dyck and Lely usually portrayed women as personifications of goddesses or virtues, while “a man in even the most imaginary of costumes . . . or the most idealizing of poses . . . is always himself, soldier, statesman, landowner or monarch.” While a man’s social identity provided the artist with his subject matter, women were required to be beautiful and little more. This reflects “their position in a society which expected them to represent private rather than public virtues.”

Comparing two examples of full-length pendant portraits illustrates this point. In 1782 Batoni painted full-length pendant portraits of Thomas and Mary, Viscount and Viscountess Headfort, later 2nd Earl and Countess of Bective and 1st Marquess and Marchioness of Headfort (Figures 36 and 37). These portraits were commissioned to fit into particular frames in the Eating Room of Headfort House. The props in each are specifically gendered. He sits at a writing desk with a globe and a history volume, in front of a window that offers a view of the Temple of Vesta. Mary holds their firstborn child and sits in front of a table with a
vase of flowers and a sewing basket, recalling Renaissance or Baroque paintings of the Madonna and Child.

The second set, painted by Louis Gauffier in 1795, depicts Lady Elizabeth Webster, later Lady Holland, and her first husband Godfrey Webster (Figures 38 and 39). Both are outdoor portraits. Lady Webster is shown seated and leaning against a stone plinth. There are trees behind her, but no recognizable landscape. A small child leans on her knee and offers a treat to a dog recognizable from other portraits of Lady Webster. Lord Webster stands in what appears to be the same outdoor setting, but the background of his portrait is a view of Florence, and there are architectural fragments in the foreground. In these full-length pendant portraits, the women are shown with their children as their primary attribute, while the men are depicted as men of the world in front of significant architectural monuments. This comparison illustrates the eighteenth century belief that women's position in society was to remain in the domestic sphere, and their portraits were to represent private rather than public virtues.103

A second portrait of Lady Webster by Louis Gauffier depicts the sitter in full length seated on a couch, with a guitar opposite, and her spaniel (Figure 40). The setting is an unidentifiable dark interior, with a bookshelf behind the couch. She is wearing a long dress, with drapery folds gathered on the floor, and a rather bizarre hat with a tall, stiff peak or feather of some sort. This portrait seems to be a pendant to that of Henry Fox Holland who she later married. His portrait by Gauffier of the same year has the same indoor setting as Lady Webster's. It is interesting that in the same year, the same woman had pendant
portraits painted by the same artist by paired with two different men. Perhaps the contrast of the outdoor setting of the portrait paired with her husband, and the indoor setting used with her future husband parallel the difference between the public and the private image.

In the course of the eighteenth century, it becomes increasingly difficult to make distinctions between female and male, upper and middle class, British and Italian. There was growing concern in England that men returned home from the Grand Tour effeminate, while at the same time, women in Rome enjoyed intellectual freedom that they were not permitted at home. Members of the middle class were having portraits painted in manners previously reserved for nobility, resulting in a new taste for portraying the upper class in the Grand Manner of Reynolds' late portraits. Johns tells us that because of Rome's significance as a center for a school of artists from a variety of nationalities, "being from Venice or Paris makes an artist no less "Roman" in consequence." He attributes this to the "remarkable degree of cosmopolitanism in during the eighteenth century."104 This sense of cosmopolitanism is also reflected in the portraits of British tourists painted in Rome, which are no less British than portraits painted in Britain.

Waterhouse credits Allan Ramsay and Joshua Reynolds with introducing the Italian Grand Style into British portraiture, which may only be half of the truth.105 After surveying the British portrait tradition and the portraits of Pompeo Batoni, it seems that the British tourists and artists in Rome introduced Batoni to their style, which this artist of the Italian Grand Manner incorporated into his
work. A cultural exchange took place when British artists traveled to Rome to study, resulting in a circular pattern of influence: for instance, Batoni influenced Ramsay, Ramsay influenced Hudson, and Hudson influenced Batoni. The history of British portraiture owes much to foreign artists who worked in Britain—a national style was not developed until the Royal Academy was formed in the eighteenth century. But considering again Johns’ idea that working in Rome is enough to actually be “Roman,” does this apply when a British artist in Rome paints a portrait of British tourist, to be sent home and displayed in Britain? This idea of any singular national style is a challenge to maintain when dealing with the British Grand Tour portrait, especially with the inclusion of such international artists as Mengs and Kauffman. The British Grand Tour portrait is best defined as a product of a cosmopolitan society centered in Rome, catering to a national taste.
CONCLUSION

Although no one denies the presence of women on the Grand Tour, they are still excluded from association with the term. Scholars have not yet investigated this aspect of the Grand Tour. Part of the hesitation may be that even “eighteenth century travel writings register unease about the inclusion of women as participants in the Grand Tour,” and they have been consistently classified as inadequate travelers or visible anomalies. Neglecting this large group of female travelers gives an inaccurate and narrow picture of the Grand Tour. The fact that women were traveling provides early examples that they were exercising independence. A number of women gained success in publishing accounts of their travels, since the authority of the classical scholar had been displaced in the eighteenth century by the authority of the eyewitness, regardless of gender. Studying the women who took the Grand Tour shows us that it was much more than a right of passage for gentlemen. It was also a leisure activity offering intellectual entertainment for both men and women of the upper and middle classes, but more than that, it provided women with an opportunity to improve their education and gain status independently.

After examining this group of portraits, several conclusions are apparent. With few exceptions, men are generally represented with recognizable
architectural monuments or landscapes in the background, while this is rare is female portraits. Women are usually shown with attributes that reflect their status in society instead of their personal interests, which are individualized in portraits of men. Only in the bust-length portrait are all things equal for men, women, upper class, and middle class.

Because there is so little published material available discussing female travelers, it is still difficult to address why there are significantly fewer portraits of women abroad. One can speculate that perhaps women were more frequently painted by lesser-known artists, with portraits waiting to be discovered still hanging on the walls of an obscure country house in England. Further research with primary sources is necessary in order to analyze this issue more thoroughly.
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