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BOWDOIN GENEALOGY

Pierre Baudouin (d. 1706)

James Bowdoin I* (1676-1747)
m. second
Hannah Portage (d. 1734)

Samuel Waldo (1696-1759)
m.
Lucy Wainwright (1704-41)

William (1713-73)
m.
Phebe Murdock (1723-72)

James Bowdoin II (1726-90)
m.
Judith (1719-50) m.
Thomas Flucker (1719-83) m. second
Elizabeth Erving (1731-1803)

Hannah (1726-85)

Sarah m. first
(1761-1826)
Sarah m. second
(1761-1826)
Henry Dearborn (1751-1829)

James Bowdoin III (1752-1811)
m.
Elizabeth (1750-1809) m.
Sir John Temple (1732-98)

* Italic indicates portrait(s) in collection.
UNKNOWN ARTIST

JAMES BOWDOIN I (1676-1747)

Oil on canvas, 36 1/4 x 29 3/4, c. 1725

James Bowdoin I, the son of Pierre Baudouin, became one of the leading businessmen in Boston through his activities in shipping and real estate, held such appointive offices as Justice of the Peace and of the Quorum, and was a member of the Governor's Council. He outlived two wives: Sarah Campbell (married 1706, died 1713), by whom he had six children, only two of whom, William and Mary, survived infancy; and Hannah Portage (married 1714, died 1734), who bore him four more, one who died in infancy, and Elizabeth, Judith, and the future Governor James II. At James I's death in 1747 he left a third wife, Mehitable Lillie (died 1748), whom he had married in 1735 when he was nearly sixty, and what was probably the largest fortune until then accumulated by a New Englander, finally probated in 1757 at £82,182/6/2.

The identification of the sitter in this portrait as James Bowdoin I poses certain problems which can best be considered in concert with the following portrait, that of the young William Bowdoin, which, although probably not by the same hand, is almost certainly by an artist belonging to the same school. These portraits were among the three which were not identified as to sitter on a list of Bowdoin family portraits attached to a letter of June 19, 1826, from the executors of the estate of Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn (previously Mrs. James Bowdoin III), announcing her bequest of them to Bowdoin College. (No artists' names were supplied any of the portraits on the list.) At least as late as 1930, the date of the last published catalogue of the museum's collections, the portraits were identified as "an ancestor of the Bowdoin Family, it is supposed" (no. 192), and "supposed to be a member of the Bowdoin Family" (no. 193), respectively.

In 1940, G. Roger Edwards, Assistant Curator of the museum, began to speculate as to whether the portraits represented Pierre and James Bowdoin I or James I and William. In studying the costume of the elder of the two sitters, he learned that the style of cravat depicted there was
that known as the “Steinkerque,” worn in commemoration of the battle of the same name fought in 1692, at which the French officers, suddenly ordered into battle, hastily twisted their cravats into the peculiar configuration which adorns this sitter. This evidence indicates that the portrait of the elder sitter could not have been painted before 1692, and since the fashion of the “Steinkerque” almost certainly did not reach this country immediately, that the portrait probably could not have been painted until a few years after that date. If the younger of the two sitters were James I, he would have been at least sixteen, and probably seventeen or eighteen, at the earliest time the portrait of the elder sitter could have been painted, c. 1693-94. However, the boy seems hardly more than about twelve, which indicates that if he were James I, his portrait would have had to have been painted about 1688, or half a decade or so before that of the elder sitter could have been painted. While it is not impossible that the young son’s portrait might have been painted before that of his father, this seems less likely than that the two portraits were painted about the same time, particularly since they are stylistically so similar.

The above argument, relating to the portrait of the younger sitter, deals only with the alternatives between James I and William. What if he were John, who may have been the eldest of Pierre’s offspring? John might well have been about twelve in 1693-94, allowing the present portrait to be of Pierre.

There exist, however, several portraits which are stylistically very close to the present examples and which, because of their dates, preclude the possibility that the elder sitter could be Pierre and the younger James I or John, and support their identification as James I and William, respectively. Among these is the portrait of John Dolbeare (1660-1740) in the New York Historical Society, in which the sitter appears to be about fifty, c. 1720, and which probably is by the same hand as the portrait of the elder Bowdoin. The portrait of Dorothy Quincy (1709/10-1762) in the Massachusetts Historical Society, as a young girl, painted in the early 1720’s, easily could be by the same hand as the portrait of the younger Bowdoin; about the same age as he, she also holds a rather wooden bird, and the landscape backgrounds in the two works are very close both in design and color. The portrait of the younger Bowdoin
also is very similar stylistically to that of Captain Stephen Greenleaf (1652-1743) in a private collection, believed to have been painted about 1722. All these portraits seem to belong to the same school which produced the artist who was responsible for the justly famous likeness of Anne Pollard (c. 1621-1725) in the Massachusetts Historical Society, painted when the sitter was a hundred years old in 1721.

The greater proficiency in the handling of the brushwork in the portrait of the elder Bowdoin would seem to support the conclusion that two different hands are in evidence, although it is not beyond the realm of possibility that the relative importance of the two figures might account for any qualitative disparity that exists. Whatever the case, the countenance of the elder Bowdoin is less wooden in appearance, and the painting of the folds of his garments more subtle and complex than in the portrait of the boy. Also effective are the shimmering highlights in the curls of his wig; and there is even a touch of what we might fairly call bravura painting at the upper right of the canvas.

If the younger of the Bowdoin sitters is William (1713-73) at approximately the age of twelve, then the date of his portrait would be about 1725. If the elder of the two is James I, who seems to be fifty or thereabouts, then his portrait could also be dated about 1725. This argument allows not only for the simultaneity of execution of the two portraits but permits us to associate them with other works by the same hand, or from the same school done at about the same time. Furthermore, if we compare the likeness of the present portrait with that by Badger of James I, painted roughly two decades later, allowing for the difference in age and artist, a striking resemblance is to be observed.

1. One of James Bowdoin I’s children (by his first wife) to die in infancy was named James; James Bowdoin II, therefore, was the second of his father’s offspring to be given that Christian name.
2. The third is the portrait identified in the present catalogue as Elizabeth Bowdoin, Lady Temple, attributed to Samuel King.
4. Portraits of Women (A Massachusetts Historical Society Picture Book), (Boston, 1954) [p. 11, ill. p. 10].

Bibliography:
Bolton, Charles, III, 924, ill. 925 (identified as “apparently Pierre Baudouin”).

1826.4 Bequest of Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn.

UNKNOWN ARTIST
WILLIAM BOWDOIN (1713-73) as a boy
Oil on canvas, 30 1/4 x 25, c. 1725

For the discussion which deals with this portrait and proposes the identification of the sitter as William Bowdoin, see the preceding entry. (The biography of William Bowdoin may be found where it seemed more appropriate to place it, under the account of his portrait as a mature individual by Robert Feke.)

1826.3 Bequest of Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn.

JOSEPH BADGER (1708-65)

Joseph Badger was born in Charlestown, Massachusetts, and came to portrait painting by way of house and sign painting about 1740, rather late in life for an artist of his time. While it is hard to believe that any painter who began to work in Boston at the time Badger did would have been unaware of the highly proficient and comparatively sophisticated likenesses which John Smibert already had been painting there for a full decade, there is little in Badger’s portraiture that reminds one of Smibert’s work. That Badger seems to have learned so little from Smibert can be accounted for either by the remoteness of their contact or the clear limitations of Badger’s talent. As we shall shortly see in the case of his portrait of James Bowdoin I, Badger frequently relied upon English portrait mezzotints of his time for the pose and setting of his subjects.

Badger was virtually a lost figure in American Colonial painting until 1918 when Lawrence Park published what is still just about all we know about the artist’s life, described his style as well as anybody has
Unknown Artist  
*William Bowdoin as a Boy*
yet done, and compiled an excellent list of some eighty of the approximately one hundred portraits he is now known to have done. Except for those few years in Boston between about 1749 and 1755, when no superior painter crowded him from the field, Badger was in a position of almost constant eclipse by such figures as Smibert and Feke before that period, and Blackburn and Copley after.

JAMES BOWDOIN I (1676-1747).

Oil on canvas, 50½ x 40½, c. 1747

Two versions of this portrait exist: the present example which descended through James II and James III to the latter’s wife, who bequeathed it to Bowdoin College in 1826; and the one in The Detroit Institute of Arts,¹ the gift of a descendant of Mrs. James Pitts, born Elizabeth Bowdoin,² the daughter of James I and Hannah Portage. Without comparing the two versions side by side, it is difficult to know which has primacy, although one authority has stated that the version at Bowdoin is a replica of that in Detroit.³ The same authority further suggests that the likeness is a posthumous one. While it is sometimes possible to discern the difference between life portraits and those copied from other sources, Badger’s almost uniformly leathery likenesses all but preclude such a judgment. If the likeness is indeed posthumous, the prototype from which it is derived is not known, although it is not inconceivable that Badger could have painted the eminent Bostonian from memory. It has more often been assumed that the portraits probably were made toward the close of the life of the sitter. If this is the case, it would help to explain why the richest man in New England was portrayed by a plug of a painter like Badger, rather than by Feke or Smibert. For Feke evidently did not arrive in Boston until the year after James I’s death, and Smibert probably was forced to give up portraiture about this time owing to his failing eyesight.⁴

Badger almost certainly derived the format of the portrait from a mezzotint dated 1726 of Sir Isaac Newton by Faber after Vanderbank,⁵ a print which he had used in the composition of several other portraits including that of Cornelius Waldo in the Worcester Art Museum. In the
case of the present portrait, however, Badger replaced the pillar behind Newton’s left shoulder with a nautical scene more appropriate to James I’s shipping interests. Otherwise, James I’s pose and the chair in which he sits are identical to Newton’s in the Faber mezzotint.

4. Cf. the biographical notices of these two artists in the present catalogue.
5. Belknap-Sellers, pls. XVII-XVIII.

Bibliography:
Burroughs, pp. 52-53.
Lee, pp. 203-05.
Robie, p. 430.
Updike, I, 456.

1826.6 Bequest of Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn.

**JOHN SMIBERT (1688-1751)**

John Smibert was born in Edinburgh, where his first contact with the brush was in the painting of houses. If he served an apprenticeship of the usual seven years between the ages of fourteen and twenty-one, it would not have been until about 1709 that he was able to go to London to attempt to fulfill those artistic aspirations already aching in him. In London he worked as a coach painter before commencing his first formal studies at an academy founded in 1711 by a group of English artists in a house in Great Queen Street. It was there that Smibert undoubtedly met George Vertue, an engraver, who throughout his life compiled in a considerable number of notebooks (now in the British Museum) data about his contemporaries. Most of our information about Smibert prior
to his American years is derived from these notebooks. According to Vertue, Smibert "first tryed to paint faces" during a relatively brief visit to his native Edinburgh a few months before his departure for Italy in 1717.

Smibert’s purpose in going to Italy, where he remained for three years, was to improve his ability as a portraitist presumably through the study of works by Renaissance and Baroque masters. Although Vertue states that in Rome Smibert “painted several persons from the life,” no such portraits are known to exist.

On the basis of the relatively few portraits which have been assigned to Smibert during his English years after his return from Italy and before his departure for America in 1728, his style at this time can be described as conforming to the constipated formulae of the Kneller school, which continued to dominate the taste of the English aristocracy even after Kneller’s own death in 1723. The time had not come when a new generation of painters would be able to break away from the suffocating confines of this tradition.¹

It is not, therefore, too difficult to understand why it was that a promising young painter like Smibert could have been tempted to leave London for the comparative wilderness of the New World. This came about as the result of an invitation to Smibert from George Berkeley, the brilliant young Dean of Derry, whom Smibert first met in Italy, to be professor of art and architecture in a college which Berkeley hoped to found in Bermuda. In the spirit of the famous line, “Westward the course of empire takes its way,” from one of Berkeley’s poems, the party set sail in September, 1728, for Newport, Rhode Island, to establish contacts for the provisioning of the Bermuda settlement and to await payment of the £20,000 voted by Parliament.

Undoubtedly because of the limited opportunities for a portrait painter in Rhode Island, Smibert removed to Boston not later than November, 1729. In this thriving community of some fifteen thousand souls, where he was almost at once regarded as a “great Master” and “wondrous Artist,”² Smibert found ample patronage and no competition. Early in 1730 Smibert held the first art exhibition ever seen in the New World, consisting of the copies of old masters which he had brought with him
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from England together with some of the portraits he already had painted in Newport and Boston. By 1731 it had become amply clear to Berkeley that a new Parliament never intended to pay over the grant its predecessor had voted for the college in Bermuda, so he returned to England, but without Smibert, who chose to remain in Boston, as it turned out, for the rest of his life.

In addition to portrait painting, Smibert also operated a "Colour Shop" in Boston where he not only provided supplies to the "many women that paints Fanns," but also sold "valuable prints, engrav'd by the best Hands after the finest Pictures . . . done by Raphael, Michael Angelo, Poussin, Rubens and other . . . Masters. . . ." Although Badger and Greenwood were to appear on the scene about 1740, they were hardly competition for a man of Smibert's training, experience, and reputation. After a successful career of nearly two decades, Smibert's eyesight began to fail and, although he wrote a friend "I ... hath been diverting my self with somethings in the Landskip way," it is probable that he gradually had to give up portraiture beginning about 1747.8

* Through the exceptionally kind offices of Stephen T. Riley, Director of the Massachusetts Historical Society, on May 26, 1966, the present writer was privileged to examine briefly a photographic copy of John Smibert's account book, recently uncovered in the Public Records Office in London. While the record of Smibert's life by the present writer is essentially accurate, certain facts revealed in Smibert's account book would modify it somewhat. Nevertheless, inasmuch as Mr. Riley hopes that the Massachusetts Historical Society will be able to publish the account book, the present writer has decided to refrain from altering his narrative in any way. With Mr. Riley's kind permission, however, note has been made in the following two entries of the dates Smibert recorded for the portraits of Rev. James McSparran and James Bowdoin II.

1. It is interesting to note that while Vertue only placed Smibert in the second rank of English painters of this period, he did the same for another young contemporary of Smibert's by the name of William Hogarth.

2. From an extremely laudatory poem about Smibert by Mather Byles which was first published in Boston in March or April, 1730. The complete text of the poem is given in Foote, Smibert, pp. 54-55.

3. Letter of July 1, 1743, from Smibert to Arthur Pond, his London dealer in artists' supplies; Foote, Smibert, p. 86.
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5. From a letter of April 6, 1749, to Pond, in which Smibert also stated: "... my eyes has been some time failling me..." *ibid.*, p. 100; cf. also a letter of December 28, 1752, from Smibert’s nephew, John Moffatt, to Pond: "He [Smibert] had been for many years in a Declining state of health, and for some years unable to paint at al'..." *ibid.*, pp. 103-04.

THE REVEREND JAMES McSPARRAN (1693-1757)

Oil on canvas (mounted on cradled panel), 30 x 25, May, 1735

James McSparran was born in Ireland in September, 1693, the son of Presbyterian parents who had moved there from Scotland. He was educated at the University of Glasgow from which he received the degree of Master of Arts in 1709, after which he studied for the Presbyterian ministry, receiving his credentials as a licentiate of the Presbytery of Scotland.

During McSparran’s first visit to America in 1718-19, he served temporarily as the minister of the Congregational Church in Bristol, Massachusetts. Although he was invited to become the pastor of this church, his ordination was delayed and his credentials disputed by Cotton Mather, whose enmity he seems to have incurred. On the basis of certain things McSparran later wrote, it is possible that this incident in his early life was responsible for his conversion to the Anglican church into whose priesthood he was ordained in London in 1720.

McSparran returned to America in April, 1721, as a missionary of the Society of the Propagation of the Gospel attached to St. Paul’s Church, Narragansett, Rhode Island, where, except for two trips to England in 1736-37, at which time he received the degree of Doctor of Sacred Theology from Oxford, and 1754-56, he remained until his death in December, 1757.

According to Smibert’s account book (see note under the artist’s biography in this catalogue), he painted a portrait of the Reverend James McSparran, which the present writer takes to be the example at hand, in May, 1735. Foote believed the portrait to have been painted at the same time as that of Mrs. McSparran ("Handsome Hannah" Gardiner) in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, during a visit paid the McSparrans by Smibert in the company of Dean Berkeley in May, 1729. Foote’s as-
John Smibert  The Reverend James McSparan
assumption was a logical one, and Smibert’s account book does in fact uphold him in the dating of the portrait of Mrs. McSparran. The present writer, however, before examining Smibert’s account book, had rejected Foote’s dating of the portrait of the Reverend McSparran on two counts. Foote cited a letter of Smibert’s dated September 22, 1735, to a correspondent in Newport in which, among other things, the artist referred to the delay in the manufacture of the frame for “Mr. McSparran’s picture.” Feeling that the Reverend McSparran looked closer in age to forty-one than to thirty-five, the present writer used this document to support his suggestion of dating the portrait in 1735 rather than in 1729.

This portrait is one of Smibert’s most effective works; it and its companion of Mrs. McSparran may have been among the first paintings of quality to have been seen by the young Gilbert Stuart, who was baptized by the Reverend McSparran and who lived the first fourteen years of his life in the environs of Newport.

Bibliography:
Bayley, Five Colonial Artists, p. 405.
Burroughs, p. 36.
Foote, Smibert, pp. 41-43, 84, 168-69.
Hagen, p. 55, fig. 75.
Lee, Cuthbert, “John Smibert,” Antiques, XVIII (1930), 119, fig. 2.
Updike, III, 405.

Exhibited:
Colonial Portraits, Metropolitan Museum, New York, November 6-December 31, 1911.

1897.1 Bequest of Charles Edward Allen of Gardiner, Maine (Bowdoin class of 1835), a descendant of the sitter’s brother-in-law, Dr. Sylvester Gardiner.
(Foote, Smibert, incorrectly stated that the portrait came to Bowdoin College in 1835, a confusion that probably arose from the fact that that was the year of the donor's graduation from Bowdoin.)

JAMES BOWDOIN II (1726-90) as a boy
Oil on canvas, 34\(\frac{7}{8}\) x 26\(\frac{7}{8}\), 1736 (before March)

According to Smibert's account book (see note under the artist's biography in this catalogue), this portrait was painted in 1736. Although Smibert did not indicate a specific month for the portrait, it appears among those painted in 1736, before the ones listed as having been painted in March of that year. (The present writer, before he saw the Smibert account book, took the sitter to be about twelve, and hence placed the portrait two years later than its actual date of execution.) This portrait of James II as a young hunter possesses an ample measure of the technical sophistication of English art of the period coupled with that freshness of approach which is one of the delights of early American portraiture of children. It probably was painted as a companion to the portrait in the present collection of *William Bowdoin* as a boy of roughly the same age, executed by an unknown artist about a decade earlier. (The biography of James Bowdoin II may be found where it seemed more appropriate to place it, under the account of his portrait, painted the year after he reached his majority, by Robert Feke.)

Bibliography:
Burroughs, pp. 47, 51 (as by Smibert, 1936).
Foote, Feke, pp. 46-47, 126-28 (as by Feke, 1930).
Foote, Smibert, pp. 135-36 (as by Smibert, 1950, assuming the sitter to be about fourteen).
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1826.5 Bequest of Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn.
John Smibert  James Bowdoin II as a Boy
ROBERT FEKE (ac. 1741-50)

Four contemporary documents and his signed and dated portraits themselves comprise the only irrefutable evidence we have about Robert Feke’s life. Based on this knowledge, Feke’s chronology is as follows: the inscription on the verso of his *Isaac Royall Family* (Harvard University), identifying the sitters, concludes, “Finisht Sept. 15, 1741 by Robert Feke.” (The Royalls were residents of Charlestown, Massachusetts.) That the Robert Feke listed in the town records of Newport, Rhode Island, as having married Eleanor Cozzens on September 23, 1742 (and which describes them as “both of Newport”) is our painter can be confirmed by a document of 1744 and two signed and dated portraits of 1745 (discussed below). On July 16, 1744, Dr. Alexander Hamilton, a Scottish physician living in Annapolis, Maryland, arrived in Newport and recorded in his diary under that date: ... in the afternoon Dr. Moffat, an old acquaintance and schoolfellow of mine, led me a course thro’ the town. He carried me to see one Feykes, a painter, the most extraordinary genius I ever knew, for he does pictures tolerably well by the force of genius, having never had any teaching. I saw a large table of the Judgement of Hercules, copied by him from the frontispiece of the Earl of Shaftesbury’s, which I thought very well done. This man had exactly the phizz of a painter, having a long pale face, sharp nose, large eyes with which he looked upon you stedfastly, long curled black hair, a delicate white hand, and long fingers.¹

The two signed and dated Newport portraits of 1745 are of the Reverend Thomas Hiscox (Private Collection), later pastor of the Baptist Church, Westerly, Rhode Island; and the Reverend John Callender (Rhode Island Historical Society), pastor of the First Baptist Church, Newport, and the minister who married the Fekes. In 1746 Feke was in Philadelphia, where he was painting portraits, which are signed and dated, of residents of that city. That he painted in Boston in 1748 is proved by his Bowdoin portraits. April 7, 1750, is the date of Feke’s next appearance, again in Philadelphia, where he is mentioned by a John Smith of that city in an entry of that date in his diary which states, “Went to Fewke’s the painter’s & viewed several pieces & faces of his painting.”² In the manuscript “Book of Records of Marriage Certificates Belonging to the Monthly Meeting of Rhode Island” are listed the
The marriages of Feke’s two daughters (Phila and Sarah), which took place on the same day, October 15, 1767, and in which each is described as “daughter of Robert Feke, late of said Newport in said County and Colony, Mariner, deceased, and Eleanor, his wife, now widow.” That Feke is not identified as a painter is not so surprising in view of the fact that his daughters had Quaker weddings, but that he is listed as a “Mariner” is a matter of some interest (to which we will return later).

While anyone who studies Feke must inevitably become entangled in what one critic has so aptly described as the artist’s “irritatingly obscure beginnings,” the present writer, thanks mainly to the painstaking researches of W. P. Belknap, is reasonably convinced that Robert Feke, the painter of Newport, Rhode Island, is identical with Robert Feke, Jr., born about 1706 at Oyster Bay, New York. The present writer also is inclined to believe, again thanks to Belknap, that Feke probably left Oyster Bay about 1731. Where Feke went and what he did between that time and the year he painted the Royalls is much less certain.

Feke’s Royall Family is based in large part on John Smibert’s Berkeley Group (Yale University) of 1729, which Feke probably saw in Smibert’s studio in Boston (where it remained until 1808) before he painted the Royalls who lived in nearby Charlestown. Another, smaller version of the Berkeley Group (National Gallery of Ireland) belonged to Smibert’s nephew Thomas Moffatt, a resident of Newport, who there introduced Dr. Hamilton to Feke in 1744; and it is likely that Feke was familiar with that version as well. That Feke plucked this plum of a commission, and not Smibert, probably had more to do with the fact that Smibert evidently was ailing at the time, and not that Feke had won any competition on the grounds of superior talent. Although the Royall Family owes something to Smibert in its handling as well as in its conception, its level of accomplishment, though far from masterful, indicates that some not inconsiderable work preceded it; and other aspects of its style point to influences different in nature from those which can be ascribed to Smibert.

Information which seems to refer to Feke’s work done before the Royall Family was published in the September, 1860, issue of Dawson’s Historical Magazine (pp. 280-81) by a respected historian of the period,
John Gilmary Shea, who had learned it from a descendant of the Oyster Bay Fekes. The note stated that “a number of family portraits executed by Robert Feke” perished in a fire at Meadowside (the Feke family homestead at Oyster Bay) about 1768. Shea also mentioned having seen a portrait on panel of a child named Levinah Cock, which was the only one still owned by the Feeks family and which, largely owing to an inscription on the verso, they believed to be by Robert Feke. This portrait (which as late as 1946 was owned by Robert Feeks Cox) of Levinah Cock, who we now know was the daughter of the painter’s sister Deborah and her husband James Cock, shows the child who was born about 1730 at about the age of two. In addition to the foregoing data (and the inscription to be discussed in a moment), on the basis of style this rather crude little painting would indeed seem to be one of Robert Feke’s juvenilia (in more ways than one).

But the inscription on the verso of the panel: “To Robert Feke at Mr. Judea Hayes in Newyork” is as important as the painting itself.⁹ Evidently contemporary with the portrait (a Judah Hays emigrated from The Hague to New York c. 1720, d. 1764), the inscription not only relates the painting to Feke but places him in New York as well. Regarding the inscription, Shea suggested that, “It would seem likely from this, that he [Feke] resided in New York also, and that portraits by his hand, may exist in some old family there.” While no such portraits have ever been found, it is possible that this is because scholars have been looking for another Tench Francis (Metropolitan Museum of Art) instead of a Levinah Cock, and that certain examples of Feke’s incunabula may yet lie undiscovered among the works of the “anonymous” New York limners of the period. Returning to the question of the genesis of Feke’s style as evidenced in his Royall Family, there is a great clarity and directness in that work which not only belongs in general to the American primitive tradition in painting but it is specifically reminiscent of the New York school of limners working in the 1720’s and 1730’s.

Concerning another possible source in the formation of Feke’s style, we may now turn to a letter written by John Feke Townsend, published in the November 15, 1859, issue of the Newport Daily News. Townsend, born in 1777, was the son of Phila Feke, one of Robert Feke’s two daught-
ters (both of whom, as we already have mentioned, were married on the same day, October 15, 1767, in Newport). Townsend wrote in part that his grandfather “was absent on voyages abroad several years, in what capacity is unknown, in one of which, in time of war, he became a prisoner and was carried into Spain. There he procured paints and brushes and while in prison he whiled away much of his time in rude paintings, which on his release he sold, and so procured the means of returning to his own country. He soon came to this town, where he married. . . . Here was his home for over twenty years.”

While the bit about Feke having painted in prison (which sounds as if it is right out of Irving Stone) may be the result of the manner in which family traditions frequently become over romanticized, there are grounds for believing the account of the voyages and even, perhaps, the Spanish captivity. First of all, there is the documentary evidence of Feke having been a “mariner” in his daughters’ wedding records. Regarding the Spanish captivity, Townsend was somewhat ambiguous as to when this may have happened. While he seemed to imply that his grandfather first came to Newport “soon” after the episode and just prior to his marriage (which, as we have seen, took place on September 23, 1742), he also stated that his grandfather had lived in Newport “for about twenty years,” which would point to an earlier date for the Spanish captivity. While the present writer is reinforced by Townsend in his belief that Feke probably did first go to Newport about twenty years before his ultimate disappearance (see footnotes 5 and 6), he is inclined to interpret Townsend’s statement concerning the Spanish captivity as referring to a voyage (taken from Newport) in closer proximity to Robert Feke’s marriage. If this is the case, it is worth remembering that Spain and England (of which Newport was then a part) were adversaries (in the “War of Jenkins’ Ear”) beginning in 1739. Feke, therefore, could have been on an English ship captured by the Spanish about that time.

Regarding Townsend’s credibility, his information could have come from at least three sources which were less remote in time than 1859 from Robert Feke’s life: Townsend’s mother; his grandmother, who lived in Newport until her death in 1804; and his uncle, Charles Feke, who survived there until 1822. The genealogical errors Townsend com-
mitted in the same letter are inconsequential in nature, and perhaps can be overlooked, coming as they did from an eighty-two-year-old writer. Townsend also wrote of his grandfather that “His health declined, and he sought the milder climate of Bermuda, where he deceased.” While this information has never been substantiated, Townsend also stated that his grandfather died at the age of “about forty-five,” which coalesces with what the painter’s age would have been about the time of his disappearance in 1750, if he was indeed (as the present writer believes) identical with Robert Feke, Jr., of Oyster Bay, born about 1706.

The principal significance of Townsend’s letter is that it convincingly affirms that Feke was a mariner, in which circumstance it is altogether likely that the painter would have been in England, and this could explain why even the earliest of Feke’s portraits seem to the present writer to posit a knowledge of English portraiture of the period, not so much through the medium of prints, but from originals, to an extent that could not have been possible in America. As Belknap pointed out, Feke’s portraits display an “apparent familiarity, in an exceptional degree for a native-born Colonial painter, with the contemporary mode in British portraiture.” And Goodrich has said, “Feke may have seen some of the few portraits by Hudson or others of the Kneller school brought over to the colonies, or more likely the engravings after them which were sold here. But parallels in light, color and handling make it likely that he had also seen British portraiture of the time in London, probably in his voyages as a “mariner.”

Whether Feke voyaged abroad during the 1730’s or the 1740’s (or both) we do not know. As regards the 1740’s, from what we know of Feke’s activities during these years, the two most likely stretches of time which suggest themselves are the periods between the date he finished the Royall Family (September 15, 1741) and his wedding day (September 23, 1742); or sometime after that date (Feke is not accounted for in 1743) and the time of Dr. Hamilton’s visit (July 16, 1744).

On the basis of a comparison between Feke’s portrait of James Bowdoin II, signed and dated 1748, and Joseph Highmore’s Gentleman in a Murrey Velvet Coat of 1747 (National Gallery, London), Hagen felt that Feke (who again is unaccounted for in 1747) must have been in
London in that year. While the present writer is not entirely convinced of the above comparison, he does feel that Feke’s portraits of 1748 display a fuller flowering of his abilities than is evidenced in those of 1746. Furthermore, in painting his faces Feke now seems to have rejected much of the specificity he formerly had given them in favor of a broader, more idealized treatment (except in his General Waldo). Whether this higher level of quality and shift in style in 1748 can have been the consequences of Feke’s having seen English painting in London the preceding year, or were simply the result of the maturation of his powers, is difficult to know.

If Feke was in England in 1747, it would not be necessary to infer that he actually had undertaken any formal study there; it is much more likely that he simply would have been an observer, who may in fact have gone to England on quite other business. If Feke was a mariner, he doubtless engaged in the pursuit as a means of helping to support his family and himself. It was not at all unusual for an artist in America before Blackburn and Copley to ply another trade in order to make both ends meet (e.g. Smibert’s “Colour Shop”).

That Feke probably never had any formal study (at least not before 1744) is testified to in Dr. Hamilton’s diary. There are also certain recurrent primitivisms in Feke’s style which would seem to preclude the possibility that he can have been drilled in any formal, academic sense. Indeed, he was rather better off in that whatever clichés he did possess were largely homemade, and that his style was not dulled by third-hand borrowings from second-rate artists. That in spite of all of this Feke was no mere limner, we hardly need argue. And there are indications that he aspired to subject matter beyond portraiture. Dr. Hamilton wrote of his Judgement of Hercules, and six years later in Philadelphia, John Smith “viewed several pieces & faces of his painting.”

Although Feke’s style may have been formed in part in the ambience of the New York limners of the early decades of the eighteenth century, and subsequently influenced by the experience of contemporary English portraiture, it was, like Copley’s, more the product of his own genius (as Dr. Hamilton had observed) than any other force. Feke was, with the possible exception of Smibert, the greatest portraitist in America be-
fore Copley. Feke’s portraits clearly seem to have impressed Copley with the fashionableness of their style and the clarity of their execution. Indeed, Feke may have been the American Giotto, whose somewhat repetitive but nonetheless powerful presences could have been one of the chief sources of Copley’s ultimately much greater accomplishment.


3. Foote, Feke, p. 52.


5. Belknap, Waldron Phoenix, Jr., “The Identity of Robert Feke,” The Art Bulletin, XXIX (1947), 201-07. Robert Feke, Jr., of Oyster Bay was the great-grandson of Lt. Robert Feke who came to Massachusetts in 1630. Lieutenant Robert, who was descended from London goldsmiths, married Elizabeth Fones, the niece of Governor Winthrop and at the time the young widow of Henry Winthrop, the governor's son. Elizabeth evidently later divorced Lieutenant Robert, who had become mentally unstable. His son John (1639-1724) became a Quaker. John’s son, Robert, Sr. (1683-1773), Robert, Jr.’s father, became a Baptist. (The religions of John and Robert, Sr., are important because of subsequent errors relating to them discussed in footnote 11 below.) Belknap cited several Oyster Bay documents of the first quarter of the eighteenth century referring to a Robert Feke, and three of 1728 which for the first time speak of Robert Feke, Sr., implying that Robert, Jr., had rather recently reached his majority. This would point to the latter’s year of birth as being about 1706. Belknap also cited several cases of members of the Feke family having removed from Oyster Bay to Rhode Island, the most notable example of a close relative of Robert, Jr.’s, having been his Aunt Abigail, who was married in a ceremony there in 1727. While it is of course known that Robert Feke, the painter, married Eleanor Cozzens of Newport in that town in 1742, Belknap believed there is evidence to indicate that Eleanor’s brother Charles married Sara Feke, a sister of Robert Feke, Jr., of Oyster Bay.

6. There is an Oyster Bay document of December 12, 1730, signed “Robart feke Ju". No other document known is so signed, and all others subsequent to this date mentioning the name Robert Feke lack the designation Senior, which would seem to imply that Robert, Sr., no longer needed to be distinguished from his son, Robert, Jr., who about that time may well have gone elsewhere. Ibid., pp. 203-04.

7. John Johnston, who probably was the last of many artists to occupy Smibert’s studio long after the artist’s death, sold the Berkeley Group to Isaac Lothrop in
1808. Foote, Smibert, p. 45.

8. In a letter of July 1, 1743, to Arthur Pond, his London dealer in artists' supplies, Smibert wrote of "having near 3 years ago recovered from a dangerous illness." Ibid., p. 86.

9. Why the picture was sent to Feke is not entirely clear, although there are several possibilities: it may have been unfinished at the time it was sent off; it may have been sent to him to copy; it may have been sent to him to show in New York as an example of his juvenile portraiture; etc.

10. Quoted from Barbara N. Parker, "The Identity of Robert Feke Reconsidered in the Light of W. Phoenix Belknap's Notes," The Art Bulletin, XXXIII (1951), 192-94. Belknap had located this document, which was here published for the first time after his death, subsequent to his publication of his article on Feke in 1947 (see footnote 5 above). In that article, however, Belknap convincingly reasoned that the same evidence, which at that time was only known in the form of an uncorroborated notice supplied by an unknown "S. F." in the January, 1860, issue of Dawson's Historical Magazine, was nevertheless essentially correct.

11. Townsend reported that Robert, Jr., was a Baptist convert, implying that the motivation for his leaving home and going to sea was a religious rift between him and his "Quaker" father, Robert, Sr. (As we have seen in footnote 5 above, Robert, Sr., was the first Baptist in the family.) Townsend also stated that the painter was of Dutch descent, information repeated by "S. F." (see footnote 10 above) in reference to whom Belknap pointed out that the confusion might have arisen out of the facts, for example, that two of the children of Lt. Robert Feke (see footnote 5 above) were baptized in the Dutch church in New Amsterdam, and that his nephew Tobias married a Dutch woman. Belknap, op. cit., pp. 205-06.

12. Some have thought that the family tradition which stated that Robert Feke died in Bermuda might have confused that place with Barbados, where in fact there are records of a Feke family in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and where a Robert Feke is recorded as having been born in 1713. A full discussion of these records, the gist of which is that the branch of the family involved is not the one into which Robert Feke, the painter, was born, may be found in Foote, Feke, pp. 114-17.


15. Hagen, pp. 76-77, figs. 70-71.

16. A painting Turkish Smugglers, said by its owner to have been signed both "R. F." and "R. Feke" turned up in an English collection forty years ago (Antiquarian, XV (1930), 34). The style of the work is very like that of Dutch
and Flemish paintings of similar subjects done in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. If by Feke, it would add a whole new dimension to what we know about him.

JAMES BOWDOIN II (1726-90)

Oil on canvas, 50 x 40
Signed and dated l.l. R F Pinx/1748

James Bowdoin II* was the son of James Bowdoin I and his second wife, Hannah Portage. An interesting description of James II’s youth, published after his death in the Massachusetts Magazine III (1791), p. 6, states that he “was distinguished ... for his steadiness, ingenuity and good behaviour ... a stranger to the sallies of youth.... A close application to study, added to a lively and penetrating genius, distinguished him as the young man of merit.... While modesty, politeness and philanthropy excited expectations the most flattering as to his future eminence.”

James II entered Harvard in 1741 at the age of fifteen as a member of the class of 1745. He is recorded as second in his class of twenty-seven, a rank determined, as was the custom, by social position (in his case the date of his father’s commission as Justice of the Peace) rather than by academic standing.

One of Bowdoin’s lifelong interests was the study of various scientific phenomena. The inventory of his mansion, which stood at what is now the corner of Beacon and Bowdoin Streets in Boston, made on September 15, 1774, two days after his name appeared on a list of patriots which was circulated among the British troops and subsequently published in the Boston Gazette, indicates that in addition to his quite considerable library of more than twelve hundred volumes, the contents of his “Great Upper Chamber” contained numerous scientific instruments, among which were six telescopes of various kinds and “an Electrical Machine & Apparatus.” His published papers in the scientific area include “An Improvement Proposed for Telescopes,” which appeared in The London Magazine (November, 1761) and “Observations upon a Hypothesis for Solving the Phenomena of Life,” American Museum
(March, 1788). It was a mutual interest in science which first brought Bowdoin and Benjamin Franklin together; this friendship was to endure from their first meeting in 1750 until their deaths a few months apart, forty years later. The two carried on an extensive correspondence on scientific subjects, and there is clear evidence that Franklin was impressed by the younger man’s astuteness. It was Bowdoin, for example, who deduced that the luminosity to be observed at times in sea water was caused by “animalcules” and not electricity, as Franklin believed. In 1780 Bowdoin was one of the founders of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, of which he was president for its first, and his last, decade. He was also a member of the American Philosophical Society and the Royal Societies of London and Dublin. And in his early thirties he even tried his hand at poetry, an example of which we will have occasion to examine in the discussion of the portrait of his wife.

Bowdoin’s political career had its official beginning upon his election (by the skin of his teeth) as one of the four Boston members of the Massachusetts (Provincial) House of Representatives in 1753. (Four years previously he had declined election to the position of Collector of Taxes.) He was thrice returned by his constituency to the House, and after a year out of office, was elected by the House to the Governor’s Council, then the twenty-eight-member upper house, or Senate, of the legislature. This position he was to hold with great distinction for sixteen of the seventeen years between 1757 and 1774.

In one of his first speeches in the House, in 1754, Bowdoin voiced his support for a union of the Colonies (under the Albany Plan) as the most effective means of combating the French. “It has been my opinion, and still is, that a general union would be most salutary . . . the Colonies have no head . . . and all pull different ways. Join or Die must be their motto.” It was an opinion he was to continue to maintain, for the same reasons, but against a different adversary.

If the first three years of Bowdoin’s membership in the Council were relatively uneventful, those which followed the appointment of Sir Francis Bernard as Royal Governor in 1760 would be tempestuous. By examining the Bowdoin-Bernard relationship, it is clear that the reasons which propelled Bowdoin into the politics of revolution were personal as well as philosophical.
On the philosophical side, there can be little doubt that Bowdoin would have found Bernard's remark, voiced in his inaugural address to the Assembly, regarding the blessings which the Colonies derived from their *subjection* to Great Britain, obnoxious. Indeed, in their response to Bernard, the Council pointedly substituted the word *relation* for *subjection.* If it was the economic effect of the Stamp Act as a hindrance to trade which first aroused Bowdoin, he was not unaware, as well, of its wider implications. On April 9, 1765, he wrote his brother-in-law, George Scott, Governor of Grenada and Dominica, "We are put out of humour here by a long String of Resolves of the House of Commons just received relative to a Stamp duty in the Colonies. We don't rate our Liberties and Property quite so high as we did two years ago: Since which we have been treated as the mere property of Great Britain; and as if we stood in no other relation to her, than the Blacks of your Island to their respective owners and taskmasters." This latter form of subservience also rankled Bowdoin for, unlike many of his fellow Huguenots, he was not a slave trader, and in 1767 drafted an act designed to stop the future importation of slaves into Massachusetts by laying a £40 head tax on them.

On the personal side, in 1767 Bowdoin's daughter, Elizabeth, married John Temple, who, though born in Massachusetts, spent his early years in England, returning to Boston in 1762 as Surveyor General of Customs. Even before his marriage into the Bowdoin family, Temple, vigilant in enforcing the revenue laws, had had a falling out with Bernard, and in 1764 officially accused him of accepting bribes. As a member of the Bowdoin family, Temple found an ardent ally against Bernard in his father-in-law. The enmity between Bowdoin and Bernard must have grown even greater in those same years, during which Bowdoin also plotted (unsuccessfully) to have his brother-in-law, George Scott, replace Bernard as Governor of the Province of Massachusetts.³

Because of Bowdoin's position in the Council, of which he was in Bernard's own words "the perpetual president, chairman, secretary, and speaker," his opposition to the Governor began to take on major proportions. When in May, 1769, Bernard learned that Bowdoin intended to launch a major attack aimed at his recall at the opening of the General
Court, he negativied Bowdoin's reelection to the Council. This action, and Bowdoin's response to it—"your Excellency's Censure is Praise . . . an Honour to the Man who is the Subject of it, and the best Evidence that he has done his Duty"—won him his first wide popular acclaim in the camp of the Sons of Liberty.

Appointed by the town of Boston to head a committee to write a report to be sent English Whigs regarding the Massacre which had taken place on March 5, 1770, Bowdoin declared on their "honor and consciences" that soldiers were at fault, that "There was a general combination among them to take vengeance on the town indiscriminately," and that after the people threw a few snowballs, the troops "deliberately" shot them down.

With these proofs of his political sentiments before them, the people elected Bowdoin to the House of Representatives to replace the now mad James Otis, with the thought that the House would immediately reelevate him to the Council. This the House did, and the new Governor, Thomas Hutchinson, who replaced Bernard (who had since been recalled), chose to permit Bowdoin to remain in the Council in the belief he would do less harm there than in the House. That Hutchinson had no more luck than Bernard with Bowdoin (although Bowdoin's reasons were now not at all personal but entirely political) may be found in a remark he made to his predecessor in a letter of August 25, 1772, "He [Bowdoin] runs into the foolish notions of Adams & Co., and when Government is the subject, talks their jargon. . . . I don't know but he may have been more cautious in his language, but he joins in the same measures." In his History of Massachusetts, Hutchinson later wrote that the harmonious relationship between Bowdoin in the Council and Sam Adams in the House was such "that when the Governor met with opposition from the one, he had reason to expect like opposition from the other."

If Bowdoin was an ally of Sam Adams, however, he still entertained every royal officer of high rank who came to Boston. Bowdoin still did not look upon himself as a rebel but rather as a Whig, attempting to rectify the abuses of the Crown while yet remaining within the bosom of the Empire. But the Tea Act was one of the events which helped to tip
the scales for Bowdoin (as it did for so many others), and he spoke in
the Council advising the Governor to use his influence with the consignees
to ship the tea back to London without landing it. After the most famous
tea party in American (and British) history, Bowdoin broke with the
more conservative Whigs, who abhorred the dumping of the tea, and
spoke his mind: “The people having done everything else in their power
to prevent the tea from being landed, and having found they are not
able to prevail, were driven to the necessity of destroying it, as being
a less evil than submission to the duty.” The die was cast, and in May,
1774, for this and all his other “subversive” behavior, Hutchinson’s
successor as Governor, General Gage, acting on “express orders from his
Majesty” negativéd Bowdoin’s election to the Council.

On June 17, 1774, as Bowdoin’s former brother-in-law, Thomas
Flucker, Colonial Secretary, barred from the chamber of the House,
read before the people from its steps Governor Gage’s proclamation dissolv¬
ing the body, Bowdoin was inside being elected to head the delega-
tion from Massachusetts to the first Continental Congress in Philadel-
phia.

But poor health, which at the time afflicted both him and his wife, pre¬
vented Bowdoin from accepting the appointment. Had he gone to Phila-
delphia, it would not be difficult to believe that his fame in American
history would have been as great as that of the man elected to replace
him, John Hancock.

While there were those who whispered that Bowdoin’s decision to
withdraw from the delegation had as much to do with his desire to stay
at home and protect his family fortune as it did with his physical condi-
tion, there is ample evidence that poor health, which was to plague him
on and off for the rest of his life (and which was in fact to play a major
role in impeding his political progress), was the true reason for his not
accepting the appointment. In the following year, for example, Abigail
Adams, in a letter to her husband, wrote of Bowdoin, “He, poor gen-
tleman, is so low that I apprehend he is hastening to a house not made
with hands; he looks like a mere skeleton, speaks faint and low, is racked
with a violent cough, and, I think, far advanced in a consumption. . . .”

Although continuing in poor health, Bowdoin was persuaded a few
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months later to accept election to the new Massachusetts Council organized now under the auspices of the Continental Congress. He was able to meet with General Washington and representatives of the other Colonies to help plan the reorganization of the Continental Army. Of Washington, Bowdoin was to write, "I take him to be a valuable character, which proportionately grows in ones' esteem the more one is acquainted with him." The feeling was mutual. Speaking to some Massachusetts Whigs, Washington said, "You need not fear, when you have a Bowdoin at your head."

Later in the same year, when the British sent out peace overtures, Bowdoin was among the first to reject them, insisting that the essential prerequisite for negotiations was the complete withdrawal of British forces from the Colonies. Concerning Thomas Paine's _Common Sense_, Bowdoin wrote, "The more it is contemplated, the stronger is the conviction of the truth of it, at least this is the case with respect to myself and my dear Rib, we having been much confirmed in it since reading the Pamphlet." And on July 21, 1776, it was Bowdoin who presided at the proclamation of the Declaration of Independence from the balcony of the State House in Boston, offering the salute: "Stability and perpetuity to American independence," and later toasting "the downfall of Tyrants and Tyranny."

After ill health forced him to resign from the Council in 1777, Bowdoin remained out of public life until 1779 when he was elected president of the convention to draft the Constitution of Massachusetts. In the matter of who was to be the first governor under the new Constitution, while Bowdoin's fiscal attitudes about paying for the war through taxation and not inflation or confiscation won him support in some quarters, a larger faction feared deflation and their candidate, John Hancock, was elected. Bowdoin was offered his choice of the lieutenant governorship or a seat in the Senate, but declined both.

Instead, during the next few years, Bowdoin was occupied with attempting to preserve what remained of his once considerable fortune. He became the first president of the Massachusetts Bank (now the First National Bank of Boston), and was one of the first to recognize the advantages of, and to invest in, the China trade. It was also during this
period that he was involved with the foundation of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

In 1785 Hancock decided to relinquish the governorship with the expectation that his Lieutenant Governor, Thomas Cushing, would be elected to replace him. Bowdoin’s supporters again advanced his name, and after a bitter campaign in which he was falsely accused of having had Tory sympathies during the Revolution because of his many Loyalist friends and relatives, Bowdoin was elected. The sound but not unduly conservative economic policies of his first administration won him wide public favor, and he was reelected to a second term by an overwhelming majority. The most momentous act of Bowdoin’s second administration was his suppression of the insurrection known as Shays’ Rebellion. While most modern historians concede that the consequences to the new Commonwealth of Massachusetts would have been much worse had Bowdoin not suppressed the insurrection, his actions contributed significantly to his defeat by a dramatic reversal of popular expression in the next election.

Although some efforts were made to draw Bowdoin back into the political arena, the remaining years of his life were devoted mostly to his personal affairs which included the renewed pursuit of his scientific interests. After a final illness of some three months, he died on November 6, 1790. The nature and extent of the obsequies attendant upon his funeral indicate that his passing was widely and truly mourned. While the names of many, like Sam Adams and John Hancock, are more famous than his, Bowdoin’s achievements were in many ways as great as theirs; and he still awaits the biographer who will restore his name to its proper place among the founders of the American republic.

The present portrait was painted in 1748. On the basis of a comparison between it and Joseph Highmore’s Gentleman in a Murrey Velvet Coat of 1747 (National Gallery, London), Hagen felt that Feke, whose whereabouts in 1747 are not accounted for, must have been in London in that year. While the present writer is not entirely convinced of the above comparison, he does feel that Feke’s portraits of 1748, which include the present example as well as those of the other three Bowdoins, display a fuller flowering of his abilities than is evidenced in those of
1746. Furthermore, in painting his faces Feke now seems to have rejected much of the specificity he formerly had given them in favor of a broader, more idealized treatment (except in his General Waldo). Whether this higher level of quality and shift in style in 1748 can have been the consequences of Feke’s having seen English painting in London the preceding year, or were simply the result of the maturation of his powers, is difficult to know.

In 1748 the twenty-two-year-old James II had already entered into a partnership with his brother-in-law, James Pitts, in the West Indies trade. The year 1748 was also that of James’s marriage to Elizabeth Erving, the seventeen-year-old sister of his college roommate. Her father, John Erving, was one of the most successful merchants of his day. This portrait and its companion probably can be regarded as James’s and Elizabeth’s wedding pictures. It is amusing to note that in a letter from James to his brother-in-law, Governor Scott, written nearly twenty years later, in which the topic explored was a wife for his son, James III, he wrote, “The Money, my dear Scott, you know is the primum mobile of most matches....” But if his Elizabeth was wellborn, we have only to turn to the following portrait to know that she was also pretty.


1. Further information about Temple may be found in the entry dealing with Blackburn’s double portrait of Elizabeth Bowdoin and her brother.
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1826.8 Bequest of Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn.

MRS. JAMES BOWDOIN II née Elizabeth Erving (1731-1803)
Oil on canvas, 50½ x 40½

Signed and dated l. r. R Feke Pinx/1748

Elizabeth Erving, the daughter of the wealthy Boston merchant John Erving, married James Bowdoin II (who had been her brother’s Harvard roommate) on September 15, 1748, when she was seventeen and he twenty-two. The charming young lady, portrayed here in what may perhaps have been her wedding portrait, can almost be described in some words from a poem by her husband (a paraphrase by him of Dodsley’s Economy of Human Life) published in Boston in 1759:

See down her neck the charming locks descent;
And, black as jet, in waving ringlets end:
The jetty locks, as down her neck they flow,
The lovely white to great advantage show:
Her comely neck, with symmetry and grace,
Rises majestic on it’s noble base,
And, like a column of superior art,
Does to the eye a fine effect impart:
Her piercing eyes their harmless lightning play;
And dart around a joy-diffusing ray:
Her cheeks, adorn’d with lovely white and red,
May vie with roses in their flow’ry bed:
Her coral lips, whene’er she speaks, disclose
The finest iv’ry in concentric rows:
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Her tempting breasts in whiteness jar outgo
The op'ning lily, and the new fawn snow:
Her tempting breasts the eyes of all command,
And gently rising court the am'rous hand.

On a much more mundane level, her husband in a letter of December 3, 1763, to his brother-in-law, George Scott, Governor of Grenada and Dominica, provides another bit of information about Elizabeth, whose health was at times as poor as that of her husband: “She knows the occasion of her ill state, and the means of removing it. She has nothing to do but to disuse Tea and snuff, and in a few months she would again be the finest girl in Christendom. A few trials of this sort have had an excellent effect, but the force of habit is too strong for her resolution.”

Elizabeth bore her husband two children: a girl who was her namesake, born in 1750, and a son named for his father, the third of his line, born in 1752. (Their double portrait as children, painted by Joseph Blackburn around 1762, is also in the present collection.)

It is very likely that Feke followed the same procedure as most of his contemporaries in basing the poses of his figures after mezzotints rather than painting them from life. Although no exact prototype for this portrait of Elizabeth has been found, Belknap has pointed out that her pose is identical to that of the mezzotint portrait of the Duchess of Cleveland by R. Tompson.¹

The whiteness of the complexion of the present sitter, as well as that of the other three Bowdoins by Feke, may be the result of overcleaning at some unknown time in the past.
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1826.7  Bequest of Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn.

WILLIAM BOWDOIN (1713-73)

Oil on canvas, 50¾ x 40¾

Signed and dated l.l. R F Pinx/1748

William Bowdoin was the fourth son of James Bowdoin I and his first wife, Sarah Campbell.1 During his student years at Harvard, from which he graduated in 1735, he was once fined and publicly admonished for playing at cards and dice. On July 12, 1739, he married Phebe Murdock, the daughter of a wealthy merchant of Plymouth, Massachusetts. Their only child to survive infancy was Sarah, born twenty-two years after their marriage, who later married her cousin James Bowdoin III, son of James II, William’s half-brother. The couple first made their home in Boston. William traveled a good deal on business, once to Louisbourg after its capture by Sir William Pepperrell in 1745, and from there to England in the same year. In 1752 William and Phebe moved to Needham, where if their house was not itself a great edifice, it nevertheless was well furnished, containing, among other things “a Number of handsome Pictures.” When he promised to turn back his salary to the town if elected to the House of Representatives, the inhabitants forthwith obliged him (using the money for schools), and he was re-elected for four successive one-year terms. Like his brother James, he
Robert Feke  William Bowdoin
also supported the Albany Plan for the Union of the Colonies.

One of his contemporaries described William as having "his full Share of Pride, Wealth and Ill-Nature," and suspected him of wishing to be appointed a Royal Governor. If this was true, William only got as far as Justice of the Peace (to which he was appointed in 1761). He seems to have been more successful in real estate (a good deal of which he had inherited from his father) than at business, for when he died his debts were in excess of the value of his personal property; his real estate holdings in New England, however, were vast. Although he died before the outbreak of the American Revolution, there is some reason to believe that he had begun to swing to the cause of liberty, for while serving on the home industries committee of the town of Roxbury toward the end of his life, he declined to sign a document to consider the problem of royal salaries for judges.

Though William was his eminent father's eldest son, his accomplishments never measured up to those of his half-brother, James II. William did surpass James in one respect, however. He was fortunate in having his portrait painted by Feke at the moment when he was the more substantial survivor of his recently deceased father, and this may explain why it was that Feke seems to have put more effort into making William's portrait a more elegant production than James's.

1. Of James I's and Sarah Campbell's six offspring, only William and his sister Mary, later Mrs. Balthasar Bayard, survived infancy.
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1826.10 Bequest of Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn.

MRS. WILLIAM BOWDOIN née Phebe Murdock (1723-72)

Oil on canvas, 50 1/4 x 40 3/8

Signed and dated l.l. R F Pinx/1748

Phebe Murdock, the daughter of a wealthy merchant of Plymouth, Massachusetts, married William Bowdoin on July 12, 1739, when she was sixteen and he was twenty-six. Their only child to survive infancy was Sarah, born twenty-two years after their marriage, who later married her cousin, James Bowdoin III, son of James II, William’s half-brother.

While this portrait of Phebe was painted in the same year as that of her husband (and presumably at the same time), it is not, strictly speaking, a pendant to it, inasmuch as she does not face William (as Elizabeth faces James II, for example). Belknap believed that Phebe’s pose was patterned after that of the English actress Anne Oldfield in a mezzotint of c. 1705-10 by Simon after Richardson. If this is so, Feke reversed the pose, for Anne Oldfield sits in the opposite direction from Phebe; and it is difficult to explain why he would have done this, particularly when Phebe’s portrait almost certainly was intended to be a pendant to William’s.
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1826.9 Bequest of Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn.

**BRIGADIER GENERAL SAMUEL WALDO (1696-1759)**

Oil on canvas, 96¼ x 60¼, probably 1748

Samuel Waldo was born in Boston and according to tradition attended the Boston Latin School. In 1722 he married Lucy Wainwright, who bore him six children. Waldo was a wealthy Boston merchant who dealt, among other things, in “choice Irish duck, Irish butter, fine Florence wine, and Negro slaves.” More important than his role as merchant, however, was the fact that he was the chief proprietor of a vast stretch of land of ultimately more than five hundred thousand acres on the coast of Maine between the Muscongus and Penobscot Rivers, “which if he found a wilderness, he left containing ten flourishing plantations.” In his capacity as official mast-agent, he also extracted from those lands that prime lumber which played such a major role in the construction of British vessels. It was as second in command to Sir William Pepperrell in the successful attack on France’s Gibraltar of America, Louisbourg, that Waldo received the title of Brigadier General.

When this portrait was received into the Bowdoin College collection in 1855, the bequest of the sitter’s great-granddaughter Lucy Flucker Knox Thatcher, it was believed to have been painted by John Smibert. Modern scholars, however, have been virtually unanimous in attributing the unsigned canvas to Robert Feke. The original ascription to Smibert
nevertheless deserves some discussion here, particularly in view of the discovery in 1914 by a descendant of Waldo’s, Miss Virginia Robie, of an entry in the diary of the General’s first cousin, Edward Waldo, from the year 1747, which stated: “Spent the morning with my illustrious cousin Samuel who is having his Likeness made by the renowned Mr. Smybert. It promises to reflect great Honour on Both though prodigious deare at the Price. I was favourably impressed by Mr. S. whose In-genuity is equalled by his Industry and surpassed by his Deportment.” Miss Robie stated that on the occasion of her examination of the diary, she only had time to copy out the passage cited above, although she did observe other references to a Smibert portrait of General Waldo referring, for example, to the fact that the General “would lose the pose and pace to the floor to the great perplexity of the artist,” which she fully expected to be able to copy verbatim at a future time. Before she could accomplish this, however, the diary is said to have been sent by its owner, Edward Waldo Pendleton of Detroit, to an expert for restoration, with the result that it shortly thereafter disintegrated completely.

While most critics do not dispute Miss Robie’s findings, they believe that if Smibert painted a portrait of General Waldo, it is either lost or, more probably, was never finished, owing to Smibert’s failing eyesight at the time.

The present portrait is very similar to, and almost exactly the same size as, Smibert’s full-length portraits of two other heroes of the siege of Louisbourg, Sir William Pepperrell (Essex Institute, Salem) and Sir Peter Warren (Portsmouth Athenæum, Portsmouth, New Hampshire). Smibert probably began Warren’s portrait between June 1, 1746, the date on which he sailed back into Boston Harbor (in company with Pepperrell and, very likely, Waldo), and the end of that month, when Warren is known to have left Boston. Both portraits were finished before Peter Pelham’s mezzotints after them, dated 1747, were executed. If Smibert had also done a portrait of Waldo, it is odd that there is no Pelham print after it to complete the victorious triumvirate. Perhaps, however, if it had been begun (as Edward Waldo’s diary of 1747 would seem to indicate), it was not finished at the time Pelham published the other two portraits in 1747.
Robert Feke  
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Concerning the Smibert portrait of Pepperrell, there is reason to believe that, because of the awkwardly ill-proportioned and poorly painted torso, this portion of the figure was painted by a lesser hand (perhaps by Smibert’s nephew and assistant, John Moffatt, Foote thought), although the unhappy outcome may simply be painted evidence of Smibert’s failing eyesight. In short, there would have been ample grounds either for Waldo not to have wished his portrait, if it had been begun by Smibert, to be finished by him or his assistant, or for Smibert not to have been able to do it at all.

As we have already seen in the portraits of the Bowdoins, there appeared in Boston in 1748 a portraitist of great ability, Robert Feke, to whom Waldo turned either to complete what may have been an unfinished portrait by Smibert, or to paint another, completely original, version to the same scale.

Whether the Bowdoin portrait of General Waldo can have been begun by Smibert and finished by Feke is a question we probably never will be able to answer. Although the X-ray made by Alan Burroughs in 1941 gave no indication that what is visible on the surface was executed over another painting, he nevertheless allowed that the X-ray might not have revealed “drawing in brown paint and even some toning . . . especially in competition with dense relining,” also pointing out a pentimento in the head, noting that “on the surface a correction in the silhouette of the hair above left, is evident.”

That the authorship of the painting has ever been disputed has of course partly to do with the fact that it bears no signature. Many Fekes (and most Smiberts, including those of Pepperrell and Warren), however, are unsigned. In cleaning and relining the picture in 1963, the restorer, John Washeba, said that in his opinion the landscape in the lower portion of the canvas had been repainted (perhaps more than once) subsequent to its original execution, and that any signature it once might have had could have been lost in the process. It might also be argued that if in fact Smibert did begin the canvas, Feke in finishing it would have been presented with something of a dilemma concerning a signature, a matter which he might have resolved by abstaining from any form of inscription.
If Feke was not literally building on Smibert, he was without any doubt competing against him (and it may have been both), in this portrait of Brigadier General Samuel Waldo, which surely would have been compared in its day (as it is in ours) with those of Pepperrell and Warren. The triumph of the figure is Feke’s alone, but the achievement of the head, which rather surpasses anything else Feke ever did, particularly in the intensity of its brushwork, may owe something to Smibert. Whatever the circumstances may have been, the end result was the greatest portrait to have been painted in America during the first half of the eighteenth century.\(^6\)

1. Their son Samuel’s second wife was Sarah Erving, the sister of Elizabeth Erving, the wife of James Bowdoin II; their daughter Hannah was the second wife of Thomas Flucker, last royal secretary of the Province of Massachusetts. Hannah’s portrait by Blackburn is in the present collection, as is that of her husband by Copley. Thomas Flucker’s first wife was Judith Bowdoin, the daughter of James I and Hannah Portage.

2. An accurate contemporary assessment of the significance of Louisbourg was made by John Smibert in a letter of March 5, 1745 (two months before the British-American victory). “At present here is little talked or thought of but war... four Vessels of force are sailed to ly off Lewisbourgh harbour to prevent any succors or provisions going in. this expedition is a great undertaking for this Country if it succeeds will be of great importance & be a terrible blow to France as it wil effectually destroy their fishery & make ye navigation to Canada very dangerous. but if it does not succeed we shall be almost undone here, for our best men, the flower of ye country are going & ye expense will be a prodigious sum of money, which if we are not assisted in ye charges of it from home must ruin this Province.” Foote, Smibert, pp. 91-92.

3. Foote, Smibert, p. 95.

4. Evidence concerning this matter is given in footnote 5 of Smibert’s biography in this catalogue.

5. Foote, Smibert, p. 93.

6. The Frick Art Reference Library possesses a photograph of what appears to be a nineteenth-century wood engraving after the present portrait, showing only three-quarters of the figure, the background of which is a paneled interior rather than a view of Louisbourg as in the painting. A photograph of another print, perhaps a lithograph, after the Bowdoin portrait, supplied the museum in 1935 by Dr. J. C. Webster, a member of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, shows the figure again in a paneled interior, but this time full-length. The origins of these prints are not presently known.
NATHANIEL SMIBERT (1735-56)

Nathaniel Smibert, the second (surviving) son of John Smibert, died in his twenty-first year, and consequently the list of portraits ascribed to him is very small. In reading over his obituary published in the Boston Gazette and discounting the usual encomiums: "From his Cradle, he wore the Marks of unaffected Virtue and Goodness. . . . In his Duty towards God, he was constant and devout," etc., etc. (which makes one wonder if anybody bad ever dies), it seems clear that Nathaniel was, in fact, a young man highly regarded for his accomplishments. The obitu-
ary in the Boston News-Letter compares Nathaniel to his father, saying that he "bad fair to equal him in his justly admired Skill." This obituary also states that "His natural Ingenuity was remarkably promising, and though he had not the Advantage of an Academical Education, yet he had made such Progress in the dead and living Languages, and in many of the Arts & Sciences, as would be esteemed to deserve the Honours."  

Nathaniel attended John Lovell's grammar school from 1744 until about 1750. If he ever studied painting with his eminent father, it would have had to have been before the boy's graduation from grammar school, by which year John Smibert's eyesight was beyond painting. At the very least, however, Nathaniel must have learned much of the art of portraiture from the example of his father's pictures. He may also, as Foote suggests, have been influenced by the portraits of John Greenwood, who until his departure for Surinam in 1752 was actively painting in Boston during Nathaniel's formative years. If Nathaniel knew anything of the portraits Feke painted in Boston in 1748, which is likely, it does not show in his work; and there is ample reason why the son of John Smibert would have dismissed the portraits of Joseph Badger.  

One is tempted to speculate to what heights Nathaniel's art would have risen had he lived, for if the portraits he left were not masterpieces, they were enormously promising. Judge William Cranach may not, in fact, have been far wrong when he wrote of Nathaniel Smibert to Dunlap, "Had his life been spared he would probably have been in his day what Copley and West have since been, the honor of America in the imitative art."  

1. Foote, Smibert, p. 257.  
2. Ibid., p. 258.  
3. Ibid., p. 263.  
THE REVEREND SAMSON OCCOM (1723-92)

Oil on canvas, 30\(\frac{1}{4}\) x 24\(\frac{3}{4}\), c. 1751-56

Samson Occom, a Mohegan Indian, was born near New London, Connecticut. He became a convert to Christianity during the “Great Awakening” of 1741-42, perhaps through the influence of the evangelical preaching of the Reverend James Davenport. Occom was the first (and the most successful) Indian pupil of the Reverend Eleazar Wheelock, with whom he studied at Lebanon, Connecticut, from 1743 to 1747. Equipped with enough English, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew to go on to college, Occom evidently was prevented from doing so because of his frail health and poor eyesight. Instead he became schoolmaster and minister to the Montauk Indians on the eastern tip of Long Island, in which capacity he served for about twelve years beginning in 1749. In 1751 he married a member of the Montauk tribe, Mary Fowler, by whom he had ten children. Occom was ordained in 1759 by the Long Island Presbytery.

In the years following Occom’s education, a considerable number of Indians had followed him in what had become known as Wheelock’s Indian Charity School. Inasmuch as the financing of the school had become extremely precarious, Wheelock, acting on a suggestion made to him by the Reverend George Whitefield (who had visited him from London in 1764), decided to send Occom (who had greatly impressed Whitefield) in company with the Reverend Nathaniel Whitaker to England to seek funds for the school. Occom and Whitaker arrived in England early in 1765. If Whitefield had some misgivings about Whitaker being “unpolished and forward,” he was able to report that “Occom attracts the approbation of all. He really behaves well.” Some two and a half years and 2,169 contributors later, £12,026 had been collected for the Indian Charity School. John Thornton, the treasurer of the fund in London, in discussing the fund raisers, later wrote, “Mr. Occom was the instrument under God that was the means of collecting all the money.”

Back in America, however, Wheelock had become more and more disillusioned about the prospect of producing any more Occoms at his
Indian Charity School, and concluded that he would be better advised to establish an institution for the training of white missionaries to convert the Indians. With a grant of land in New Hampshire he founded Dartmouth College, named in honor of the second Earl of Dartmouth, under whose patronage in England the money collected for the Indian Charity School had been raised.

Realizing that the funds he so laboriously had helped to raise were not being used for the purpose he had envisioned, Occom wrote to Wheelock on July 24, 1771: I verily thought once that your Institution was Intended Purely for the poor Indians— with this thought I cheerfully ventured my Body & Soul, left my Country my poor young Family all my Friends and Relations, to sail over the Boisterous Seas to England, to help forward your school, hoping that it might be a lasting Benefit to my poor Brethren, with this view I went a volunteer— I was quite willing to become a Gazing Stocke, yes even a Laughing Stocke in Strange Countries to promote your cause. . . . But when we got Home behold all the glory had decayed and now I am afraid, we shall be Deem’d as Liars and Deceivers in Europe, unless you gather Indians quickly to your college . . . and have not so many whites in the Charity . . . as long as you have no Indians, I am full of doubts.

In a letter of February 24, 1772, to Occom, Wheelock wrote, “I thought my dear sir you had fully known my object to be the Indians which has been invariably the same from the first.” But the training of white missionaries to the Indians was not the same “object” as Occom’s, so he set about to attempt in his own way to contribute something to the Indians by securing a grant of land from the Oneida tribe in New York State on which New England Indians might live protected from the encroachments of the white man. Occom’s efforts, interrupted by the Revolution, were resumed in 1784 and in the following year Brother-town was established. In 1789 Occom removed there himself, spending the last three years of his life as minister to the settlement.

Although it is said that Occom occasionally was driven to drink as a result of the unhappy vicissitudes of his life after his return from England, he also published an Indian hymnal in 1774; and his most famous sermon, preached at the execution of an Indian named Moses Paul, first printed in 1772, went through nineteen editions.
Until very recently this portrait, which was bequeathed to Bowdoin College by James Bowdoin III, had been identified only with the title *Indian Priest*. In response to an inquiry from the present writer, however, Dr. Frederick J. Dockstader, Director of the Museum of the American Indian, suggested that the sitter probably was Samson Occom.\(^7\) Subsequently, the painting was compared with a mezzotint portrait of Occom by John Spilsbury, published by Henry Parker in London in 1768. According to an inscription on the print, it was made after a painting of Occom (the present whereabouts of which is unknown) by Mason Chamberlin, the Elder. Chamberlin also painted a portrait of Whitaker (Dartmouth College) supposedly at the behest of the Earl of Dartmouth.\(^8\) Presumably Occom’s portrait was painted at the same time. Although this likeness shows Occom at the age of about forty-two to forty-five (based on the period of the London visit), which is several years older than his age would have been in the Bowdoin picture, twenty-eight to thirty-three (based on the relation of Nathaniel Smibert’s period of activity to Occom’s year of birth), the resemblance is sufficiently convincing for the present writer to believe that the Smibert portrait is also of Occom. In addition, if we know that the sitter was forty-two to forty-five in the London mezzotint, it is by no means difficult to believe that he was twenty-eight to thirty-three in the Smibert portrait. And it also should be mentioned that the traditional title, *Indian Priest*, is eminently applicable to Samson Occom.

OCCOM is known to have visited Boston on various occasions (the first was on November 22, 1748)\(^9\) during his life. That this portrait is unfinished, with a band of the gray underpainting at the neck and showing through the open shirt, seems to point to the fact that it may have been in the process of execution at the time of Smibert’s untimely death in 1756. Since, however, it is difficult to know anything about Smibert’s stylistic development during the only half decade or so of his creative activity, it is also possible that the portrait could have been painted as early as 1751 and left unfinished for some unknown reason.

For whom the portrait could have been painted is not known. Perhaps it was commissioned by Occom himself. Indeed, on November 12, 1756, the Boston Commissioners of the London Society for the Propagation of
the Gospel in New England advanced Occom £20 to discharge debts they felt he incurred because he was living too extravagantly. On the other hand, Occom’s fame already was such that others might have commissioned the portrait, and it also is not inconceivable that the painter could have done it on his own hook.

Because of its unfinished state, it seems reasonable to assume that the portrait never left Smibert’s studio during his lifetime. This studio, which had been John Smibert’s before his son Nathaniel occupied it, passed from the latter to John Smibert’s other surviving son, Dr. Williams, and after his death, probably in 1774, to John Moffatt, John Smibert’s nephew. Following Moffatt’s death in 1777, it was rented by a number of artists, including John Trumbull (c. 1777-79), who copied some of the pictures in it. The studio continued to remain partially intact at least until 1808, when John Johnston, who probably was the last artist to occupy it, sold John Smibert’s Berkeley Group. If the portrait of Occom was still in the studio as late as about 1780, it could have been acquired there by James Bowdoin III. (For further information on this subject, see Appendix B, James Bowdoin III as Art Collector.)

The present portrait is a vivid and expressive likeness, and while on the basis of style there can be little doubt that it was painted by Nathaniel Smibert, it is not entirely surprising that one critic, Alan Burroughs, believed it to be an early work of John Singleton Copley. 11

1. Also known as Moor’s Charity School in honor of the donor of a tract of land for its use, Colonel Joshua More of Mansfield, Conn. (The different spelling of the name of the school arose from the rather careless usage of the time.)
9. Blodgett, op. cit., p. 34.
10. Ibid., p. 41.
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1813.4 Bequest of James Bowdoin III.

**JOSEPH BLACKBURN** (Active in America, 1754-63)

Blackburn’s American years, which probably began in Newport in 1754 and included a couple of years (1760-61) in Portsmouth, were spent mainly in Boston and its environs. Just prior to this period, in 1752-53, he is known to have painted a considerable number of portraits in Bermuda. Because of the style of these Bermuda portraits, as well as of those painted in America, it seems reasonable to assume that Blackburn had received his artistic training in London, in the ambience of such modishly rococo portraitists as Thomas Hudson and Joseph Highmore.

In arriving to paint in Boston in 1755, Blackburn found himself not only very much the best, but very nearly the only, portraitist in town. John Smibert was dead, and his son Nathaniel was about to follow him; John Greenwood had gone to Surinam and Robert Feke, to no one knows where. The only remaining artists were Joseph Badger, about to be eclipsed again by a superior talent (this time Blackburn’s), just as he had been before by Smibert’s and Feke’s; and a new young talent by the name of John Singleton Copley, who was not about to be eclipsed for long by anybody.

But Copley was yet very young and had much to learn about portrait painting, some of it from Blackburn. Nevertheless, starting about 1758, the evidence of certain of Blackburn’s portraits shows that he was beginning to be influenced by Copley. There were commissions enough for both, however, and Blackburn flourished to such an extent that it was not necessary for him to become involved in other enterprises to help support himself, as had his predecessors (like Smibert with his “Colour
In short, when Blackburn left America in 1763 and returned to England, where he is known to have been the following year, it was for reasons unknown, because there is no evidence to indicate that Copley was cutting into his patronage. Blackburn probably spent the remainder of his life in England, where there are examples of portraits by him dated as late as 1778.

ELIZABETH (1750-1809) and her brother JAMES BOWDOIN III (1752-1811) as children

Oil on canvas, 36\(\frac{7}{8}\) x 58, c. 1760

This double portrait, which is one of the most enchanting studies of children in American Colonial portraiture, depicts the offspring of James Bowdoin II and his wife Elizabeth Erving. The ages of the two children appear to be about ten and eight, respectively.

Like her mother before her, Elizabeth married at the age of seventeen. Her husband, who was eighteen years her senior, was John Temple. Though born in Massachusetts, Temple spent his early years in England, from which he returned to Boston in 1762 as Surveyor General of Customs for the northern district of America and Lieutenant Governor of New Hampshire. Because of his aristocratic forebears (he became the eighth baronet of Stowe in 1786), he proved to be a political liability to his father-in-law, when the latter was a candidate for Governor in 1785. Temple, however, was never a Tory; in fact, he and his father-in-law shared both the same politics (Whig) and the same adversary (Royal Governor Sir Francis Bernard).

In 1767 Temple's office became merged in a newly created five-member board of customs, but as the only commissioner to stand against Bernard, Temple ultimately found himself out of office in 1770. Partly as an attempt to bribe Bowdoin to stay in line in the Council ("One would have thought the unexpected favors shown his son-in-law would have softened him"—letter of Governor Hutchinson to his predecessor, Francis Bernard, August 25, 1772), Temple was appointed Surveyor General of Customs in England in the following year. But the Tories missed their mark in more ways than one: Bowdoin wasn't bribable, and
Joseph Blackburn  *Elizabeth and James Bowdoin III as Children*
Temple had really wanted the commissionership of Ireland which, to add insult to injury, had gone to Bernard.

For his role in the publication of those infamous letters which Bernard's successor as Royal Governor, Thomas Hutchinson, had written his Tory friends in London, urging stern measures against the very American Whigs he was ostensibly supposed to be placating, Temple was summarily removed from office in 1774.

During the next decade, Temple sought both in England and on two lengthy trips to America, accompanied by his wife Elizabeth, to do what he could so smooth the relationships between the two countries. He did not, however, meet with much success in either place: the British thought him (rightly) sympathetic with the Colonial cause; and the Americans suspected him (wrongly) of loyalty to the Tories.

After the treaty of peace, Temple was made British Consul General to the United States, a position which he held for thirteen years, living mainly in New York. Following his death in 1798, Elizabeth once again took up residence in Boston, where, as we shall have occasion to see further on in the present collection, her portrait (until now believed to be that of her mother, Mrs. James Bowdoin II) was painted in her old age, probably by Samuel King.

(James Bowdoin III's life will be discussed in the entry dealing with his portrait by Stuart.)

1. Owing to the fact that a portion of the lower part of Elizabeth's dress and most of James III's left shoe are lacking, it is possible that the canvas may have been cropped at that edge at some unknown time in the past.

2. Copley made pastel portraits of John and Elizabeth Temple; the former is signed and dated 1765; the latter, which is neither signed nor dated, probably was done in 1767, the year the couple was married. Trumbull painted a conversation piece of the couple with their son Grenville and daughter Augusta in 1784. At the same time he also painted a three-quarter-length portrait of John and a "small head" (apparently lost) of Elizabeth. In 1806 Stuart painted a portrait of Lady Temple, as well as a bust-size copy of Trumbull's portrait of Sir John, to make the pair which Lady Temple gave to her daughter Elizabeth, Mrs. Thomas Lindall Winthrop. Stuart also painted a replica of his original bust-size portrait of Lady Temple, seated in a chair with a pillar behind her, enlarged to serve as a pendant with Trumbull's portrait of Sir John, which she gave to her other daughter, Augusta, Mrs. William Lambe Palmer.
MRS. THOMAS FLUCKER née Hannah Waldo (1726-85)

Oil on canvas, 50¼ x 40½, c. 1755

Hannah Waldo, the daughter of Brigadier General Samuel Waldo and Lucy Wainwright, was the second wife of Thomas Flucker, who was to become the last Royal Secretary of the Province of Massachusetts. When this portrait came to Bowdoin College in 1855, the bequest of the sitter’s granddaughter, Mrs. Lucy Flucker Knox Thatcher, the subject was identified as Thomas Flucker’s first wife, Judith Bowdoin, the daughter of James Bowdoin I and his second wife Hannah Portage. Subsequent knowledge concerning the identity of the portraitist and his career in America, however, precluded that identification, for Judith Bowdoin died in 1750, four years before Blackburn’s first American portraits are known to have been painted.

Thomas Flucker was not the only man in Hannah Waldo’s life. Five years prior to their marriage, she had been betrothed to Andrew Pepperrell, the only son of her father’s former comrade-in-arms, Sir William. Soon after the marriage banns were published on September 3, 1748, Andrew “was attacked with a lingering fever, which left him feeble and dispirited,” and the wedding was delayed. On March 8, 1750, Nathaniel Sparhawk wrote his father-in-law, Sir William (then
in London), “The love affair between Andrew and Hannah, now of four years duration, is still pending much to the annoyance of both families as well as trying to the patience of the lady.” But the following year, Sir William wrote General Waldo (in London), “The wedding day is fixed.” A few days before the day set, however, Andrew wrote Hannah saying that circumstances compelled him to ask her to postpone the wedding again until a later date, more convenient to him, which he suggested. Hannah never answered this letter, but went right ahead with elaborate preparations for the wedding. “Guests and minister were assembled when, tired beyond endurance and angered beyond repression at the indecision and procrastination of her lover, she told Andrew that she would not marry one who had occasioned her so much mortification.” Six weeks later, on January 14, 1751, “moved by Peak or perhaps having already transferred her affections,” Hannah married Thomas Flucker, whose first wife, Judith Bowdoin, had died the preceding May. Andrew Pepperrell died of typhoid fever in the spring of 1751.

If this marriage seemed auspicious enough to outweigh the distressing events of the preceding four years, it ultimately was to prove a source of additional unhappiness for Hannah, partly because of her husband’s Tory loyalties (Thomas Flucker’s biography is given in the discussion of his portrait by Copley in the present collection), and partly because of their opposition to the marriage of their daughter Lucy to Henry Knox.

Henry Knox was the proprietor of the “London Book Store” on Washington Street in Boston when the accomplished young Lucy, a customer there, met him. Her parents felt certain that he would not be able to support her in the proper fashion, not to mention the fact that Henry was considerably beneath their daughter socially. But Lucy married him anyway, on March 20, 1774. One year to the day later, Henry, in disguise, accompanied by Lucy, with his sword quilted into the lining of her cloak, fled Boston, she to live in Worcester, and he to join Washington’s army. On March 17, 1776, with Henry now a General and commanding the Continental artillery on Dorchester Heights overlooking Boston, the British troops evacuated the city together with 926 loyalists, among whom were Hannah Flucker and her party of five.
Ironically, while the Fluckers were enduring exile and relative penury in London, Henry Knox, through his military exploits in close association with Washington, was raising his wife to the highest rank of American society. When Lucy, in a letter of July 17, 1777, wrote her husband some news of her parents in London, saying, “Papa enjoys his £300 a year as Secretary of the Province,” it may have been more than this one paradox which caused her to add, “Droll, is it not?”

The present portrait probably was painted in the first two or three years of Blackburn’s activity in Boston. While Hannah’s pose seems very like those in earlier American portraits derived from mezzotints, it is a trifle more lively, and probably reflects painted prototypes of the Hudson-Highmore variety, as much as merely printed ones of the preceding generation of English artists. What has been brought about is a slight yielding of face and form to the restrained rococo of Blackburn’s style.

1. This and the following quotes in the present entry were taken from the account of the subject’s life in Waldo Lincoln, Genealogy of the Waldo Family (Worcester, 1902), I, 191-96.
2. Lincoln (ibid., p. 194) was incorrect in stating that the Fluckers left together at this time. Thomas had preceded his wife by six months, having sailed from Boston with General Gage on September 10, 1775. (Boston News-Letter, Friday, October 13, 1775.)
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1855.2 Bequest of Mrs. Lucy Flucker Knox Thatcher, the granddaughter of the sitter.

JOHN SINGLETON COLEY (1738-1815)

John Singleton Copley was the son of Irish immigrants who are believed to have arrived in Boston shortly before his birth. His father, who operated a tobacconist’s shop on Long Wharf, died sometime before
May of 1748, when his mother took a second husband, Peter Pelham, a portrait painter and mezzotint engraver. Although Pelham died three years later, the brief period of his marriage to the former Mrs. Copley must have been of the greatest significance for young John, and it was surely this fortuitous contact at such an early age with a practicing artist that predestined his career.

While it is perfectly understandable that Copley’s earliest works (of 1753-54) included painted portraits (Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Mann, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston) as well as one in mezzotint (The Reverend William Welsteed), it is interesting that at the same time he also tried his hand at classical subjects (Galatea, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston). But he probably already knew the high place accorded “history painting” in the hierarchy of artistic importance from having read such authorities as Du Fresnoy and De Piles (available in English translation), and must have seen (if only as through a glass, darkly) something of such art in the copies of European pictures in John Smibert’s studio. Although the teen-age Copley was to turn of necessity to portrait painting in order to help support his widowed mother and infant stepbrother, his frustratingly remote inkling of the Olympus of “history painting” was to beguile him for the rest of his American years.

In the formation of his style of portraiture, Copley owed much to the work of Robert Feke, whose portraits of subjects like the Bowdoins, painted in Boston in 1748, seem to have impressed him with the fashionableness of their style and the clarity of their execution; and John Greenwood, whose style, in turn, owed much to Feke’s. Blackburn’s touch of the English rococo provided yet another ingredient in the early stages of Copley’s artistic makeup. But the real force at work in the swift maturation of Copley’s style of portraiture was, without any doubt, his own innate artistic genius; for in less than a decade he had reached a summit of excellence in that area since matched only by one other painter in the history of American art, Thomas Eakins, more than a century later.

In 1765 Copley sent the portrait of his sixteen-year-old half brother, Henry Pelham, known as The Boy with a Squirrel (Private Collection), to London for exhibition at the Society of Artists. It caused a sensation,
and the next year he sent his *Young Girl with a Bird and Dog* (Toledo Museum of Art). But perhaps because he tried too hard to respond to the few corrective suggestions passed on from London about his *Boy with a Squirrel*, his second effort was not as successful and he was much more heavily criticized. Copley, who had always told himself that being first in America was not enough, now felt that he would never know what his critics truly meant, never be able to ascend “that Mighty Mountain where the Everlasting Lauriels grow to adorn the brows of those Elus- trious Artists that are so favoured of Heaven[...],” unless he could see the world of their paintings with his own eyes.

Yet he remained in America, gaining greatly in fame and fortune, drawing his patronage from both Tories and Whigs, until 1774 when, triggered by the desire not to become involved in the conflict he clearly foresaw between the two sides, he realized his dream of twenty years and sailed for England, never to return to America.

Copley’s English years have long been either largely neglected or vastly underrated by critics who failed to recognize that his best work done there constituted a new level of achievement, comparable, and in some ways surpassing, the greatest productions of his American career. Here at last (after a few months on the Continent to see more old masters) he could paint those “history pictures” he only had been able to dream about in America. His *Death of Major Pierson* (Tate Gallery, London) of 1782-84 in many ways surpassed anything of its kind ever done before, and his *Watson and the Shark* (National Gallery, Washington) of 1778 was a brilliant forecast of Gericault’s *Raft of the Medusa* done forty years later. Furthermore, many of his dashingly painted English portraits (*Midshipman Augustus Brine*, Metropolitan Museum of Art, and *Mrs. Daniel Denison Rogers*, Private Collection), are worthy rivals of his more coldly observed portraits of comparable American subjects (*Daniel Verplanck*, Metropolitan Museum of Art, and *Mrs. Thomas Gage*, Private Collection).

THOMAS FLUCKER (1719-83)

Oil on canvas, 28 7/8 x 24, probably 1770-71

Thomas Flucker was born in Charlestown, Massachusetts, the eldest son of Captain James Flucker and Elizabeth Luist. His first wife, whom he married on June 12, 1744, was Judith Bowdoin, the sister of James Bowdoin II and his second wife, Hannah Portage. Judith died on May 25, 1750, apparently without issue. On January 14, 1751, Flucker remarried; his second wife was Hannah Waldo (whose portrait by Blackburn is in the present collection), the daughter of Brigadier General Samuel Waldo and Lucy Wainwright. Through these two marriages Flucker was related to two of the wealthiest and most influential Massachusetts families of the eighteenth century.

Flucker was commissioned a Justice of the Peace in 1756, became a selectman of Boston in 1765, was a member of the Massachusetts House of Representatives between 1756-60, and a member of the Governor’s Council, 1761-68.

On November 12, 1770, he was appointed Colonial Secretary of the Province of Massachusetts, and was the last man to hold that position. It was in that capacity that, on June 17, 1774, barred from the chamber of the House of Representatives, Flucker read from its steps Governor Gage’s proclamation dissolving the Assembly, while inside, his former brother-in-law, James Bowdoin II, was being elected to head the Massachusetts delegation to the first Continental Congress. On August 9, 1774, Flucker was appointed one of Governor Gage’s mandamus councilors.

Flucker sailed for England, leaving his wife and family behind him in Boston, on September 10, 1775, in the company of Governor Gage, who had been recalled to “lay before his Majesty the State of Affairs in this Province” (Boston News Letter, Friday, October 13, 1775). Hannah and her party of five were among the 926 loyalists to evacuate Boston with the British forces, while the Flucker’s son-in-law, Henry Knox, whose marriage to their daughter Lucy they had opposed because of his modest means and low social rank, now a General in the Continental Army, was in command of the artillery on Dorchester Heights, threatening Boston.
The Fluckers spent the remainder of their lives in London. Although the salary of £300 per annum Thomas had received as Colonial Secretary of the Province of Massachusetts was restored to him by the Crown in 1777 (for Lucy’s reaction to this, see her mother’s biography under her portrait by Blackburn in the present collection), the modest comfort this afforded Hannah and him was a far cry from the much greater style they had enjoyed in Boston, where they also drew income from lands now forfeited (some of which, in Maine, the Knoxes were later able to reclaim). Since Flucker had been one of the “notorious Conspirators” mentioned in the Massachusetts Conspiracy Act of April 30, 1779 (fifth on the list headed by former Governors Bernard and Hutchinson), his American estate was slated for confiscation by the state. When an attempt was made to do this after his death, what remained was only sufficient to pay his creditors about a shilling on the pound.

The date of this portrait of Thomas Flucker presents certain difficulties. In a letter dated Boston, September 24, 1771, from Henry Pelham to Copley, who was then painting in New York, the following statements appear: “I have rece[i]ved Money from Messers. Sargent, Fenno, Barrell, Goldwait, Pepperell, Hancock and Mrs. Watts. I have about 90£ O. T. by me. Mr. Jno. Green owes, as also Mr. Flucker, Mr. Loring and Mrs. Martin.” With the exception of Fenno, who was a tenant of Copley’s, all the other names cited here correspond to those of persons painted by Copley. This would seem to indicate that the debts mentioned, both paid and owed, related to portraits rather than other matters, and that the appearance of Mr. Flucker’s name among them points to his portrait already having been painted.

There is, however, another document which must be dealt with. It reads as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1774</td>
<td>To his own Portrait</td>
<td>£14.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>To his Sons Do.</td>
<td>£14.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£28.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To two black and Gold Frames at £1.8</td>
<td>2.16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£30.16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Can this bill refer to the portrait of Flucker which seems to be mentioned in Pelham’s letter, and which would have been painted before Copley’s departure for New York in mid-June of 1771? (The portrait of Flucker’s son, Thomas, is unlocated.) It seems highly unlikely that so eminent (and wealthy) a person as Flucker would have left his portrait unpaid for for three years.

The price of £14 is also perplexing. For a portrait exactly the same size (and similar in all other respects) as that of Flucker, dated by the leading Copley authority, Jules David Prown, during the same period (1770–72), John Hancock paid £9.16.0, as did Daniel Henchman (Prown, 1770–74) and Mr. and Mrs. Alexander MacWhorter (1769). Why would Flucker be charged £14? That this higher fee may have reflected an extra charge for tardy payment seems farfetched. From other evidence we have concerning Copley’s fees, we know that he raised his price for quarter-length portraits (30” x 25”) such as all those cited above from four guineas in 1764–66 and possibly earlier, to seven guineas or pounds in 1768–69, to nine pounds, sixteen shillings for all the examples mentioned above—save that of Thomas Flucker.

Can it be, then, that the portrait referred to in the bill of June, 1774, is, in fact, not the one at Bowdoin, but rather another, either larger in size (the half-length of John Amory, 1768, was £14) or, if quarter-length, more expensive because of its later time of execution? If so, then, like the portrait of his son, mentioned in the same bill, it too is unlocated; and perhaps either or both were lost when the Flucker house and nearly all it contained was destroyed in the Charlestown fire of June, 1775; or both were taken to England in 1775 or 1776, and are yet to be found.

On stylistic grounds Prown points out the similarity between the portrait of Flucker and that of John Newton (Berkshire Athenaeum, Pittsfield, Massachusetts), signed and dated 1772. Because of the evidence of the Pelham letter, however, Prown does not exclude the possibility that the portrait of Flucker might have been painted as early as 1770, comparing it to the portrait of Mrs. Humphrey Devereux (on indefinite loan to the National Art Gallery, Wellington, New Zealand), painted some time before January 25, 1771. This latter juxtaposition seems even more striking to the present writer. Yet, as Prown so correctly
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points out, "Since the New York trip (mid-June to January 3, 1772) did not mark any break in Copley's stylistic development, there is some difficulty in determining whether a number of pictures should properly be dated before or after this interlude." Indeed, Copley's portrait of Eleazer Tyng (National Gallery of Art, Washington), for example, which is signed and dated 1772, is in the opinion of the present writer stylistically very close to that of Mrs. Humphrey Devereux and to the Bowdoin portrait of Thomas Flucker. If, therefore, on the basis of style, the Flucker portrait could have been painted either before or after Copley's New York trip, with the additional support of the Pelham letter, the present writer is inclined to opt for the former, reinforced somewhat by the possibility that Flucker's appointment as Colonial Secretary, an office into which he was sworn on March 11, 1771, could well have been the motivation for him to sit to Copley.

Flucker and Copley were to meet again in London. On February 1, 1776, they were among the twenty-one men to attend the first weekly dinner meeting of what started out to be the "New England Club," at the Adelphi in the Strand. When the club became more political in nature ("The Brompton Road Tory Club," it was called), Copley, who had a few years before written Benjamin West: "I am desirous of avoideing every imputation of party spir[it], Political contests being neithther pleasing to an artist or advantageous to the Art itself," stopped attending.

In comparing this portrait of Flucker with that of Hancock mentioned above (Prown, fig. 300), painted during the same period, Prown has written: The Flucker and Hancock portraits typify Copley's late period in several ways. Hancock was a radical Whig, Flucker a high Tory. In both portraits Copley employed dramatic chiaroscuro and a somber palette that seem to reflect the darkening political skies. Although a clear casual relationship cannot be proven, there is no doubt that, as the storm clouds of Revolution gathered over Boston, Copley's colors did become more muted and his background darker and more abstract, with a flood of light focusing more strongly on the figures, the dramatis personae, and less on their surroundings and the objects that typified or symbolized their place in society.

Here, then, is Copley's portrait of Thomas Flucker, a Tory, painted at
the same level of objectivity that characterized his portraits of Whigs, and at an extremely high level of quality—physically and psychologically the most striking presence in the Bowdoin College collection of Colonial and Federal portraits.

2. Prown, p. 82.
3. While Copley's portraits of persons named Sargent and Loring were painted quite a bit earlier than 1771 (and the date of his portraits of Sir William, which was destroyed, and Lady Pefferrell, which is unlocated, are unknown), all the other names cited were, or are believed to have been, painted by Copley at dates more closely preceding that of the Pelham letter. *Ibid.*, pp. 82-83 (with information concerning dates under the appropriate references). Regarding the name Sargent, Prown (p. 85) suggests that this reference may have been to a portrait of Judith Sargent, which though painted after she had become Mrs. John Stevens in 1769 (at a time reasonably close to the date of the Pelham letter), may have been paid for by her father, Winthrop Sargent.

5. Thomas Flucker's son's name was Thomas (Lincoln, p. 195) and not James (as suggested with a question mark in both Parker-Wheeler, p. 265, and Prown, p. 214).
6. Prown, p. 82.
11. On this date the portrait was sent to the sitter's son, the former American painter John Greenwood, then residing in London. Greenwood had ordered the painting in a letter received by Copley in the spring of 1770, and it probably was painted in the fall of that year. *Ibid.*, pp. 77-78.
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1855.1 Bequest of Mrs. Lucy Flucker Knox Thatcher, the granddaughter of the sitter.

UNKNOWN ARTIST
JAMES BOWDOIN III (1752-1811) as a young man

Oil on canvas, 30 3/4 x 25 1/2

On the list of Bowdoin family portraits attached to a letter of June 19, 1826, from the executors of the estate of Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn (previously Mrs. James Bowdoin III), announcing her bequest of them to Bowdoin College, the present portrait is identified as “Late Hon. James Bowdoin, as a young man.” As in the case of all the other portraits on the list, no artist was given, and his name still eludes us. Since it has not been possible to identify the style of the portrait with that of any American artist, and inasmuch as the age of the sitter coincides with those years when the young James Bowdoin III made his first two trips to England and the Continent, it generally has been assumed that the portrait was painted abroad.

James Bowdoin III first went abroad* to England in January, 1771;¹ he returned home in April, 1772.² He went abroad again late in 1773
(probably in December), arriving in Naples on January 20, 1774,3 traveling from there through northern Italy and France4 to London, sailing home in September, 1775.5

In a letter James wrote the day after he arrived in Naples to his sister, Elizabeth Bowdoin Temple, in London, in response to one he had received in Naples from her,6 he stated: "I shall improve the Hint given respecting my picture & get it taken accordingly & send it you."7 Whether the present portrait can be that which James might have had made in response to his sister’s request, we do not know. Although the portrait seems more English than continental, it still could have been painted on the Continent inasmuch as there were many English portraitists at work there (particularly in Italy) at the time. The rather indifferent quality of the portrait, however, has always prevented its being identified as the work of any known English artist of the period.8

* Further data concerning these trips will be found in James Bowdoin III’s biography under his portrait by Stuart in this catalogue.

1. James Bowdoin II (Boston, Jan. 2, 1771) to Benjamin Franklin in London: "I take this opportunity by my son to express my own pleasure, & the general satisfaction, at your appointment as Agent for the House of Representatives." Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society (Boston, 1897), Sixth Series, IX, 248. Benjamin Franklin (London, Feb. 5, 1771) to James Bowdoin II in Boston: "I am very sensible of the honour done me by your House of Representatives, in appointing me their Agent here. . . . It will be a great pleasure to me if I can be any way useful to your son while he stays in England." Ibid., p. 261.

2. James Bowdoin II (Boston, April 22, 1772) to George Erving (J. B. II’s brother-in-law, and J. B. III’s uncle) in London: "I am very sorry there has been any misunderstanding between you and Jemmy. . . . His arrival here tho unexpected gave us great pleasure. . . ." Winthrop Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society. J. B. III may also have gone to the Continent during this trip. James Bowdoin II (Boston, Nov. 7, 1771) to George Erving in London: "I much approve yr proposal of his [J. B. III’s] going with you to Holland." Winthrop Papers, MHS.

3. James Bowdoin III (he incorrectly dates the letter Jan. 20, 1773, but it is clear he meant 1774. Cf. footnotes 4 and 6 below) to Mrs. Elizabeth Bowdoin Temple (his sister) in London: "I last night arrived here after a passage of seven & twenty days from Newfoundland. . . ." Winthrop Papers, MHS.

4. James Bowdoin III (Rome, March 29, 1774) to Mrs. Elizabeth Bowdoin
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Temple in London: “I shall leave Rome this week and proceed to Florence where I shall stay about three days—from thence go to Bologna and pass a day or two there—from whence I shall proceed on to Lyons.” Winthrop Papers, MHS. James Bowdoin II (Sept. 12, 1774) to James Bowdoin III: “I have just recd yr letter of ye 12th May dated at Lyons. . . .” Winthrop Papers, MHS.

5. Mrs. Elizabeth Bowdoin Temple (London, Sept. 16, 1775) to Mrs. James Bowdoin II (her mother): “Jemmy goes from town tomorrow, he is now very busy in getting his things on Board the ship. . . .” Winthrop Papers, MHS. Josiah Quincy (Braintree, Dec. 11, 1775) to James Bowdoin II: “Having tasted the pleasure of your friendly correspondence, I feel myself unhappy to see it thus long discontinued. Permit me therefore to renew it by transmitting to you and your good lady our cordial compliments of congratulation upon the safe return of your dear and only son from his travells.” Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, op. cit., p. 391.

6. James Bowdoin III (Naples, Jan. 21, 1774) to Mrs. Elizabeth Bowdoin Temple in London: “Since writing the foregoing Epistle [see footnote 3] I received a letter from Mr. George Athorp dated Paris 18th December 1773 inclosing me a letter from you.” Winthrop Papers, MHS.

7. Ibid.

8. Ellis Waterhouse (Barber Institute, Birmingham University, Feb. 26, 1966) to the present writer: “I honestly don’t think it can be by any nameable English hand.” Professor Waterhouse also stated: “What it looks like is an American copy of a picture painted in England.” Although the present writer does not rule out this possibility, it seems more likely to him that the portrait was painted by some minor English artist in England or on the Continent. There also is a remote possibility of a continental artist. Then, too, the portrait still might have been painted in America by an as yet unidentified American artist, or a foreign artist working in America, but not necessarily in Boston. (There is nothing like covering all the possibilities!)

1826.1 Bequest of Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn.

CHRISTIAN GULLAGER (1759-1826)

Christian Gullager* was born in Copenhagen, the son of Christian Guldager Prang and Marie Elizabeth Dalberg. Gullager studied at the Royal Academy of Arts in Copenhagen, receiving a prize, Lille Solvemedaille, in 1780 from the president of the Academy, Prince Frederick of Denmark. The prize is said to have carried with it the privilege of
traveling in Europe for a period of three years at the King’s expense.

Exactly when and where Gullager arrived in America is not known. That he was still in Denmark as late as 1782 can be proved by references in family correspondence to a family portrait painted in Copenhagen dated in that year and signed “C. Gullager,” which also is evidence that even before his appearance in America he had altered the spelling of his family name. The first mention of Gullager in America is the record of his marriage in Newburyport, Massachusetts, on May 9, 1786, to Mary Selman.

Early inscriptions on the backs of the portraits probably by Gullager of Captain Ofin Boardman and Mrs. Boardman (Worcester Art Museum) of Newburyport indicate that they were painted in 1787. Since the first four of the Gullagers’ nine offspring are said to have been born in Boston (Caroline, the first, having been born on April 5, 1787), it is likely that the Gullagers went there shortly after the Boardman portraits were painted, although it was not until the 1789 Boston Directory that Gullager’s name was listed (as a portrait painter in Hanover Street).^1

Gullager was quite active in 1789, painting a number of portraits, including those of several members of the Salisbury family of Worcester, where he spent nearly three weeks from the end of May until the middle of June, and some time in September to paint two of the Salisbury’s Waldo relatives. In November, Gullager traveled to Portsmouth, New Hampshire, where he painted a portrait of George Washington (Massachusetts Historical Society), whom he had sketched in Boston the week before when the President attended a concert of sacred music in King’s Chapel.

Although Gullager’s next three children are believed to have been born in New York (Andrew on July 4, 1793; Charles, April 14, 1794; and Henry, August 12, 1795), there is no record of their father’s activity as a painter there until the fall of 1797.

“Gulagher, Christian, limner, Tremont street” is listed in the 1796 Boston Directory. Gullager probably still was there at least in January, 1797, because on the ninth of that month Stephen Salisbury in Worcester wrote his wife-to-be Elizabeth Tuckerman in Boston: “Should Mr. Gullager not wait on you tomorrow, oblige me so much as to desire
your Brother Edward to remind him of his Engagement.” Since Dunlap recorded in his diary that Gullager (whom he had met looking for work in New York in 1806) had told him that he once had been “principal scene painter” at the Federal Street Theatre in Boston—which opened on February 3, 1794, and burned down on February 2, 1798—it seems likely that the period 1796-97 was when he did this work, and it may be that he returned from New York principally for that purpose.

Gullager was back in New York by the fall of 1797, for an advertisement listing his address as “58 Maiden-lane” there appeared in the Minerva of September 18. This was followed by one in the Commercial Advertiser on October 2. In these Gullager referred to himself as a Portrait (“from whole Lengths to Busts, on any scale”) and Theatrical Painter. In addition, he was prepared to do “Decorations for Public and Private Buildings; Frontispieces or Vignets for Publications on History, Allegory or Sentiment” (examples of the latter of which he already had done in Boston); and “Paintings on Silks for Military Standards or other ornamental purposes.” He also stated, “Mr. Gullager contemplates the establishment of a regular Drawing Academy should he be fortunate in meeting the good opinion and patronage of men of taste. Educated from his youth at the academy in Copenhagen he flatters himself he possesses requisite talents for such an academy.” With the exception of the lines about the “Drawing Academy,” the same advertisement subsequently appeared in several issues of The Time Piece during October and November. In short, Gullager was prepared to do a number of things to earn his livelihood, although he evidently abandoned the notion of a “Drawing Academy.”

Apparently, all this advertising did not elicit enough business to keep Gullager in New York for long, and even though his son Benjamin seems to have been born there on July 16, 1798, Gullager already was trying his luck in Philadelphia, where he advertised in the Gazette of the United States on May 5, 1798. Although Gullager did mention that he was a portrait painter, these advertisements were almost completely devoted to a discussion of the superiority of his skills as an ornamental painter, as opposed to those of an artist by the name of George Rutter, who claimed “20 years experience” in Philadelphia. In addition to the durability of
his work ("not to be injured by the weather"), Gullager claimed "elegance of design, truth and beauty of colouring, neatness and masterly execution, [that] has not been equalled by George Rutter and Co." Gullager's flags and drums, signs, fire buckets, cornices, etc. were "executed in stile (not that superb stile of modern elegance peculiar to G.R.) but in a workmanlike manner, peculiar to an artist master of his profession." Rutter responded, requesting "the public not to be imposed upon by foreign artists [perhaps meaning both Copenhagen and New York] but to decide upon the merits of each by comparison of the work executed by both. . . . N.B. In future no attention will be paid to the self-flattering advertisements of Mr. G." But the running battle in the press continued through the issue of June 25.

In the Philadelphia directories of 1798, 1800, and 1801, Gullager is listed as a "portrait and ornamental painter." In the directories of 1803-05 he is listed as a "miniature painter," in the first year at "221 N 2nd" and in the last two at "70 Mulberry." As we already have seen, Gullager was in New York in 1806 looking for work. While he could have gone there because his Philadelphia patronage may have declined, it seems more likely that his marriage had broken up, for although Gullager lived another twenty years, the following entry appears in the 1806 Philadelphia directory: "Gullager widow of Christian, 70 Mulberry." Whether Mary threw him out or he deserted her, we cannot know, but whatever the case, the fault almost certainly was his.

The portraitist John Wesley Jarvis once said that Gullager "with his hat over one eye, was more au fait at walking Chestnut Street, than at either face or sign painting." On the basis of what Gullager had said was his experience at the Federal Street Theatre in Boston, Dunlap had recommended him for similar work in New York to the theatrical manager Thomas A. Cooper. When Gullager after many weeks had not finished a scene he had started, Cooper told Dunlap, "Some time next year I may have one scene from Mr. Gallagher, and it will cost more than a Van Dyck or a Titian." And Dunlap had to admit that "however great Gallagher's taste for the arts might be, his taste for lounging was greater."

Clearly, Gullager's temperament was ill-suited to the kind of hard
work required to earn enough money to raise a family of nine, and although it may have been the hope of his reform (as well as, possibly, his charm) that stayed Mary's hand from procuring a divorce immediately, she finally did so on December 27, 1809. According to one of Gullager's granddaughters, in 1825 there appeared at her mother's house "a handsome old gentleman, with a cloak thrown across his shoulders ... begging grandma for a home. She took him in and cared for him. . . . One morning mother carried his breakfast to him, he was speechless—had a paralytic stroke during the night—That was the end." In this manner, on November 12, 1826, home again, Christian Gullager died.

* This information on Gullager was drawn from Louisa Dresser, "Christian Gullager, an Introduction to His Life and Some Representative Examples of His Work," Art in America, Vol. 37 (July, 1949), pp. 103-79.

1. Some discussion of Gullager's style in relation to that of John Johnston's will be found in the biography of that artist in the present catalogue.

2. "Gallagher" is the way Dunlap misspelled Gullager's name.

JAMES BOWDOIN II (1726-90)

Oil on panel, 10¾ x 8¾, c. 1791 (Version A)

Oil on panel, 10¾ x 8¾, c. 1791 (Version B)

For a number of reasons it has seemed best to discuss both versions of this portrait in the same essay. Version A was given to the College by Miss Clara Bowdoin Winthrop in 1924. Version B was bequeathed to the College in 1826 by Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn (previously Mrs. James Bowdoin III), but remained in the possession of various descendants of the sitter until 1894. (The reason for not basing the priority of the versions on the dates they came into the museum's collection will be explained below.)

The attribution of these two panels to Christian Gullager apparently was first suggested on stylistic grounds by William Sawitzky, not later than 1943.¹ In the first major article on Gullager in the July, 1949, Art in America, Louisa Dresser concurred, also on stylistic grounds.² In addition, Miss Dresser felt that, while both versions might have been painted after a lost original, the one given by Miss Winthrop in 1924
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stood a better chance of being the original than that acquired by the museum in 1894, which looked to her more like a replica of the 1924 version.\(^3\) This view also had been favored by Professor Philip C. Beam.\(^4\) The present writer concurs, on the basis of the more powerful modeling and the greater attention to detail in the 1924 version (evident in spite of the fact that it is in poorer condition than the 1894 version). In fact, Bowdoin’s features in the 1924 version are more realistically aged than in the 1894 version, where they are more summarily idealized. Hence, the designation of the 1924 version as \textit{Version A} and the 1894 version as \textit{Version B}. On the question of how the two versions are related to one another in terms of the period of execution, Alan Burroughs (who made a laboratory examination of both in 1940), while he felt himself unable to establish a priority between the two, reported as follows: \textit{Both versions are painted on the same kind of wood and ground in approximately the same technique. The main difference between the two is the type of crackle which is due to the action of the medium in drying. In my opinion they are both of the same period.}\(^5\)

Louisa Dresser also quoted for the first time in print in her article on Gullager a pertinent passage from a then recently discovered letter, dated March 5, 1832, from Gullager’s son Charles to another son, Henry, regarding their father’s career, as follows: \textit{As one of his achievements in portraiture he painted the likeness of Governor Bowdoin, of Massachusetts, one year after his death—there having been no likeness of him taken during his life,—which was so correct that it was immediately purchased by his family and several copies were taken for friends.}\(^6\)

While Charles Gullager was of course incorrect in stating that no likeness of Bowdoin had been made during his lifetime, at least one other source in much closer proximity to Bowdoin’s lifetime had held the same view. This source, which was uncovered by Clifford K. Shipton,\(^7\) and about which Miss Dresser did not know when she published her article, is of even greater value in corroborating the major point in the aforementioned letter. In the November 16, 1791, issue of the Boston newspaper, the \textit{Columbian Centinel}, the following notice appeared: \textit{Portrait of Mr. Bowdoin. Mr. Gulliger, of this town, has lately executed a fine portrait of the late Hon. Mr. Bowdoin, which, we are told, is the only}
Christian Gullager  *James Bowdoin II (Version A)*
Christian Gullager  *James Bowdoin II* (Version B)
one ever taken of that distinguished, learned and virtuous character—and which from this circumstance alone, must be highly valuable. The industry, genius, and attention of Mr. G. point him out as worthy the highest encouragement of every class of citizens—on this effort of his, in creating, if we may be allowed the expression—a likeness of Mr. B. must to the friends of Philosophy, Science, and the liberal Arts.8

This notice is so much of a testimonial that one suspects that it may have been printed as a favor to Gullager (possibly in return for one of his various decorating services), with the information in it perhaps even being supplied by him. Still, one wonders why the editors of the publication seem to have been unaware of the two portraits of Bowdoin from life (both of which are in the present collection), which almost certainly had hung in his house in Boston, where they would have been seen by many. It is possible, however, that these two portraits may not have been mentioned because they showed a young James Bowdoin II (in Smibert’s portrait, he is a boy of only nine; in Feke’s twenty-two), who simply was a different person from the mature statesman his survivors had remembered. While it is puzzling that no later portraits of such an eminent figure exist, if we can excuse the editors of the Columbian Centinel for overlooking the two early portraits, we may have reliable contemporary testimony to support an explanation that none was ever painted.

In considering the possible origin of the likeness of Bowdoin in the two panel paintings, we first must examine a portrait miniature of Bowdoin which is related to them. Before doing so, however, we must deal with the question of its former attribution, which once was given to the two panels as well. The miniature was first published by Augustus Thorndike Perkins in his A Sketch of the Life and a List of Some of the Works of John Singleton Copley, which appeared in 1873.9 In this study, the miniature was called a Copley, and listed as belonging to Robert C. Winthrop. Like the miniature, one of the panels also was published for the first time in the same book, as Copley, but at the end of the text rather than in the same place as the miniature with which Perkins compared it, inasmuch as he stated that he had found the panel after his book had gone to press.10 Also listed as belonging to Winthrop, the panel prob-
ably was *Version A*, since it is identical with a late nineteenth- or early twentieth-century reproduction of that version in the museum’s files, on the back of which (in the hand of Professor Henry Johnson, Curator 1881-87, 1892-1914; Director 1914-18 of the Bowdoin College Museum of Art) is written: “Copy of a painting by Copley in the possession of Robert C. Winthrop, Jr.” Bayley, following Perkins’ lead, gave the miniature and the panel to Copley in his study of that artist’s work published in 1915.\(^1\) In that publication both paintings were listed as belonging to Mrs. Robert C. Winthrop, Jr., the mother of the donor. (Robert C. Winthrop, Jr., died in 1905.)

Turning for a moment to *Version B* of the panel, in the documents dealing with the desire of various descendants of the sitter to retain the picture, as well as in the records of the Boards of Bowdoin College always declining to consent, nowhere is an artist’s name cited. While these documents date from a period during which artists’ names often simply were not mentioned in connection with pictures, it is conceivable that the family never mentioned that they thought *Version B* was by Copley for fear that that information would have made it even more difficult for them to keep the panel. The present writer is inclined to believe, however, that the family did not know by whom the picture was, and did not ascribe it to Copley until after Perkins’ publication of the miniature and *Version A* of the panel as such in 1873.

While the present writer dismissed the possibility of being able to associate the wood engraving by Alonzo Hartwell in the May, 1835, issue of the *American Magazine* (p. 373), cited by Louisa Dresser,\(^2\) with either of the two versions of the panel at Bowdoin, his secretary, Mrs. Kathryn Rumsey, convinced him otherwise. Mrs. Rumsey pointed out that certain features of *Version A*, particularly as regards the globe and books at the lower left, not to mention the characterization of the Governor’s countenance, which differentiate it from *Version B*, are identical with the Hartwell engraving. Unfortunately, however, neither the author nor the owner of the original painting are cited in the *American Magazine*. Although there may be documents dealing with the authorship and or the ownership of the miniature and *Version A* of the panel prior to Perkins’ publication of the two pictures, the present writer is
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unaware of them. Nevertheless, he suspects that Perkins’ preparations for his book on Copley may have triggered the advancement by Winthrop of an attribution of the two pictures to Copley, first of the miniature he owned, and later of Version A of the panel, which he either originally had not thought to be by the same artist, or which (because it appeared at the end of Perkins’ text) he had acquired subsequent to Perkins’ knowledge of the miniature. In short, it would appear that the attribution of all three of these pictures to Copley probably was not by long family tradition, but rather that it originated instead about 1873.

About 1940 G. Roger Edwards, Assistant Curator of the museum, in studying some unpublished material in the Bowdoin-Temple Papers preserved in the Massachusetts Historical Society, came across a letter which contains a statement pertinent to our discussion. On September 6, 1775, Elizabeth Bowdoin Temple wrote from London (where she had gone with her husband in 1770) to her mother, Mrs. James Bowdoin II in Boston: “I often wish I had some resemblance of you and my father, but I now despair of it since you let Mr. Copley go, without having them taken.”

Both versions of the panel paintings were held to be by Copley from the times they came into the museum’s collection at least until the publication of the fourth edition of the Descriptive Catalogue of the Art Collections of Bowdoin College in 1930. Apparently, the first scholars to question the attribution of these two panels in print were Barbara Neville Parker and Anne Bolling Wheeler in their John Singleton Copley, American Portraits, published in 1938. Although they seem to have believed that Perkins’ mention of the miniature and Version A of the panel referred instead to two versions of the panel (which can be excused since the whereabouts of the miniature evidently was not then known, and they consequently may have thought that it did not exist and that Perkins had confused his descriptions), they felt that neither panel was “characteristic of Copley’s American painting.” The present writer might add, parenthetically, that no one has thought that the panels were characteristic of Copley’s English work either.

The miniature, which was lost sight of for many years, was included, as Copley, in an exhibition relating to the Bowdoin family held at the
Bowdoin College Library in June, 1959. At the present time the miniature is in the possession of a descendant of the sitter, Winthrop Gardner Minot. In April, 1966, it was examined in the original by Jules David Prown (the author of the most recent study of Copley's entire oeuvre, published this year, and the leading authority on that artist's work), and in photograph by the present writer. Prown does not accept the attribution to Copley, and although unable to supply the name of the artist, feels that it probably is American, c. 1790.\(^{16}\) In addition, Prown suggests that while the miniature may not have been the original source of this likeness of Bowdoin, it seems to him to take precedence over the two panels (which he had long since rejected as being by Copley). The present writer agrees that the miniature is not by Copley, and while he also feels that there may have been another source from which the miniature was drawn, he is less certain that it takes precedence over both panels, and believes it is more closely related to Version B, which although by Gullager and of the same period, generally is thought to be subsequent in execution to Version A. (On this point, it must be stated at once that at the time of his correspondence with Professor Prown, the present writer only was able to supply him with two extremely poor photographs of the panels.)

Because of the very close similarity between the miniature and Version B of the panel portrait, particularly in terms of the manner in which the features are idealized in both, the present writer is tempted to suggest that the miniature also might be by Gullager. It must be pointed out, however, that although Gullager was described as a miniaturist in the Philadelphia directories of 1803-05,\(^{17}\) no miniatures by him are known, and consequently we are not able to make a comparison in that medium. Furthermore, comparing miniatures with works in another medium is extremely risky, even when, as in the present case, the works are relatively comparable in scale.

The question still remains to be answered as to what might have been the source (or sources) for Gullager's apparently posthumous panel portraits of Bowdoin, and (whether it is Gullager or not) of the miniature, which seems to share a common source. Louisa Dresser, in her article on Gullager, called attention to a profile silhouette of Bowdoin en-
graved by Samuel Hill for the January, 1791, issue of the Massachusetts Magazine, and described there as “a profile, which is a striking likeness, copied from one in the possession of the family.” In the opinion of the present writer, this engraving could have been one of the sources of Gullager’s panel portraits (and again, possibly, the miniature) of Governor Bowdoin. In fact, Gullager could have seen what the Massachusetts Magazine implied was a silhouette in the possession of the family, which briefly may have been in the hands of Samuel Hill when he made his engraving after it. It is worth noting that Hill engraved two frontispieces drawn by Gullager for the Massachusetts Magazine in 1790.

There also exists a posthumous medal depicting the mature Bowdoin in profile, which though facing in the opposite direction from the Hill and Gullager profiles is extremely similar to them, and which the present writer believes could have been made about the same time. It is interesting to point out that in the same letter from Charles Gullager to his brother Henry, a portion of which already has been quoted in connection with Gullager’s likeness of Governor Bowdoin, in reference to his father’s portrait of Washington, he says, “Busts also in plaster and medals equally admired were cast from it in great numbers by him.”

Finally, remembering the notice in the Columbian Centinel which spoke of Gullager “creating” a likeness of Bowdoin, another source for the portraits in question simply may have been his recollection of the old statesman, whom he must have seen in Boston between his own arrival there in 1787 and the latter’s death in 1790.

When, as Governor, Bowdoin reviewed the militia from the steps of the courthouse in Harvard Square in November, 1785, he was described as follows: *His appearance and dress, as the troops passed by him, are well remembered. . . He was a tall, dignified man . . . dressed in a gray wig, cocked hat, and white broadcloth coat and waistcoat, red small-clothes, and black silk stockings. His face was without color, his features rather small for his size, his air and manner quietly grave.*

Apart from the clothing, the description of the man could as easily apply to the two panel paintings by Gullager. And instead of reviewing the troops, Bowdoin, his glance raised heavenwards, is shown like a pharaoh in the afterlife, dressed in one of his best suits and surrounded
by many of the most significant appurtenances of his earthly life.

1. Letter dated March 25, 1949, from Louisa Dresser, Curator, Worcester Art Museum, to Professor Philip C. Beam, Bowdoin College Museum of Art. "In my notes taken at your gallery in 1942, I find the statement that Sawitzky tentatively suggests Gullager as the artist. . . . Actually I am not sure whether I secured the information about Sawitzky’s opinion at Bowdoin or when he came to Worcester in 1943." The museum’s files apparently do not contain any statement by Mr. Sawitzky referring to these panels, so Miss Dresser may have learned of Mr. Sawitzky’s opinion at Worcester in 1943. William Sawitzky, now deceased, was a pioneer scholar of remarkable ability in the area of early American painting.

3. Ibid., p. 128.
4. Loc. cit.
8. Transcribed exactly by the present writer from a copy of the original newspaper, in which the notice clearly lacks certain words (or phrases).
10. Ibid., p. 125.
13. For further information about Elizabeth Bowdoin Temple (who was pastelled by Copley about 1767) see the double portrait of her brother and herself as children by Blackburn, and her portrait as an old lady attributed to Samuel King in the present catalogue.
15. It was reproduced in Justin Winsor, The Memorial History of Boston (Boston, 1882), III, 195; and referred to in the same author’s Narrative and Critical History of America (Boston, 1889), VIII, 429. In both places it was listed as belonging to the Hon. Robert C. Winthrop (Sr.). In the latter citation, reference also was made to two life-size copies of the miniature having been painted by Edgar Parker for Robert C. Winthrop, Jr., one being in the patron’s pos-
session and the other in Independence Hall. The former probably is that now in the Massachusetts Historical Society. It was reproduced by Francis G. Walett, "James Bowdoin, Massachusetts Patriot and Statesman," Proceedings of the Bostonian Society (Annual Meeting, Jan. 17, 1950), opp. p. 27 as "Courtes y of the Massachusetts Historical Society, James Bowdoin in Mid Life, From a Copy by an Unknown Artist of a Miniature by John Singleton Copley."

16. Verbally, to the present writer.
18. Ibid., pp. 128-29.
19. A silhouette which is almost identical to the Hill profile is in the collection of Miss Clara Bowdoin Winthrop, a direct descendant of the sitter. It is paired with one of Sir John Temple, also owned by Miss Winthrop. Both were done by John Meirs of London. Since Bowdoin is not known to have ever been abroad, the Meirs silhouette of him must have been copied from one done in America, probably prior to 1785 when the Temples returned to this country. Either this silhouette, or another version of it, or the original from which the likeness was taken, may have been used by Hill. A silhouette purporting to be of James Bowdoin II was reproduced on the cover of the January, 1931, issue of The Bowdoin Alumnus, the source for which was given (p. 36), as "Courtesy of the First National Bank of Boston." (James Bowdoin II was the first president of the Massachusetts Bank, the predecessor of the above institution.) The features in this silhouette are so different from those in the Hill engraving, the two panel portraits, and the miniature (all of which are similar to one another) that it must be rejected as a likeness of James Bowdoin II. Mr. John Calkins of the First National Bank of Boston informed the present writer (verbally, May, 1966) that he could find no grounds for identifying the miniature as James Bowdoin II, and that he believed it probably was one of a series of portraits of former presidents of the bank made for the institution earlier in this century.

21. Malcolm Storer, Numismatics of Massachusetts, Massachusetts Historical Society Collections (Boston, 1923), LXXVI, 243, ill. pl. XXXI, no. 1873.
22. Dresser, op. cit., p. 111.

Exhibited (1924.1):

1924.1 Gift of Miss Clara Bowdoin Winthrop.
Received from the estate of Mrs. George Sullivan Bowdoin (whose husband changed his name to Bowdoin agreeable to the will of Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn). He was a son of Mrs. George Sullivan in whose possession the picture was, subsequent to the death of Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn.

SAMUEL KING (1749-1819)

Samuel King was born in Newport, Rhode Island, the son of Mary Haggar and Benjamin King, who ran a shop where he made and repaired nautical instruments. There is a tradition that Samuel was sent to Boston to serve an apprenticeship as a house painter, at which time he also may have studied certain less mundane forms of painting, inasmuch as upon his return to Newport he is said to have painted a portrait of a local gentleman, which was exhibited in the window of his father’s shop.

If King was apprenticed at the usual time for such an undertaking, he would have been in Boston in the 1760’s. Judging from the quite uneven quality of his portraits, which are mediocre at best, it seems quite unlikely that he can have received any significant instruction in that art (although, of course, he simply may not have been very talented to begin with). In the Boston of the 1760’s one thinks immediately of the atelier of Thomas Johnston, where all manner of the decorative arts (but very little portraiture) was practiced. While King never developed as a portraitist as fully as John Johnston, it is not impossible to believe that some of what he did know came out of the same ambience, which subsequently also included Christian Gullager. King also may have received some encouragement from the Scottish portraitist Cosmo Alexander, who was in Newport in 1769-70.

There is good reason to believe, however, that King spent most of his time following in his father’s footsteps as a maker of nautical instruments. In fact, Washington Allston spoke of King as one “who made quadrants and compasses, and occasionally painted portraits.” And although it sometimes is said that the young Newporters Gilbert Stuart and Edward Green Malbone may have studied with King, it seems unlikely that they could have learned very much from him.
ELIZABETH BOWDOIN, LADY TEMPLE (1750-1809)

Oil on canvas, 30 7/8 x 26 3/4, probably c. 1790

This portrait was one of the three not identified as to sitter* on a list of Bowdoin family portraits attached to a letter of June 19, 1826, from the executors of the estate of Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn (previously Mrs. James Bowdoin III), announcing her bequest of them to Bowdoin College. (No artists’ names were supplied any of the portraits on the list.) At least as late as 1930, the date of the last published catalogue of the museum’s collections, the portrait was identified only as “a Lady in a High Cap” (no. 191). About 1940 G. Roger Edwards, Assistant Curator of the museum, suggested that the sitter might represent Mrs. James Bowdoin II in old age, and from time to time the picture has been so exhibited. The present writer, however, is reasonably convinced that the subject depicted is Elizabeth Bowdoin, Lady Temple (the daughter of Mrs. James Bowdoin II). This identification is based primarily on a comparison of the present likeness with that of Lady Temple in a miniature by Edward Greene Malbone (in the museum’s collection).¹ There is also a Malbone miniature of Mrs. James Bowdoin II (Norton Art Foundation, Shreveport, Louisiana) in old age, in which the likeness is very different from that in the present portrait.² (This latter miniature, which was not published until 1958, was not known to Mr. Edwards.)

In a letter of March 28, 1941, to Mr. Edwards, Alan Burroughs, Conservator, Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, suggested that the present portrait “is evidently by Samuel King,” comparing it to the portraits by King of Benjamin Mumford and Mrs. Mumford in the Newport Historical Society. A notation in the museum’s file on the portrait indicates that subsequently William Sawitzky³ “believes this attribution quite possible.” Although it would appear that this attribution has never since been suggested for the portrait when exhibited, it is possible that the Burroughs letter and the Sawitzky notation may have gotten lost in the shuffle about the time Mr. Edwards, shortly thereafter, was inducted into the armed services.

The present writer, in his researches on the portrait, came across the suggestion of Samuel King as its author, and checked it against several
photographs of portraits by that artist in the Frick Art Reference Library. He now feels that there are grounds for attributing it to Samuel King, particularly on the basis of a comparison of it with a likeness by King of Mrs. Ezra Stiles (Yale University), as well as those of the Mumfords.

As to when the portrait was painted, the present writer based his suggested date of c. 1790 on a comparison of the portrait with those of Mrs. Samuel Salisbury\(^4\) and Mrs. Daniel Waldo\(^5\) (both of which are in the Worcester Art Museum), painted by Christian Gullager in 1789. Not only are the costumes worn by these two ladies very similar to that worn by the lady in the present portrait, but there are remarkable similarities of pose and setting as well. In fact, this writer (before he was aware of the Burroughs-Sawitzky attribution to Samuel King) once thought the portrait at Bowdoin might be by Gullager, a notion of which he was quickly disabused by the leading authority on Gullager, Miss Louisa Dresser, Curator, Worcester Art Museum.\(^6\)

He now feels that King either was influenced by Gullager, or that the similarity of the images can be accounted for by their having been developed at the same time and in the same ambience. It also is remotely possible that this portrait might be a copy of a lost original by Gullager, painted about the time he made his posthumous likenesses of James Bowdoin II. The present writer has conjectured that Gullager also may have painted Mrs. James Bowdoin II at the same time (see footnote 2).

Since the present portrait (or the original from which it may have been copied) seems to have been painted about 1790, we have further evidence for believing the subject to be Lady Temple and not Mrs. James Bowdoin II, for the age of the sitter is much closer to what the former’s would have been at that time (about forty, born 1750) than the latter’s (about sixty, born 1731).

Although Lady Temple was living in New York with her husband, who was British Consul to the United States, from 1785 until his death in 1798\(^7\) (after which time she did take up residence in Boston), it is altogether likely that she would have visited her family in Boston occasionally, particularly at the time of her father’s funeral in November, 1790. In fact, since James Bowdoin II was ill for some time before his
death, Lady Temple may have come earlier in the fall of 1790, perhaps remaining into 1791.

Since Samuel King is believed to have made trips from Newport to Boston, he could have been there during that period, or, if he in fact did copy a lost original by Gullager, this could have been accomplished in Boston on any number of subsequent occasions. The possibility that Gullager may have painted the original of the portrait in question is somewhat reinforced insofar as it is hard to accept the fact that Lady Temple would have sat to a mediocre artist like Samuel King. Whatever the case, on stylistic grounds the present writer is inclined to support an attribution to King for the portrait at hand.

* The others are the first two in this catalogue of James Bowdoin I and William Bowdoin (as a boy).

1. See the discussion of this miniature in the present catalogue.

2. Tolman, pp. 143-44, ill. p. 144. Sold in 1940 by Miss Edith Grinnell Bowdoin, a descendant of the sitter, to James Graham and Sons, N. Y. Tolman believed that this was one of two miniatures of the subject (his no. 51), painted "About 1800." He believed that the other (his no. 52) was that listed on p. 17 of Malbone’s account book (ill. Tolman, p. 103) among those painted by him in Boston in 1804 as "Madam Bowdoin a copy" (listed by Tolman without any provenance as "Unlocated"). The present writer is not convinced that two Malbone’s of Mrs. James Bowdoin II ever existed, however. He believes that since Mrs. James Bowdoin II died in 1803, and because no prototype is known for Malbones “Madam Bowdoin a copy,” Tolman simply assumed that his no. 51 must have been painted from life, and that Malbone’s copy of 1804 probably was made after it. In other words, Tolman’s no. 51 probably never existed, and its provenance belongs under his no. 52. The present writer would further like to suggest that the missing prototype for Malbone’s miniature of Mrs. James Bowdoin II probably was painted in Boston at about the same time as the portrait of Lady Temple, attributed to Samuel King, possibly by that artist, or perhaps by Christian Gullager about the time he made his posthumous likenesses of James Bowdoin II in the present collection.

3. Probably about 1941-42. (Cf. footnote 1 in the entry on the Gullager portraits of James Bowdoin II in the present catalogue regarding the identity of Mr. Sawitzky.)


7. For additional information about Sir John and Lady Temple see the discussion in this catalogue under Blackburn's portrait of *Elizabeth and James Bowdoin III as Children*.

1826.2 Bequest of Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn.

JOHN JOHNSTON (c. 1753-1818)

John Johnston was the son of Thomas Johnston (c. 1708-67), a Boston artist who was more craftsman (an engraver of maps, battle plans, a view of Boston from Noodle's Island, bookplates, and music; perhaps even an organ builder; and evidently in his later life, primarily a japanner, since he is so described in his obituaries) than painter. At just about the time John might have begun his formal apprenticeship with his father (as his brothers had done), Thomas Johnston died, and the boy went instead to John Gore, a house and sign painter. After this apprenticeship, which probably terminated about 1773, Johnston entered into a partnership with Daniel Rea, Jr. (b. 1743), who had worked for his father and married his sister. In addition to being a craftsman and painter, Rea also was a notable singer, who once was said to have sung by request for George Washington.

After about two years, Johnston left to serve in the Continental Army, rising to the rank of captain (commissioned June 16, 1776) in General Henry Knox's regiment. He participated in the Battle of Long Island (August 27, 1776), during which he is said to have been severely wounded and taken prisoner by the British. Johnston was later exchanged and was honorably discharged at an early date (October, 1777), which would tend to corroborate the story of his wound.

The Rea & Johnston account books (Baker Library, Harvard University Business School) indicate that the firm engaged in a variety of artistic activities, such as the painting of signs and venetian blinds (fifteen shillings the pair) and interior and exterior decoration. The partners numbered among their customers most of the best people in Boston, including Paul Revere, who was billed six shillings on August 23, 1786, for "painting the backs of masonick chairs."

Unlike his father, who had been reduced mostly to painting the fur-
niture of Bostonians, while Smibert, Badger, Greenwood, Feke, Blackburn, and Copley were painting their portraits, John Johnston was fortunate in beginning his career when the competition was less formidable. (To be sure, because of the flight of a substantial number of loyalists, as well as general wartime conditions, patronage also was less abundant.) The account books referred to above show that a customer had been billed (eighteen pounds) for a portrait of General Joseph Warren on April 15, 1781, so it seems likely that Johnston must have begun his activities as a portraitist soon after his discharge from the army. Exactly how long Johnston remained in partnership with Rea is not known, except that the following entry in the account books of 1787 makes it clear that by that time they were no longer together:

\[ \begin{align*} 
\text{Dr. John Johnston of Boston Portrait painter} \\
\text{To the half of Sundry Articles for Jobs} \\
\text{Unfinish'd after the Dissolution of} \\
\text{Copartnership of Rea & Johnston} 
\end{align*} \]

The document is also testimony that Johnston’s chief occupation was now portrait painting.

Concerning Johnston’s later portraits, there are certain similarities between them and the work of Christian Gullager, who painted in Boston c. 1787-93 and c. 1796-97. Whether or not Gullager can have played any role in the formation of Johnston’s mature style is difficult to say. On the basis of Gullager’s Newburyport portraits of 1787, there is reason to believe that his style was not fully formed on his arrival in Boston, so perhaps, in fact, Johnston may have influenced him. The similarities we see, however, may be the result of a certain amount of artistic cross-fertilization on the part of two artists in the process of forming their styles in the same ambience at the same time. Whatever the case, their work (as well as this period of painting in Boston, generally) requires and deserves further study.

In addition to his portrait of General Joseph Warren, Johnston painted many of the most notable people in Boston during his career, including Samuel Adams and Governor Increase Sumner. Johnston occupied John Smibert’s old studio from about 1800 to 1808, the last year in which his name appears in Boston directories at that (or any other) address. He
also must have purchased the contents of the studio, for in 1808 he sold Smibert’s famous Berkeley Group (Yale University Art Gallery) to Isaac Lothrop of Plymouth.

Johnston died in Boston in 1818. Whether or not he painted until the end of his life is not known, although it seems likely that the disappearance of his name from Boston directories after 1808 coincides with the termination of his career. Johnston’s style is marked by an ability to capture likeness and character with economy and directness. While not a great painter, he is still one of the most underrated portraitists of the Federal period.

JUDGE DAVID SEWALL (1735-1825)
Oil on canvas, 35½ x 28½
Signed and dated l.r. J. Johnston pinxit 1790

David Sewall* was born in York, Maine, the seventh son of a seventh son, Samuel Sewall, and his second wife Sarah Bachelor. He was a member of the Harvard class of 1755, which was later said to have produced more able men than any Harvard class since that of 1721. One of David’s classmates was a young man named John Adams.

Sewall acquired his legal education in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, from Judge William Parker, whose daughter Mary he married in 1762. After her death in 1788, he married a second time, in 1790, to Elizabeth Langdon. She was the daughter of the Reverend Samuel Langdon (president of Harvard, 1774-80), with whom Sewall had more than three decades before, in 1758, prepared a Portsmouth almanac.

Sewall was admitted to the bar in 1763. During the next few years he held such minor but nonetheless lucrative jobs as collector of the liquor excise and Register of Probate. Judging from Sewall’s political behavior at the time, although he could not by any means be described as a loyalist, neither was he exactly what one would call a staunch Whig. Sewall was chairman of the York town committee, which on January 9, 1775, instructed its representative to the Provincial Congress: “That you on no pretence whatever give your Voice or consent to Assume any new form of Government.”
If Sewall had for a long time been pessimistic about the success “of our controversy with the King,” by 1780 he was confident that the Colonies would sustain their independence. When it was suggested that Maine be separated from Massachusetts, however, he turned thumbs down, arguing that “One Revolution in an Age is quite Sufficient.”

The last forty years of Sewall’s public life were spent in the judiciary. He was appointed to the Superior Court in 1777, and to the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts in 1781. From 1789 until his retirement in 1818 he was Judge of the United States District Court for Maine. Nehemiah Cleaveland, Bowdoin class of 1813, described Judge Sewall as “the most venerable impersonation of justice” his “eyes ever looked upon.”

From 1794 through 1815 Judge Sewall was president of the Board of Overseers of Bowdoin College, which conferred on him the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws in 1812.

The present portrait shows Sewall in 1790 at the age of fifty-five, the same year he took a second wife, Elizabeth Langdon, an “agreeable sensible woman” who subsequently presided over “his Grand new House,” which he named Coventry Hall in honor of his English ancestors. Sewall died on October 22, 1825, five days short of his ninety-sixth birthday. Upon hearing the news, his old classmate John Adams is reported to have said, “The glory of York has departed.”

* The principal source for this information about the life of David Sewall is Clifford K. Shipton, Sibley’s Harvard Graduates, XIII (Boston, 1965).

1839.1 Bequest of Mrs. David Sewall.

JAMES EARL (1761-96)

James Earl was born in Paxton, Massachusetts. Like his older brother, the American painter Ralph Earl (1751-1801) before him, James went to England about 1784 to study with Benjamin West. During the decade he was in London, James Earl exhibited sixteen pictures in nine years at the Royal Academy. In 1789 he married Georgiana Caroline Pilkington Smyth, the widow of an American loyalist.

Leaving his wife and family in London, Earl set sail for America in
1794, but instead of arriving at some northern port, his ship was blown off course and put in at Charleston, South Carolina. Evidently having impressed the local inhabitants with the “suavity of his disposition, benevolence, and good humor,” as well as his talents as a portraitist, Earl remained for nearly two years painting numerous Charlestonians. He died there of yellow fever on August 18, 1796.

1. From Earl’s obituary in the *South Carolina State Gazette and Timothy and Mason Advertiser*, Saturday, August 20, 1796 (quoted in Sherman, p. 144).

**PORTRAIT OF AN UNKNOWN GENTLEMAN**

Oil on canvas, 30 x 25, c. 1784-94

When this portrait was acquired in England some years ago, it was believed to have been painted by Benjamin West, an attribution which, after it came into the present collection, was disputed by the leading West scholar, Helmut von Erffa.\(^1\) A note on the mount of the photograph of the painting in the Frick Art Reference Library made on May 13, 1955, by Mrs. William Sawitzky stated her belief that the portrait was by James Earl. Following this suggestion, the present writer examined photographs of a number of portraits by Earl juxtaposed to similar examples by West, with the result that he now concurs with Mrs. Sawitzky’s opinion. The present portrait is very close to those by Earl of *David Young* (property of a New York dealer in 1941, present whereabouts unknown) and of *Ebenezer Burrill* (property of a descendant of the sitter).

Although this picture probably was painted in England, it answers as well to a description of Earl’s Charleston portraits: “To an uncommon facility in hitting off the likeness, may be added a peculiarity in his execution of drapery, and, which has ever been esteemed in his art the ne plus ultra, of giving life to the eye and expression to every feature.”\(^2\)

1. Letter to the present writer.
2. From Earl’s obituary in the *South Carolina State Gazette and Timothy and Mason Advertiser*, Saturday, August 20, 1796 (quoted in Sherman, p. 144).

1952.4 Gift of John H. Halford, Bowdoin class of 1907, and Mrs. Halford. (Purchased from Daniel Farr, a dealer who acquired it in England.)
CHARLES BALTHAZAR JULIEN FÉVRET DE SAINT-MÉMIN (1770-1852)

Saint-Mémin was born in Dijon, the son of Bénigne Charles Févret de Saint-Mémin, a lawyer, and his wife Victoire Marie de Motmans, a Creole from Santo Domingo, where her family were wealthy sugar planters. Educated in Dijon until he was fourteen, Charles then entered L'École Militaire in Paris, from which he graduated in 1785. In 1788 he became an ensign in the elite household guard of Louis XVI, but after the outbreak of the French Revolution his parents and he were forced to flee to Switzerland.

In 1793 Saint-Mémin and his father left Switzerland to go to Santo Domingo to attempt to protect Mme de Saint-Mémin’s interests on that island. In New York, however, they learned of the Negro rebellion in Santo Domingo, which rendered it inadvisable for them to proceed there.

Relatively penniless in New York, the Saint-Mémins, father and son, tried their hand at market gardening for one season, an undertaking for which they were perfectly ill-equipped, and which consequently did not prosper. Having once achieved a certain modicum of success as an amateur watercolorist at home in Dijon, Saint-Mémin was encouraged to see if he might earn a living for his father and himself in the arts. Since their place of residence in New York commanded a panoramic view of the city, Saint-Mémin’s first work (done in 1796) was a pencil sketch of that scene, which, solely with the aid of what he was able to learn from encyclopedias, he engraved. He then hand-colored prints pulled from the plate as his first commercial undertaking in the arts. If Saint-Mémin was entirely self-taught as an engraver (and even made his own tools), it is worth noting that his background was not devoid of the experience at least of such material. His grandfather, Charles-Marie Févret, had been the editor of a new edition of Père Lelong’s Bibliothèque Historique de France, and upon his death before the completion of his labors he left to his son a huge collection of engravings, with which the young Charles could not have failed to have been somewhat familiar.

After executing several more landscapes Saint-Mémin turned to portraiture as a more lucrative means of livelihood. Perhaps because he was
hampered somewhat by his lack of training, he turned to the physiono-
trace, a method whereby a sitter's profile was traced mechanically in
pencil life-size on a piece of paper, upon which the artist would then fill
in the features of the face with black-and-white crayons. Saint-Mémin's
choice of this technique, invented by Gilles-Louis Chrétiens in Paris in
1786, also probably had something to do with the fact that several mem-
bers of his family had sat to Chrétiens.

True to form, Saint-Mémin constructed his own apparatus, which
(presuming it was like Edme Quenedey's, who was a colleague of Chré-
tien) was a wooden frame on three legs about five and a half feet high
and two feet wide. Attached to a rectangular frame which slid up and
down between the upright shaft was a sighting device consisting of two
crossed threads. Also attached to the frame was a pantograph and a pen-
cil; while the operator traced the silhouette of his subject through his
viewer, the pencil would recreate that image life-size on a piece of paper
(covered in Saint-Mémin's case with a pink watercolor wash).

A drawing so created, however, was not an end in itself, but rather a
study which Saint-Mémin then reduced by means of a pantograph to a
round image two inches in diameter which he then engraved. This is not
to say that the drawings were not regarded as finished works of art, for
some of his sitters ordered them alone, and Saint-Mémin was even re-
sponsible for their frames as well as the glass which covered them, the
extremities of which were painted black with gold decorations, all ac-
cording to Saint-Mémin's own design. But while the drawing alone
could be had for $8, the real money was in the engraving, which for gen-
tlemen cost an additional $17 together with twelve impressions, and for
ladies, an additional $27. Extra engravings were $1.50 the dozen.

Following a brief partnership with an engraver named Valdenuit,
Saint-Mémin worked alone in New York until 1798, when he moved to
Burlington, New Jersey, where his mother and sister, who had since
come from Switzerland, had started a girls' school. From Burlington
he went almost immediately to Philadelphia (only twenty miles away),
then the Nation's capital, where he found ample patronage.

From 1804 to 1809 Saint-Mémin worked in Baltimore; Annapolis;
Washington; Richmond, Virginia; and Charleston, South Carolina. In
1810 he went back to France. Upon his return to the United States in 1812, he once again took up residence in New York, but since his eyesight had been impaired by his extensive activities as a portrait engraver (of which approximately eight hundred examples are known), he worked as a portrait painter and landscapist. Two years later he returned to France, and from 1817 until his death he was reduced to being a museum director (of the institution in his home town of Dijon).

1. Quenedey’s sketch of the physionotrace is reproduced in Howard C. Rice, Jr., “Saint-Mémin’s Portrait of Jefferson,” The Princeton University Library Chronicle, XX, no. 4 (Summer, 1959), fig. 6.

SILAS LEE (1760-1814)

Pencil and black-and-white crayon on paper covered with pink watercolor wash, 19 3/8 x 14, 1799

Silas Lee was born in Concord, Massachusetts, the son of Dr. Joseph Lee and his wife Lucy Jones. It has been said of Lee that, because “letters and arms alternately occupied his thoughts,” his birthplace having been one of the first battlegrounds of the Revolution, he did not get around to going to college until he was twenty, an extremely late age for his time. He entered Harvard in 1780, graduating as a member of the class of 1784. Lee subsequently studied law with Judge George Thacher (whose niece, Temperance Hedge, he later married) of Biddeford in the District of Maine. Admitted to the bar in 1788, Lee came to Pownalborough (now Wiscasset) in the District of Maine the following year. In addition to the fact that Pownalborough was the shire town of a then territorially large county (Lincoln) and a very active port in foreign trade, its attractiveness to Lee also may have been due to the fact that its most prominent lawyer of the preceding two decades, Timothy Langdon, was declining in popularity.

In 1794, 1797, and 1798 Lee was a member of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, and was elected as a Federalist to the sixth and seventh Congresses, where he served from March 4, 1799, until his resignation on August 20, 1801. Although Lee was a member of the opposite party, President Jefferson appointed him United States Attorney
for the District of Maine, a position which he held from January 6, 1802, until his death. It was in this capacity that he libeled as a prize of the United States the British brig *Boxer*, which had been captured after a bloody battle off Pemaquid on September 5, 1813. In 1804 Lee became Judge of Probate (a capacity in which he served for the rest of his life); and in 1810-11 he was Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas for Lincoln County. Lee also was an Overseer of Bowdoin College in 1798-99; and a Trustee from 1799 to 1814.

Frederic Allen, a younger contemporary of Silas Lee, and a fellow lawyer with him in Lincoln County, later wrote of him: *The success of Mr. Lee at the bar was not owing to his power as an orator. Few men were more deficient in all the essential elements which constitute good speaking. Without imagination, or power of illustration, without any pretension to elegance of diction, he only labored to make himself understood, and it seemed no small effort to accomplish that. A perpetual stammering and hesitation were the general characteristics of his addresses to the jury. He possessed, however, other qualities, which served to supply any deficiency in elocution. He was courteous and bland in his manners; polite and gentlemanly in his address, and most familiar and easy of access. He was remarkable for his hospitality, and especially desirous of entertaining men of cultivated minds, wherever found, at his residence. He had a passion for building houses, which he indulged beyond his wants, or his means—which ever kept him embarrassed in his finances, and notwithstanding the perquisites of all his offices, rendered his estate at the time of his death deeply insolvent.*

While the present writer cannot vouch for the complete and unbiased accuracy of all of Mr. Allen’s remarks about Silas Lee, on the last point he would seem to have known what he was talking about. Silas Lee certainly did have “a passion for building houses,” which he apparently did indulge beyond his means. The first of his houses (there would be four) was built in 1792 on High Street at the edge of the Common. It has justly been described as: “monumental in proportion and precision of outline, with its captain’s walk, its semicircular portico whose exquisite entablature is supported by Ionic columns, its staircase both unique and beautiful, its mullioned windows and superb interior finish, place it in the foremost rank as one of the finest examples of colonial architecture.
in Maine.”^3 This house Lee sold in 1807, having the year before built a more modest dwelling on Summer Street.4 He also built on his property at Birch Point a “villa,” which burned down in 1872. It is said to have been “approached by a bridge 200 feet in length, in the center of which was a gate with a fine Grecian urn turned over it . . . situated nearly in the center of the peninsula, with an enchanting prospect on every side. The villa was in semicircular form facing east, with the two extremities exactly corresponding with each other. . . .”^5 

Lee’s most ambitious architectural undertaking probably was the house which is a replica of Sheriff Manor in Dunbar, Scotland. It contains an elliptical flying staircase, which is believed to be one of only two examples of its kind in the United States (the other being in the Nathaniel Russell house on Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina). Designed, appropriately enough, by a Scottish architect by the name of Robert Stuart, and built in 1807-08 on the corner of High and Lee Streets, this house was Silas Lee’s last residence.6 He died on March 3, 1814, the first victim of the three-month-long epidemic of “spotted fever” (cerebrospinal meningitis). Mrs. Lee, who outlived her husband for three decades, subsequently built for herself a much more modest house which, although it “does not compare in architectural value with those built by her husband,”7 she was more easily able to afford.

Regarding the year the present portrait was executed, in an album kept by Saint-Mémin, containing examples of the great majority of his engraved portraits, above that of Silas Lee (no. 446) appears the date 1799.8 In that year Saint-Mémin was at work in Philadelphia, then the capital of the United States, where Silas Lee was in attendance as a member of Congress. Since Lee’s portrait was engraved as well as drawn, it is very likely that he paid Saint-Mémin the going rate of $25 for a drawing, the engraved plate, and twelve impressions from it. (Lee also may have ordered additional impressions from the plate at the rate of $1.50 per dozen.)

Although the silhouette of the drawing originated with a mechanical apparatus, Saint-Mémin’s subsequent rendering of the features in black-and-white crayon resulted in a convincingly three-dimensional and life-like image that speaks to us of the Silas Lee who was “courteous and
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bland in his manners, polite and gentlemanly in his address, and most familiar and easy of access.”

2. Now called the Governor Samuel Smith House, after a subsequent occupant.
4. From 1857 until recently the parsonage of the Congregational Church.
6. Now called “Castle Tucker” after a former owner, Captain Richard Holbrook Tucker, in whose family the house still remains.
8. A photographic reproduction of this album (the original of which is now in the collection of Paul Mellon) was published in New York in 1862 by Elias Dexter: *The St.-Mémin Collection of Portraits; Consisting of Seven Hundred and Sixty Medallion Portraits, Principally of Distinguished Americans, Photographed by J. Gurney and Son of New York from proof impressions of the original copper plates.* (Another set of 760 plates is in the Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington, and one with only 545 is in the Cabinet des Estampes, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, owns 560 plates without autograph notations, and the Prints and Photographs Division, Library of Congress, about 400.)

1869.1 Gift of Mrs. P. S. J. Talbot, a grandniece of the sitter.

MRS. SILAS LEE née Temperance Hedge (d. 1845)

Pencil and black-and-white crayon on paper covered with pink watercolor wash, 19½ x 14, 1799

Temperance Hedge was born at Dennis or Yarmouth, Cape Cod, Massachusetts. She was the niece of Judge George Thacher, with whom she is said to have resided before her marriage to Silas Lee, who studied law with Judge Thacher. Mrs. Lee was a founder and the second “Presidentess” of what is believed to be the oldest organization of its kind in the United States (the “Grandmother” of American women’s clubs), the Female Charitable Society of Pownalborough (now Wiscasset), the first meeting of which was held in the Lee house on High Street on November 11, 1805.
C. B. J. F. de Saint-Mémin  Mrs. Silas Lee
Mrs. Lee's portrait certainly was drawn by Saint-Mémin at the same time as her husband's (see the preceding entry), in Philadelphia in 1799. Although her portrait apparently never was engraved by Saint-Mémin,¹ and although she probably only cost her husband a mere $8 as a result, if she felt badly, she needn't have, for of all the hundreds of portraits drawn by Saint-Mémin she had the rare distinction of being one of the few women among them.

1. An engraved portrait of Mrs. Lee does not appear in Saint-Mémin’s album (see footnote 8 under the preceding entry). Saint-Mémin, however, did not preserve a copy of all of his engraved portraits. Of those in the album, a comparatively few are of women.

1869.2 Gift of Mrs. P. S. J. Talbot, a grandniece of the sitter.

EDWARD GREENE MALBONE (1777-1807)

Edward Greene Malbone* was born in Newport, Rhode Island, the third of the six children of John Malbone and Patience Greene, whose union (for reasons unknown) never had the benefit of clergy. There is no record of exactly when Edward adopted his father’s name, but a letter of October 11, 1794, he wrote John Malbone (addressing him as “Honored Sire”) from Providence, apologizing for leaving home without telling him, concluded: “making use of that name which I shall study never to dishonor. Your dutiful son, Edward G. Malbone.” (Malbone’s three sisters were not baptized with that name until after their father’s death.)

Malbone’s reason for leaving home at the age of seventeen was to take up his brush professionally, after having wielded it as an amateur for several years in Newport. That Malbone originally took to painting without any instruction probably can be assumed from an account written later by his sister, in which she spoke of her youthful brother “making his own brushes, and preparing his colours, even before he could discriminate between the different shades, having never seen a paint box.” Although Malbone may have had some instruction from Samuel King, since King evidently was more of a maker of nautical instruments than a painter (see his biography in the present catalogue), it is not likely
that the young miniaturist can have learned much from him. Essentially, Malbone can be regarded as self-taught.

While not a great deal is known about Malbone’s earliest works done in Providence, he apparently met with almost immediate success there. Upon a visit home, Malbone so impressed the British Consul in Newport with his accomplishments that that gentleman invited the young artist to accompany him to England. As much as Malbone had been hoping to go to England, however, he declined, feeling himself obligated to remain in America to assist his family, his father having recently died.

Malbone next went to Boston where he renewed a friendship of his youth in Newport with Washington Allston, who was then a student at Harvard College. Malbone next worked in Philadelphia and briefly in New York before moving to Charleston, South Carolina, early in 1801. About the middle of May of that year, in company with Allston (who had graduated from Harvard the year before), Malbone sailed from Charleston for England. While the purpose of Allston’s visit was to study at the Royal Academy (and he remained for three years), Malbone already was an accomplished miniaturist whose principal interest was in discovering how his work stacked up against that of English artists practicing in the same medium. The opinion of a Charleston artist, John Blake White, who had gone to England the year before, can give us some notion of what Malbone found out in London, and help to explain why he stayed only about six months. Blake wrote in his journal: “Malbone as a miniature painter stands high already, and may rank with the first in England.” And Benjamin West, upon seeing Malbone’s portrait of Washington Allston (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston), is said to have exclaimed: “I have never seen a miniature that pleased me more.”

During his stay in London Malbone shared little of Allston’s interest in old masters such as Titian, Veronese, and Rembrandt; but concerned himself instead with the work of contemporary English portraitists, of whom he thought Lawrence the best, followed by Beechey and Cosway. Malbone executed at least one subject painting in London, his largest known work (7 x 6 inches), called The Hours (Providence Athenaeum), a composition of three idealized figures (the hours—past,
present, and future), which he copied after Shelley. He also may have studied informally for a short period at the Royal Academy.

Returning to Charleston, Malbone entered upon the most prolific period of his career, executing during the next five months no fewer than fifty-eight miniatures, an astounding average of one about every two and a half days, including Sundays. Although he never again matched this output, Malbone, even from his earliest years as an amateur, always applied himself with such exceptional diligence to his work that he found it necessary to alternate intense periods of activity with a few weeks devoted mostly to relaxation, usually at home in Newport.

From June, 1802, until July, 1803 (with time out for rest in Newport in the summer of 1802 and the spring of 1803), Malbone painted in New York. After moving to Providence where he worked for three or four months, Malbone returned to New York in December, 1803, remaining until April, 1804, when he established himself in Philadelphia. He did not remain long in Philadelphia, for by July he was back in New York where on the tenth of that month he was painting the portrait of a fellow miniaturist (at a 25 percent discount—$40 instead of the usual $50), Anson Dickinson (unlocated). It has been said that at the time Malbone was painting this portrait Alexander Hamilton’s funeral procession passed beneath his window, but Malbone did not stop work to see it, nor would he permit his sitter to do so—an indication of his sedulous application. In September, 1804, Malbone went to Boston where he worked for sixteen months. (Among the first miniatures he painted in Boston were the two in the present collection.)

Early in 1806, perhaps partially because of a “pulmonary complaint” from which he had been suffering, Malbone returned to Charleston, where he nevertheless resumed painting. Back north in New York in May, 1806, where his sister later wrote he was “very feeble and much emaciated,” Malbone remained only about a month before going home to Newport. Although his sister reported that “he appeared to recruit a little; laying aside his pencil, indulging in riding and exercise of various kinds,” one day “being very fond of field sports, in shooting, he ran to pick up a bird; the act of stooping suddenly brought on a hemorrhage, which confined him to his bed.”
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After a period of confinement Malbone evidently thought he had recovered enough to go to Boston to resume painting, but in a letter of October 5 had to confess: “I . . . have not been well enough to use my pencil yet.” He apparently never painted again. Returning to Newport, on the advice of his physicians he embarked the next month for Jamaica, arriving after a voyage of seventeen days in Port Antonio, which he found to be “the most wretched and miserable hole that I ever was in.” He soon left, sailing to Savannah where he took up residence in a cousin’s home. Four months later, on May 7, 1807, at the age of twenty-nine, Malbone died, a victim of tuberculosis.

Malbone’s old friend, Washington Allston, once wrote of him that “as a man his disposition was amiable and generous, and wholly free from any taint of professional jealousy.” And in another letter: *He had the happy talent among his many excellencies, of elevating the character without impairing the likeness; this was remarkable in his male heads; and no woman ever lost any beauty from his hand; nay, the fair would often become still fairer, under his pencil. To this he added a grace of execution all his own.*

For the five years between December, 1801, and December, 1806, Malbone kept an account book in which he recorded 340 miniatures he painted. Of these, only a few more than one hundred have been located. If we add the number of miniatures not located to the 470 or so which are known, we arrive at a figure of about 720, which probably is a fair approximation of the total production of his career of nearly twelve years.

* The information in this biography was derived chiefly from Ruel Pardee Tolman, *The Life and Works of Edward Greene Malbone* (New York, 1958).

1. Reproduced in facsimile in Tolman, pp. 84-122. In addition to miniatures, Malbone also listed various of his expenses which give some insight into his daily life. For example, over the five-year period covered, he spent $850 on clothes, $50 on wine, $60 on theater tickets, and $125 on books.
JAMES BOWDOIN III (1752-1811)

Watercolor on ivory, 3⅛ x 2½(8), oval, probably November-December, 1804

Signed l.r. Malbone

On page 17 of Malbone’s Account Book, listed with those miniatures he did in Boston in “October & November 1804” is the following entry: “Mr. Bowdoin a copy.”¹ Inasmuch as two versions of his miniature of James Bowdoin III (the present example and that in the collection of Miss Clara Bowdoin Winthrop, West Manchester, Massachusetts), one is confronted by two alternatives: either Malbone meant that he had made a copy of his own miniature of James Bowdoin III, or that he had copied another portrait of the subject.

In referring to the version in the present collection, Tolman stated that it was “a copy after Stuart’s oil, now owned by Bowdoin College, Maine, which was painted about 1797. In Park’s Gilbert Stuart, the date is given as 1806, but the cut of the coat and the powdered wig with a queue place it near 1797; moreover, the subject appears to be nearer forty-five than fifty-four.”² When citing the version of the miniature belonging to Miss Winthrop, Tolman stated: “Evidently Malbone made two copies at about this time.”³ The present writer does not find Tolman’s reasons for dating the Stuart very compelling, and is inclined to feel that it was copied after one of the versions of the Malbone miniature of the subject. (For a full exposition of this argument, see the discussion of Stuart’s portrait of James Bowdoin III in this catalogue, where the subject’s biography also is given.)

1. Reproduced in facsimile in Tolman, p. 103.
2. Tolman, p. 143 (no. 49). Park, Stuart, I, 168 (no. 99); III, pl. 67. Since Bowdoin was abroad on his diplomatic mission from April, 1805, until April, 1808, Park’s date “c. 1806” for the Stuart portrait is impossible.
3. Tolman, op. cit. (no. 50). As observed in the biographical notice on Malbone just preceding this entry, Malbone’s Account Book does not list all the miniatures he painted.

1951.7 Gift of Mrs. Dorothy Hupper (the wife of Roscoe H. Hupper, Bowdoin class of 1907) in honor of President and Mrs. Kenneth C. M. Sills. Prove-
Edward Greene Malbone  James Bowdoin III
Edward Greene Malbone  
Elizabeth Bowdoin, Lady Temple
ELIZABETH BOWDOIN, LADY TEMPLE (1750-1809)

Watercolor on ivory, 3\(\frac{3}{8}\) x 2\(\frac{7}{8}\) (s), oval, probably November-December, 1804

This miniature is not one of those listed by Malbone in his Account Book.\(^1\) Although Tolman dated it “about 1803,”\(^2\) since it has all the earmarks of being a pendant to the preceding miniature, it probably was painted about the same time. In addition, Malbone was working in New York in 1803, and Lady Temple had moved from there to Boston after her husband’s death in 1798. (For information about the subject’s life, see the discussion of the double portrait of her brother and her as children by Blackburn in this catalogue. Footnote 2 in that entry cites other portraits of the subject. Also see her portrait attributed to Samuel King in this catalogue.)

1. Reproduced in facsimile in Tolman, pp. 84-122.
2. Tolman, p. 254 (no. 431).

1951.8 Gift of Mrs. Dorothy Hupper (the wife of Roscoe H. Hupper, Bowdoin class of 1907) in honor of President and Mrs. Kenneth C. M. Sills. Provenance: Mrs. George Sullivan Bowdoin; Miss Edith Grinnell Bowdoin; James Graham and Sons, New York; Mrs. Norvin H. Green; Green Sale, Parke-Bernet Galleries, Nov. 30, 1950, no. 243.

GILBERT STUART (1755-1828)

Gilbert Stuart was born near Newport, Rhode Island, the son of Gilbert Stewart (who later changed the spelling of the family name to its present form) and Elizabeth Anthony. Gilbert, Sr., in partnership with Edward Cole and Dr. Thomas Moffatt (a nephew of John Smibert), erected a snuff mill in the living quarters of which his son Gilbert was born. Gilbert, Jr., was baptized on Palm Sunday, 1756, by the Reverend James McSparran (whose portrait by Smibert is in the present collec-
tion). In 1761 Gilbert, Sr., disposed of his interest in the snuff mill and moved his family into Newport. Here the young Gilbert attended school, where about the age of thirteen he is said to have begun to copy prints, and shortly thereafter to draw portraits.

Stuart probably received his first artistic instruction from the Scottish portraitist Cosmo Alexander, who came to Newport in 1769. When the following year Alexander returned to Edinburgh, he invited Stuart to join him as his assistant. This the young artist was permitted to do, but when Alexander died suddenly in Edinburgh in August, 1772, the seventeen-year-old Stuart found himself in a precarious position far from home. Although he received some assistance from Alexander’s brother-in-law and is said to have tried to support himself as an artist, Stuart’s accomplishments were yet too modest for him to succeed. Returning home in 1773 or 1774, Stuart pursued his painting and also studied music, another area in which he was talented.

In 1775 Stuart again left home, residing briefly in Boston, where he even had a pupil, the fourteen-year-old Mather Brown, whose later work was to be greatly influenced by that of his first master. Moving on to Philadelphia, Stuart painted a group portrait of his uncle Joseph Anthony and his wife and children in July. But Stuart’s intention upon leaving Newport had been to make his way to London, where he finally arrived late in the year. Not finding much success as a portraitist, Stuart took advantage of his musical talents and training, working briefly (for about three months) as a church organist.

As all American artists in London inevitably did, Stuart presented himself to Benjamin West. Possessing no letter of introduction, Stuart, burying his pride (a rare thing for him), wrote West a letter the likes of which he would never write again: *Pity me good sir. I’ve just arrived at the age of 21, an age when most young men have done something worthy of notice and find myself ignorant, without business or friends, without the necessities of life so far that for some time I have been reduced to one miserable meal a day and frequently not even that, destitute of the means of acquiring knowledge, my hopes from home blasted and incapable of returning thither [the Revolutionary War had begun and his parents had withdrawn to Nova Scotia], pitching headlong into misery I have only this hope. I pray that it may not be too*
great; to live and learn without being a burden. Should Mr. West in his abundant kindness think of aught for me I shall esteem it an obligation which shall bind me forever with gratitude. With the greatest humility. . . .

True to form, West consented to instruct Stuart, and subsequently even took him into his own household, where he remained for nearly five years. Unlike West’s other pupils, Stuart had no desire to pattern his work after that of a particular old master. Instead, he said, “For my own part I will not follow any master. I wish to find out what nature is for myself, and see her with my own eyes. This appears to me to be the true road to excellence.” While Stuart’s stylistic development during his years with West was more the product of his own predilections than his teacher’s instruction, it probably would not have matured without the benefit of the regulating effect West’s methodical application to work had on Stuart’s innately much more haphazard approach.

Stuart exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1777 and 1779, but his first work to attract favorable attention was his portrait of West (National Portrait Gallery, London), exhibited in 1781, about which the critic of the St. James Chronicle wrote, “An excellent portrait of Mr. West, indeed I do not know a better one in the room.” And in response to an inquiry from some of his other pupils about Stuart’s technique, West said, “It is of no use to steal Stuart’s colors; if you want to paint as he does you must steal his eyes.”

With the appearance of his full-length portrait of William Grant of Congalton skating, called The Skater (National Gallery, Washington), in the exhibition of 1782, Stuart had arrived. Universally admired, the success of this picture encouraged Stuart to strike out on his own. He shortly thereafter concluded his association with West and indulged in the first of what would be a lifetime of extravagances, expensive rooms of his own. Against a background of competition from such figures as Reynolds, Romney, and Gainsborough, Stuart, although he was unable to command their fees, succeeded in attracting considerable patronage. Temple Franklin, writing from London to his grandfather Benjamin in 1784, spoke of Stuart as an artist “who is esteemed by West and everybody the first portrait painter now living.” Although a bit extreme, this pronouncement was not far from the mark.
In 1786 Stuart married a country girl by the name of Charlotte Coates, who was the sister of one of his first London friends. Although Stuart was earning a good living, he already was indulging himself beyond his means (having hired a French chef and frequently engaging professional musicians for lavish evening entertainments); and his wife’s parents had taken a dim view of the union. Yet the marriage was not unsuccessful, and the couple ultimately had twelve offspring.

Despite his continuing success in London, the year after his marriage Stuart removed to Dublin. Although he ostensibly had gone there to paint the Duke of Rutland, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, it is more likely that his improvident manner of living in London had obliged him to consider withdrawing before having to face the prospect of debtors’ prison. Stuart entered Dublin on the very day of the funeral of his prospective patron, who had died on October 24. As cruel a blow to his fortunes as this unfortunate turn of events had first seemed, Stuart’s fame had preceded him to such an extent that he quickly found abundant patronage among the Irish aristocracy. Here he was to paint for some five years. But if his living habits and the cavalier manner in which he treated his sitters in London had been bad, they grew worse in Dublin. Stuart’s daughter Jane later admitted that her mother could never be persuaded to talk about her Irish years because they were associated in her mind with “reckless extravagances, or what she called his (her husband’s) folly.” By the early part of 1792 Stuart was ready to leave Ireland and a studio of unfinished portraits, for most of which he already had been paid at least in part. Clearly, he had no conscience in the matter, and the mundane business of supplying the garments and backgrounds for his sitters had always bored him anyway. “The artists of Dublin will get employment in finishing them,” he said to his friend James Dowling. “The likeness is there, and the finishing may be better than I should have made it.” If Stuart had thought of returning to London to take advantage of the patronage left waiting after Reynolds’ death in February, 1792, the appointment of the twenty-three-year-old Thomas Lawrence to be Principal Painter to the King soured him on that prospect. His eyes turned homewards to America instead, where a new aristocracy was in the making; and early in 1793 he set sail for New York.
New York looked different from London and Dublin, and it was different. Here Stuart’s patrons-to-be were mainly wealthy merchants who expected a greater degree of fidelity to nature than that any of his previous subjects had preferred. This new challenge was a blessing in disguise to Stuart, for in order to meet it he was obliged to summon up creative powers that had diminished greatly during his last years in Dublin. Although Stuart’s first essays in portraiture in New York can scarcely be distinguished in style from those painted in Dublin, except perhaps for a greater care in execution, his superb portrait of Mrs. Richard Yates (National Gallery, Washington) represents at one and the same time a style different from, and a level of excellence to match, anything he had ever done. And this portrait was so American in flavor that it was almost as if Copley had come home.

But if Stuart soon did not want for patrons, they were not exactly the right ones from his point of view. Probably from his first thoughts of returning to America, Stuart’s real objective had been to paint President Washington. As a means of gaining an entrée into the President’s circle, Stuart, not without certain qualms, renewed an old acquaintance with John Jay, now Chief Justice of the United States, whose portrait, when he was Peace Commissioner in London, Stuart had once started but never finished. Apparently Jay thought enough of Stuart’s talents to forget the past and commissioned him to do a three-quarter-length portrait like the one he had originally ordered. It was during these sittings that Stuart apparently made known to Jay his desire to paint the President and received word that Washington would sit for him that fall. But events conspired to make it impossible for Washington to keep that appointment, and it was not until March, 1795, that he finally sat to Stuart in Philadelphia. Although it could have been expected that a Stuart portrait of Washington would be popular, the likeness was received with such enthusiasm that no fewer than thirty-nine replicas were ordered by thirty-two subscribers. The portrait also achieved the desired effect as far as other commissions were concerned, and Stuart was inundated by requests of persons wishing to sit for him.

At the request of William Bingham, a United States senator from Pennsylvania and a friend of Washington’s, the President sat again for
Stuart in April, 1796. His earlier likeness having been taken from the right, Stuart this time painted his subject from the left. It was this study which provided the likeness Stuart used for his full-length portraits of Washington.

Although the seat of government removed to Washington in 1800, Stuart remained on in Philadelphia for another three years before moving to the new capital. In Washington Stuart found ample patronage among the leading figures of the city, and he remained until 1805, when on the invitation of Senator Jonathan Mason of Massachusetts he went to Boston to paint several portraits. His work once again met with immediate success, and Stuart remained in Boston, living in Roxbury and Medford as well, for the rest of his life.

JAMES BOWDOIN III (1752-1811)
Oil on canvas, 29⅞ x 24⅞

James Bowdoin III was born in Boston, the only son of James Bowdoin II and Elizabeth Erving. The first record we have of Jemmy (as he was referred to in family correspondence) is as a boy of about eight in his portrait with his sister Elizabeth by Blackburn (in the present collection). Like his father before him, at the age of fifteen Jemmy entered Harvard as a member of the class of 1771. Although he did not receive his diploma until the Commencement of that year (see the letter of James Bowdoin II of June 12, 1771, quoted below), he apparently had completed his course work by the end of the preceding year, for in January, 1771, he went abroad to England. Poor health (which Jemmy may have inherited from his father who was ill on and off most of his life) was the reason James II gave for his son's premature departure. In a letter of January 2, 1771, James II wrote his old friend in science and politics, Benjamin Franklin, in London: My son's health being precarious I have been lately advised to let him try the effect of a voyage, which it is apprehended may be beneficial to him. This occasions him going to England sooner than I had intended. Permit me to recommend him to your friendship. . . . Your advice to him, particularly with regard to his conduct & the means of improvement, I shall esteem a singular favor.¹
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Thomas Pownall, in a postscript to a letter dated London, June 2, 1771, to James II, wrote: Your son I find has entered himself at Xst Church, Oxford,—a very wise & commendable step in so young a man, & of which I think in every view he will reap ye advantage. By ye little I saw of him he appears to me to have more of ye gentleman & of ye honest man than one usually meets with. You are & ought to be very happy in him.

Just when Jemmy decided upon the pursuit of an academic course in England is not entirely clear, and although he had his father’s consent to do so, it would appear that the elder Bowdoin did not envision any significant residence in England by his son for that purpose. In fact, as we shall see from a letter he wrote Jemmy on June 12, 1771, he evidently thought that his son, by presenting his Harvard diploma, might receive one from Oxford and even, possibly, Cambridge and Edinburgh, as well!

I find by Mr. Stewart’s [Jemmy’s Uncle Duncan Stewart] Letter you have an inclination to continue in England after him. In my answer I informed him, that when I consented to your going thither so early in life, it was on account of your health, and your having so good a friend to go with. I also informed him that I intended you should see England again, but that I would have you return with him, and this I shall depend on.

You will have your degree given to you at the next Commencement: when I shall procure a Diploma from the President and send to you: by means of which you will probably be able to procure a Degree at Oxford, or perhaps you may obtain it without such a diploma.

If you should be at Cambridge or Edinburg you may possibly obtain Degrees at those Universities also: in which case you must not forget to procure their Diplomas.

Although Jemmy remained on in England, he did not continue at Oxford for very long, however. On November 6, 1771, he wrote his father: “I informed you in my last ... of having quitted Oxford.”

Promising to return to Boston the following spring, he then apprised his father of his current activities: “I have just begun to learn French, likewise Dancing and Fencing, all which I expect to be perfect masters of before my return.” Then, typically: “My staying in England longer than you expected makes it necessary for me to request your renewal of
your order for money ... the sum necessary ... will be at least three hundred pounds. Perhaps you may at first think it extravagant. ..."

It was more than two months before James II learned his son had left Oxford. On January 28, 1772, he wrote Jemmy: "If you were settled at Oxford in a good way of improvement, 'tis a pity you quitted it so precipitately."

Previously, however, he already had consented to his son's remaining on in England, having written him on November 7, 1771: "This you'll receive by ye hand of ye Uncle Mr. George Erving: who proposes to return to New England in about a year. If it would conduce to your Improvement I should be willing you should stay in England another year, and then return with him."

But Jemmy had some sort of falling out with his Uncle Erving, and did not stay in England long enough to return to Boston with him, for on April 22, 1772, James II wrote Erving: "I am very sorry there has been any misunderstanding between you and Jemmy. ... His arrival here tho unexpected gave us great pleasure. ..."

Jemmy went abroad again, this time to Italy, late the following year, arriving at Naples on January 19, 1774. A letter he wrote his sister, Elizabeth Bowdoin Temple, a few days later told her something about Naples and tells us something about its youthful author: Naples is an extreme fine City, full of large and elegant Buildings—has fine streets paved with smooth stones. The Climate is delightful, and it abounds with almost every Luxury, & yet I can't endure it. [It] is the most disagreeable place I was ever in. I shall hasten to see the different Curiosities here & make my departure as soon as possible. The people here abound in Deceit & there is no such thing as purchasing any Thing without being Cheated. My Lord & his Taylor are both upon a footing & both have their Carriages."

From Naples Jemmy went to Rome where he stayed until about April 1, moving on from there for briefer visits to Florence and Bologna, from whence he journeyed to Lyons. As in the case of his first trip abroad, he was remaining abroad on his second longer than his father had anticipated. On September 12, 1774, James II wrote Jemmy: I have just rec'd yr letter of ye 12th of May dated at Lyons. ... A winter voyage (as you say) will be disagreeable, and therefore I would have you take passage for America by one of the first Spring Ships without fail. ... I absolutely depend upon seeing you in ye Spring."
Learning that his son had drawn upon his London bankers to the tune of some £475 above and beyond what he had intended for him, on March 30, 1775, James II wrote his son in London, addressing him (more sternly this time) as “Dear James: I do assure you my finances will not allow of such an expense. . . . Immediately after receiving this letter, I would have you embrace the first opportunity of coming to America. . . .” Then on the very date of Paul Revere’s ride, April 18, 1775, James II, penning the briefest of all his letters to his son, addressing him once again as “Dear Jemmy,” and subscribing himself “most affectionately yrs,” wrote: I do not expect to write to you again before I have the pleasure of seeing you. The state of things here, in consequence of the wise measures of ministry & Parliament make it indispensably necessary that you return to America without delay. This I depend upon.

But Jemmy did not sail until the fall. On September 16, 1775, Elizabeth Bowdoin Temple wrote her mother: “Jemmy goes from town tomorrow. He is now very busy in getting his things on Board ship. . . .” She also added: If the Voyage does not make an alteration, I think you will see my Brother better than he has been for several years. I hope my Father will not be displeased at his stay since it has been of so great benefit and indeed it would have been impossible for him to have gone sooner, without endangering his life which was in great hazard all the spring and part of the summer. Whether Jemmy really was that ill we probably will never know, but reading between the lines of his sister’s letter, it is not impossible that it was designed to help smooth the way for Jemmy’s tardy return.

Jemmy’s continuing poor health generally is given as the reason why he did not play an active role in the Revolutionary War, but it is said that he had the privilege of entering Boston after the British evacuation on March 17, 1776, with General Washington, and of taking him to dine at his Grandfather Erving’s.

On April 20, 1780, James Bowdoin III married Sarah Bowdoin, the daughter of his father’s half brother William. That no children were born of this union was a matter of deep concern to the couple. In the first place, they clearly had a great fondness for young people, and often invited Sarah Cony, the daughter of one of their dearest friends, Dr. Samuel Cony of Augusta in the District of Maine, to live with them. In a
letter of September 4, 1801, to Sarah Cony, James III, praising the girl for her “agreeable, modest, & amiable deportment,” further advised her in the qualities she should cultivate, i.e., “undeviating good humour, cheerfulness without loquacity, self respect without Pride, gaiety without Folly, Prudence which will neither permit you to expose yourself, nor to injure another, discretion, candour, Truth. . . .”¹⁷

But if James and Sarah were distressed that they had no children to bring them joy and comfort during their lifetimes, they were just as concerned that there would be no one to carry on the family name. To this end James III wrote his sister’s son, James Bowdoin Temple, on September 11, 1803, in the following terms: with a view to fullfill as far as possible yr expectations & wishes, whilst my own may not be disappointed in complying with requirements & promises I made my late father, that in case I did continue without children, I should select some one of his Relations, a young man of worth and good reputation, to bear up his name. In making such an election, it is necessary to be plain & explicit, to present to you ye several obligations & duties which will devolve on the one side & on ye other as necessary pre-requisites to ye situation contemplated. It will be necessary for you to become a Citizen of ye U. S. & particularly of this state: for the latter purpose you must petition the genl. ct., as well as for the alteration of yr name, as becoming a citizen of ye U. S. will entitle you to hold real estate. . . . I will allow you one thousand dollars per annum to be paid half yearly for the term of two or three years to give you an opportunity of forming a matrimonial connection:—upon which event I will continue to you ye same allowance, & put you into possession of my farm in Dorchester, ye produce of which, with ye allowance forementioned will place you in a respectable situation.¹⁸

Accepting his uncle’s offer, James Bowdoin Temple abandoned his career in the British army (which had not been going too well, anyway), came to this country in 1805, became a citizen, and changed his name to James Temple Bowdoin. In 1808 he married Mary Dickason, and in due course produced three offspring: two girls and a boy, James Temple Bowdoin, Jr.¹⁹

And it surely was not without an awareness of the desire of the childless James Bowdoin III to perpetuate his family name that in 1794 the General Court of Massachusetts established a college in the District of
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Maine named in honor of his father. On June 27 of that year James III wrote “The Overseers & Corporation of Bowdoin College,” in part, as follows: You’ll permit me to suggest that the honourable Testimonial of Respect paid in the Establishment, to the Name, the Character, the Talents and Virtues of my Late Father, must attach me in a peculiar Degree to an Institution, in ye Success of which, I feel myself deeply interested. Bowdoin College shall receive the feeble aid of my Endeavours, to promote its usefulness, Interest and Welfare, and as a first Step to the Design, suffer me to say, that as soon as you shall signify your acceptance by the Votes of your respective Bodies of the sum one Thousand Dollars in Specie, and of one Thousand acres of Land, Situated in the Town of Bowdoin, to be disposed of, in such a way and Manner, as you shall deem best, to Subserve the Designs of the Institution, I stand ready to pay the said Sum, to whomsoever you shall direct to receive it, & to Make ye necessary Conveyance of the Land, aforesaid. 20

In January of the following year Bowdoin added £823 to his benefaction, “the interest to be applied to ye establishment and support of a Professorship of Mathematics & of natural & experimental Philosophy.” 21

When Bowdoin College did not come into being as swiftly as he had anticipated (mainly owing to the reluctance of certain members of the Boards to locate the College in Brunswick), on August 17, 1795, James III wrote his old friend Daniel Cony: “It is high time that measures more spirited were taken to carry into Execution the proposed College. . . Must the Institution give way to its Administrators or its Administrators to the Institution?” 22 And in the same letter Bowdoin expressed something of his philosophy of education: “Literature & the Sciences give force to Population and Improvement. On them depend your Constitution, Laws, Religion, Morals, which pursued in all their Ramifications determine the fate of a Country. . . .”

While Bowdoin was extensively involved in business affairs (mainly having to do with land holdings) during the 1780’s, and became even more burdened with such matters after his father’s death in 1790, he also was interested in public affairs and, to a certain extent, in holding political office. In 1788, his father and he were delegates to the state convention which ratified the Federal Constitution. Bowdoin was elected
five times to the General Court (1786-90) as a representative from Dorchester, where he made his home; was twice a member of the Massachusetts Senate (1794 and 1801); and served one year on the Governor’s Council (1796).

If Bowdoin ever had hopes for higher office in Massachusetts, they were dashed after the turn of the century when state politics became dominated by the Federalists, whose views were in sharp contrast to his own Jeffersonian Republican sentiments. Shortly after Jefferson’s election to the Presidency, Bowdoin wrote him: Altho I am personally unknown to you, it is not with ye less pleasure that I congratulate you. . . . If sir my feeble aid can in any way contribute to ye success of yr administration, confiding as I fully do in ye rectitude & purity of your intentions, I have no hesitance in rendering to you my Services without being able to point out in what way they can be particularly useful.  

In a letter of March 20, 1802, to his friend Henry Dearborn, Secretary of War, Bowdoin described Jefferson’s administration as one “which promises to give Body, Life and action to the principles of ye American Revolution!” While Bowdoin’s politics were disdained in Boston, they were appreciated in Washington; and two years later he was offered the appointment of Minister to Spain. As Henry Dearborn’s letter of November 13, 1804, notifying Bowdoin of his impending appointment implied (“I am confident that the Court of Madrid will not be as agreeable to you as that of London”), however, Madrid had not been Bowdoin’s first choice of a diplomatic post. On December 28, 1802, Bowdoin had written Dearborn: A particular friend of yours has lately been acquainted that Mr. King [United States Minister to London] was likely soon to be recalled; how far it would comport with the honor & interest of your friend to be named his successor I submit to your consideration. . . . If it could be done without involving the propriety of your own conduct or that of Mr. Jefferson’s, permit me to authorize you to mention my name to Prest J. as a successor to Mr. King.  

In reply, on January 9, 1803, Dearborn wrote Bowdoin: The subject of your confidential letter had been anticipated. I took the liberty of introducing the subject more than two months since, and have had several conferences relative thereto, and with such appearance of success that I expected soon to have been per-
mitted to sound your inclinations on the subject, but from recent unforeseen occurrences it becomes necessary to have recourse to measures which may produce a temporary derangement of measures heretofore contemplated. . . . 27

Nothing came of the prospect for appointment to London, and it probably was with mixed feelings that Bowdoin viewed the offer of Madrid. Furthermore, his health having been uncertain for some time, Bowdoin at first strongly debated the advisability of accepting the Spanish post. He also was reluctant to undertake the arduous journey to Washington he was asked to make before his departure. When the President reiterated his desire for Bowdoin to accept the position and waived the usual requirement of a visit to Washington, Bowdoin decided to go ahead, perhaps partly with the expectation that an ocean voyage might restore his health as it apparently had in his youth. Unfortunately, this was not to be the case, and a few weeks after his arrival at Santander on June 12, 1805,28 instead of proceeding to Madrid, Bowdoin decided to go to London where he might have the benefit of medical advice, and then resolve his future course of action. In London Bowdoin learned that, in view of the coalition between Spain and France (under the domination of Napoleon), his mission, the principal purpose of which was to negotiate with Spain for the possible acquisition of West Florida, could be more effectively carried out in Paris. His health having improved by fall, Bowdoin embarked for Paris, where he arrived on November 1, 1805.

On March 17, 1806, Jefferson appointed Bowdoin Co-Commissioner with John Armstrong, American Minister to France, to deal with all matters "concerning the said territories of the said United States and of His Catholic Majesty." 29 From their very first encounter, however ("I have seen our minister & have had some conversation with him upon the subject of our affairs, but it has not been so satisfactory as I could wish"), 30 Bowdoin and Armstrong did not hit it off with one another. Nor did their negotiations prove fruitful, and the following year Bowdoin, whose health continued to be poor, in a letter of May 1, 1807, to President Jefferson, requested that he be recalled. 51 In response, Jefferson wrote Bowdoin on July 10, 1807: "It is with real unwillingness we should relinquish the benefit of your services. Nevertheless if your mind is de-
cidedly bent on that, we shall regret, but not oppose your return. The choice therefore remains with yourself."

But Bowdoin’s mind was made up, and he resigned and returned home to Boston, arriving on April 18, 1808. On May 29, Jefferson, writing from Monticello, sent Bowdoin the following message: I received the favor of your letter written soon after your arrival a little before I left Washington, & during a press of business preparatory to my departure on a short visit to this place. This has prevented my earlier congratulations to you on your safe return to your own country. There, judging from my own experience, you will enjoy much more of the tranquil happiness of life than is to be found in the noisy scenes of the great cities of Europe. I am also aware that you had at Paris additional causes of disquietude. These seem inseparable from public life, and indeed are the greatest discouragements to entering into or continuing in it. Perhaps however they sweeten the hour of retirement and secure us from all dangers of regret. On the subject of that disquietude, it is proper for me only to say that however unfortunate the incident I found in it no cause of dissatisfaction with yourself, nor of lessening the esteem I entertain for your virtues & talents; & had it not been disagreeable to yourself I should have been well pleased that you could have proceeded on your original destination.

Bowdoin’s remaining years were spent mainly in caring for his real estate holdings, and particularly in the development of his property on Naushon Island, which he owned and where he spent his summers. He was greatly interested in the advancement of the woolen industry in America and made an English translation of Louis Daubenton’s *Instruction pour les bergers et pour les propriétaires de troupeaux*, which he published in 1810. James Bowdoin III died after a protracted illness on Naushon Island on October 11, 1811. He bequeathed to Bowdoin College his library, his scientific equipment, his collection of minerals, seventy paintings, and 142 old master drawings. (For a further discussion of the paintings and drawings, see Appendix B, *James Bowdoin III as Art Collector*.)

This portrait of *James Bowdoin III* presents certain problems relating to its origin and quality which are extremely difficult to resolve. We can begin our investigation of these problems by quoting from a letter of August 29, 1876, which Robert C. Winthrop, Sr., a grandnephew of
James Bowdoin III, wrote to Jane Stuart, the artist’s daughter, concerning various of his family’s portraits done by her father, in which he stated: “I may add that your father painted Hon. James Bowdoin, after his return from Europe, and the portrait is at Bowdoin College.” In the same letter Winthrop also added: “I have a miniature copy, by Malbone, of your father’s portrait of Hon. James Bowdoin.” Unfortunately, both of Winthrop’s statements cannot be correct, and most of our further discussion will have to do with which of the two is right. For while there are, in fact, two versions of Malbone’s miniature of James Bowdoin III, in which the subject’s appearance and costume (except for the coloring) are manifestly the same as in the Stuart portrait, the only circumstance under which Malbone could have copied the Stuart was if the latter had been painted before Bowdoin’s departure for Europe, since Malbone died the year before Bowdoin’s return to Boston.

On page 17 of Malbone’s Account Book, listed with those miniatures he did in Boston in “October & November 1804” is the following notation: “Mr. Bowdoin a copy.” Tolman, who properly dismissed Park’s impossible dating of the Stuart oil of James Bowdoin III (“c. 1806”), in referring to the Stuart, stated: “the cut of the coat and the powdered wig with a queue place it near 1797; moreover, the subject appears to be nearer forty-five than fifty-four.”

Quite aside from Tolman’s reasons (which are not very compelling) for dating the Stuart before the Malbones, we should consider the entire period during which Stuart could have painted the portrait of James Bowdoin III from Stuart’s return to this country in May, 1793—and disregarding the date in the Malbone Account Book for the moment—until Bowdoin’s departure for Spain in April, 1805. For one thing, we know that Stuart did not arrive in Boston until July, 1805, about three months after Bowdoin had sailed, and since, as we already have seen, Bowdoin did not make a trip to Washington between the time of his appointment as Minister to Spain in November, 1804, and his departure, those months must be excluded from consideration. We are, then, left with a period from May, 1793, until November, 1804 (although, because of Bowdoin’s poor health at the latter date, we probably can exclude sev-
eral months prior to it in 1804). During these years Stuart was in New York (1793-94), Philadelphia (1794-1803), and Washington (beginning in late 1803). Although the present writer is not aware of any documents which relate to a trip made by James Bowdoin III to any of these cities (or anywhere else) during this period, there is one that indicates that Mrs. Bowdoin, at least, must have made such a trip.

In a letter of November 29, 1806, to Mrs. James Bowdoin III in Paris, her niece, Mrs. Thomas L. Winthrop, who was at the time having her portrait painted by Stuart, in referring to the artist, wrote: “I asked him if he could alter the drapery of the one which he took of you, which he can with much ease when you return.” While there is no mention of a Stuart portrait of James Bowdoin III, Mrs. Winthrop, in the same letter, also referring to Stuart, stated: “He is a very pleasant companion, and promises himself much pleasure in conversing with my uncle when he returns.” And on July 21, 1807, from Paris, James Bowdoin III wrote his nephew, Thomas L. Winthrop: I have purchased a number of pencils agreeably to Mr. Stewart’s request, wch I shall forward by the first opty & I have added an assortment of impalpable colours, wch I understand are equally good & much more economical than colours ground in oil: in this case Mr. Stewart will put ye oil to ye colours as he wants them: They have been carefully selected by a Painter & procured at the lowest prices: their cost is 258 livres.

Unfortunately, these two letters do not offer any conclusive proof that James Bowdoin III and Stuart had been in contact, much less that Stuart had painted him, prior to Bowdoin’s departure for Europe. In the case of the first letter, it is altogether likely that Stuart would have looked forward to “conversing” with Bowdoin, particularly after the latter’s diplomatic mission abroad, even if he had never met him before. As far as the second letter is concerned, Winthrop knew Stuart well, and Bowdoin might only have been acting as his nephew’s agent in purchasing “pencils” and “impalpable colours” for the artist.

Although we do not know whether or not Bowdoin sat to Stuart before his departure for Europe, and while he could have done so after his return to Boston, it is also possible that he never did. If we compare the present portrait with that of Mrs. Bowdoin by Stuart, despite the
fact that the portraits are clearly pendants, it is immediately evident
that not only are they different in format, but that the former is unequal
to the latter in quality. As regards format, Mrs. Bowdoin was painted
in a setting (with pillar and sky behind) limited only by the extremities
of the canvas itself; whereas her husband’s portrait, although done on
a rectangular canvas, was painted within an oval. While this disparity
might be explained simply by arguing that the portraits probably were
executed at different times, and for some reason or other were not
matched in terms of setting, the existence of the two Malbone mini-
tures, oval in shape, suggests the possibility that the present portrait of
James Bowdoin III might have been copied from one of them. (In view
of the two versions of the miniature, the entry in Malbone’s Account
Book: “Mr. Bowdoin a copy” could mean that one was a copy of the
other, and not necessarily that they had been copied from another work.)
In addition, if the present portrait was copied from one of the Malbone
miniatures, it would help to explain why it is inferior in quality to its
pendant. (This situation also may be due in part to the fact that the
former was extensively restored in the past, while the latter is all but
completely original.)

A stipple engraving of James Bowdoin III, which is exactly like the
present portrait in terms of the subject’s appearance and costume, and
which also is oval in shape, appeared in the July, 1812, issue of Polyanthos
(facing page 73), together with a “Biographical Account of the late Hon.
James Bowdoin.” The engraving bears the inscription: “G. Stuart Pinx.”
(at the left) and “J. R. Smith Sculp.” (at the right); and the last sen-
tence of the “Biographical Account” reads: “The engraving which ac-
companies this is from a portrait by Mr. Stewart, and is recognized as a
good likeness.”

If the hypothesis that Stuart copied his portrait of James Bowdoin III
from one of the Malbone miniatures is correct, he could have done so
between his arrival in Boston in July, 1805, and the date of the above
engraving.

On April 20, 1807, Mrs. Thomas L. Winthrop, in another letter to
her aunt, Mrs. James Bowdoin III, in Paris, wrote: “Stewart has finished
my father’s and mother’s pictures and they are very excellent. Do per-
suade my Uncle to have his done like the ones of yours and Sarah's and give it to me. I have the one done by Lovett hanging alongside of yours but it is not a good likeness. Do tell him that it would gratify both me and my husband extremely if he would."\(^{46}\) (The two portraits referred to in the second sentence of this quotation were those about which James Bowdoin III had written a Madame O'Brien—who evidently supervised his house in Boston during his absence—on May 13, 1806, which, together with that of George Sullivan, had been painted in Paris, apparently by Henri van Gorp.)\(^{46}\) It is not clear from the third sentence whether it was Stuart's portrait of *Mrs. James Bowdoin III*, or Van Gorp's, which was hanging next to that by Lovett (unlocated) of *James Bowdoin III*.\(^{47}\) In any event (perhaps partly in view of the fact that the Lovett was "not a good likeness" of Bowdoin), it is not beyond the realm of possibility that the Winthrops might have prevailed upon Stuart to paint a copy of one of the Malbones during Bowdoin's absence in Europe. If this was done, it might explain why Bowdoin would not have sat for Stuart after his return from Europe, although Bowdoin's continuing poor health, coupled with his absence on Naushon Island several months of every year, could have been a contributing factor.

Another possibility for the present portrait is that it was painted posthumously, between the time of Bowdoin's death in October, 1811, and the time Smith used it for his engraving which appeared in *Polyanthos* the following July. It will be remembered that Gullager had painted posthumous portraits of *James Bowdoin II* (based on a silhouette the family owned or Hill's engraving after it), and Stuart might have been called upon to do something similar in the case of *James Bowdoin III*.

1. *Collection of the Massachusetts Historical Society* (Boston, 1897), Sixth Series, IX, 248.
3-8. Winthrop Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society.
9. JB III to Elizabeth Bowdoin Temple, March 28, 1774: "I shall leave Rome this week and proceed to Florence where I shall stay about three days—from thence go to Bologna and pass a day or two there—from whence I shall proceed on to Lyons." Winthrop Papers, MHS. JB II to JB III, Aug. 24, 1774: "The last letter I rec'd from you was dated ye 9th of April at Florence." *Ibid.*
10-13. Winthrop Papers, MHS.

15. *A Volume of Records Relating to the Early History of Boston, Containing Boston Marriages from 1752 to 1809* (Municipal Printing Office, Boston, 1903), p. 446. In JB III’s biography in the DAB, the date is given as May 18, 1781.

16. Cony was involved in the management of JB III’s land holdings in the District of Maine, and the two carried on an extensive correspondence. (Cf. JB III Letterbooks, Bowdoin College Library.)

17. JB III Letterbooks, BCL.


19. Provisions were made in the wills of James Bowdoin III and Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn for certain of the descendants of James Bowdoin III’s sister, Lady Temple, provided they changed their names to Bowdoin. In addition to Lady Temple’s son, two of her daughter’s (Mrs. Thomas L. Winthrop’s) sons, James and John, did so, as did Mrs. Winthrop’s daughter’s (Mrs. George Sullivan’s) two sons, George and James.

20-22. JB III Letterbooks, BCL.

23. Letter dated Feb. 24, 1801, Jefferson Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society; Jefferson’s (polygraph?) copy, Library of Congress; also, JB III Letterbooks, BCL.

24. JB III Letterbooks, BCL.


28. All dates relating to JB III’s travels abroad during his diplomatic mission are based on data in the JB III Letterbooks, BCL.

29. JB III Letterbooks, BCL.


31. JB III Letterbooks, BCL.

32. Jefferson Papers, MHS; Jefferson’s (polygraph?) copy, LC; also, JB III Letterbooks, BCL.

33. Jefferson Papers, MHS; Jefferson’s (polygraph?) copy, LC; also, JB III Letterbooks, BCL.

34. Mason, p. 267.

35. One is in the present collection (see entry in this catalogue), and the other, in the collection of Miss Clara Bowdoin Winthrop, West Manchester, Massachusetts.
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37. Park, Stuart, I, 168 (no. 99); III, pl. 67. Dresser, Maine, p. 24 (here dated “probably before 1804”).
38. Tolman, p. 143.
39. Stuart was still in Washington as late as June 27, 1805, for from there on that date Henry Dearborn wrote Thomas L. Winthrop in Boston, concerning Stuart’s portraits of Jefferson and Madison commissioned by JB III, saying that Stuart had “nearly completed” them and would “take them with his other effects, to Boston.” (See the entry concerning the Stuart Jefferson in the present catalogue.) The following notice appeared in the Boston Columbian Centinel on July 31, 1805: “Mr. Stuart, the celebrated painter, who has immortalized his fame by his masterly portrait of our deceased Washington, is now on a visit to this town from Philadelphia”—where Stuart had stopped briefly on his way from Washington.
40. Mason, pp. 265-66. (Original letter, Winthrop Papers, MHS.)
41. JB III Letterbooks, BCL.
42. In Robert C. Winthrop, Sr.’s letter of Aug. 29, 1876, to Jane Stuart, already quoted, in part, in the above text, Winthrop also stated: “I have often heard my father say, that when Stuart first came to Boston, he advanced him the sum necessary for opening a studio.”
43. On July 22, 1936, Mr. W. C. Thompson of the Vose Galleries, Boston, wrote Mrs. Roger Sessions (Curator, Bowdoin College Museum of Art, 1935-36), in part, as follows: “I have discussed the matter of the condition of the Stuart portrait of James Bowdoin with our foreman and he reports that the condition which we treated the last time calls for flattening out the blisters and bubbles where the paint has left the canvas in certain areas. This condition is something which could not have been foreseen when the picture was relined some time ago. ...” According to a note in the museum’s files, the painting previously had been at the Vose Galleries for restoration between December, 1931 and March, 1932. There are no records to indicate whether or not the Stuart portrait of Mrs. James Bowdoin III was ever restored, but it never has been relined.
44. John Rubens Smith (1775-1849) was an English-born painter and printmaker who worked in Boston c. 1809-14.
45. Winthrop Papers, MHS.
46. In a letter of May 3, 1965, to the museum, Mr. Grafton Minot, a Bowdoin descendant, reported that about thirty years previously his parents had acquired a portrait of Mrs. James Bowdoin III, which he subsequently wrote (in a letter of Aug. 3, 1965) had since been attributed to Van Gorp. A photograph of the portrait supplied by Mr. Minot indicates that it undoubtedly represents
Mrs. James Bowdoin III, and the present writer has assumed that it was one of the three portraits referred to by James Bowdoin III in the excerpt from the letter (JB III Letterbooks, BCL) quoted in the text above. (The portraits of Sarah Winthrop and her future husband, George Sullivan, both of whom accompanied the Bowdoins to Europe, are unlocated. Miss Winthrop was the Bowdoins' grandniece, and George Sullivan acted as James Bowdoin III's secretary.)

47. William Lovett (1773-1801) was a Boston portraitist.

1870.6 Bequeathed to Bowdoin College in 1826 by Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn, with the proviso that her grandniece, Mrs. George Sullivan, be permitted to retain it during her lifetime. It came to the College after the death of Mrs. Sullivan's son, George Sullivan Bowdoin (see footnote 19 above), in 1870.

MRS. JAMES BOWDOIN III (1761-1826)
Oil on canvas, 30 x 25½

Sarah Bowdoin was the daughter of William Bowdoin and Phebe Murdock (see their portraits by Feke in the present catalogue), and was their only child to survive infancy. On April 20, 1780, she married James Bowdoin III, the son of her father's half brother, James Bowdoin II. Since the couple had no children, both her husband and she made provisions in their wills for certain of the descendants of her husband's sister, Lady Temple, provided they changed their names to Bowdoin.

After her husband's death Sarah Bowdoin became the third wife of their old friend, Major General Henry Dearborn, on November 10, 1813. Shortly after this event John Adams wrote Thomas Jefferson:

Ridendo dicere Verum quid vetat. I must make you and myself merry or melancholly by a little Phylosophical Speculation about the formidable Subject of Aristocracy.

Not long after General Dearborn's return to Boston from the Army, a violent Alarm was excited and spread in Boston and through the country, by a report at first only secretly whispered in private circles that an Affair of Love was commencing between the General and Madam Bowdoin, the virtuous and amiable relict of my Friend and your Ambassador, James Bowdoin. The Surprise, the Astonishment, were universal and the indignation very general. The exclamations
were in every mouth. "Impossible!" "It cannot be!" "It is a false report." "It is too bad!" "It is a scandalous fiction!" "It is a malicious Calumny against Mrs. Bowdoin!" "Would that Lady disgrace her Husband?" She was herself a Bowdoin: "Would she degrade her own and her Husband's Name and Blood?" "Would she disgrace the illustrious Name of Bowdoin which has been so long famous in France?" "Would she disgrace her Husband who has been an Ambassador? And her Father in Law, who was her Uncle, and had been Governor?"

This is no exaggeration. I have heard all these exclamations. Have you read Cecilia, or the Scottish Chiefs? Is there any thing in the Character of the Delville Family, or in any of the Scotch Thanes, more outrageously Aristocratical, than these popular Sentiments in this our Democratic Country?

I Undertook like a genuine Knight Errant to be the Champion of the Lady: and said some things very shocking to some Companies. To some very grave Ladies I said "Why, Madam, if Mrs. Bowdoins Object is Love and domestic comfort, the General is an healthy, robust and personable Man, which her former Husband was not. If her Object is Ambition, She will advance her Degree and condition by this Alliance; for neither Governors nor Earls hold so high a Rank as a Secretary at War and Commander in Chief, of all the Armies of a great Nation. Her Object cannot be Wealth, for She has enough; but if it was, Collectorships and other Offices must have given the General a Competency.

The present portrait of Mrs. James Bowdoin III apparently was painted by Stuart prior to the subject's departure with her husband on his diplomatic mission abroad in April, 1808, for on November 29, 1806, Sarah Bowdoin's niece, Mrs. Thomas L. Winthrop, who was at the time having her portrait painted by Stuart, in referring to the artist, wrote her aunt in Paris: "I asked him if he could alter the drapery of the one which he took of you, which he can with much ease when you return." Since Stuart did not arrive in Boston until about three months after the Bowdoins sailed, the portrait would have had to have been painted either in Washington, where Stuart had been since late 1803, or in Philadelphia, where he worked before he went to Washington (although the present writer is not aware of any records of such a trip made by Mrs. Bowdoin).

Judging from the apparent age of the sitter in the portrait, it probably
was not painted before about 1800. Another reason for this assumption is a portrait of Mrs. Bowdoin which was painted in Paris sometime after the Bowdoins’ arrival there on November 1, 1805, and before a letter written by her husband on May 13, 1806, to a Madam O’Brien (who evidently supervised the Bowdoin house in Boston during their absence), in which he announced that he was sending home portraits of Mrs. Bowdoin, Sarah Winthrop, and George Sullivan. The only one of these three portraits known to exist is that of Mrs. Bowdoin, attributed to Henri van Gorp, in which the subject’s age does not seem to be very much beyond that in the Stuart portrait. Stuart’s reaction to the portrait was recorded in the same letter from Mrs. Winthrop to her aunt cited above. “Sarah [Mrs. Winthrop’s daughter] he knows nothing of, but is surprised that you both have acquired the French character, which appears the case from these pictures.” Exactly what Stuart meant in saying that Mrs. Bowdoin had “acquired the French look” we cannot know for certain, but the subject’s expression in the Van Gorp likeness—with her head leaning slightly to one side, her hair tousled, and her eyes wide open, gazing out at the viewer—is very different from what it is in the present portrait.

Whether Stuart actually did alter his portrait of Mrs. James Bowdoin III after her return from Europe, and if so, in what way, has never been ascertained during laboratory examinations of the portrait in the past, but it is possible that the lace “mantilla” Mrs. Bowdoin is wearing might have been an article of costume the wife of the former United States Minister to Spain would have wished to have shown in her portrait.

1. See footnote 15 in the preceding entry.
2. See footnote 19 in the preceding entry.
7. Possibly an allusion to Sir John Temple (Earl of Stowe), the husband of James Bowdoin III's sister Elizabeth.

8. Henry Dearborn was Collector of the Port of Boston from March, 1809 to Jan., 1812.

9. Mason, p. 266. (Original letter, Winthrop Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society.) Park, Stuart, I, 169 (no. 100), III, pl. 68, placed the portrait “c. 1806,” an impossible date in view of the fact that the subject was abroad from April, 1805 until April, 1808.

10. See footnote 39 in the preceding entry.

11. Based on correspondence in the James Bowdoin III Letterbooks, Bowdoin College Library.

12. JB III Letterbooks, BCL. Sarah Winthrop and George Sullivan, who accompanied the Bowdoins to Europe, were later married. The former was their grandniece, and the latter acted as James Bowdoin III’s secretary.

13. See footnote 46 in the preceding entry.
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1870.7 Bequeathed to Bowdoin College in 1826 by Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin Dearborn, with the proviso that her grandniece, Mrs. George Sullivan, be permitted to retain it during her lifetime. It came to the College after the death of Mrs. Sullivan’s son, George Sullivan Bowdoin (see footnote 19 in the preceding entry), in 1870.

**THOMAS JEFFERSON (1743-1826)**

Oil on canvas, $48\frac{3}{8} \times 39\frac{3}{4}$, 1805-07

On March 25, 1805, James Bowdoin III, who was soon to embark for Spain where he had been appointed United States Minister, in a letter to his good friend General Henry Dearborn, Secretary of War, wrote, in part, as follows: *I shall be much obliged to you to procure me the portraits of Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison if a good painter can be found at Washington, and they should be willing to take the trouble of sitting therefor. I should be glad to have them sent to one of the Atlantic ports of Spain subject to my order. Mr. Winthrop will pay your draft on presentment for the amount of ye Painter's bill. I should like to have them done by Stuart, could he be induced to execute them, as well he is able. They need not be framed, as I can pro-
cure more fashionable and better frames in Europe. Please to let ye pictures be half length and of a size to match each other.¹

That the commission was promptly conveyed to Stuart is testified to by the following letter of June 27, 1805, from Henry Dearborn to Thomas L. Winthrop: By Mr. Bowdoin’s request I engaged Mr. Stuart to take a half length portrait of the President of the U. S. and one of Mr. Madison. Mr. Stuart has nearly completed them and will take them with his other effects to Boston and when completed will deliver them to you, to be forwarded to Mr. Bowdoin, and as Mr. Bowdoin requested me to draw upon you for the expense of the two portraits, I take the liberty of requesting you to pay Mr. Stuart the amount of his bills when presented.²

One of the chief points of interest relating to these two portraits has been whether or not they were painted from life. As regards the subject of the present entry, the best summary of Stuart’s life portraits of Jefferson was given by the former President himself to Henry Dearborn in a letter dated July 5, 1819: With respect to Mr. Stuart, it was in May, 1800 I got him to draw my picture, and immediately paid him his price, one hundred dollars. He was yet to put the last hand on it, so it was left with him. When he came to Washington in 1805 he told me he was not satisfied with it, and therefore begged me to sit again, and he drew another, which he was to deliver up to me instead of the first, but begged permission to keep it until he could get an engraving from it. I soon after got him to sketch me in the medallion form, which he did on paper with crayons. Although a slight thing I gave him another 100 dollars, probably the treble of what he would have asked. This I have; it is a very fine thing, though very perishable.³

The above letter is but one of many in a correspondence between Jefferson and Dearborn in which the former President asked the good offices of the man who had been his Secretary of War (and who now lived in Boston where Stuart had been a resident since the summer of 1805) to attempt to procure for him the portrait the artist had painted of him in Washington in 1805. Before dealing with the ultimate disposition of the second life portrait, a few words must be said about the first, inasmuch as Stuart’s professed dissatisfaction with it (or, more likely, as we shall see, the fact that he no longer possessed it) gave rise, in part, to the necessity for taking a second.
On June 12, 1800, under the heading “Adams and Jefferson,” the following advertisement appeared in the Philadelphia Aurora: Mr. Stuart informs the public that engravings from his Portraits of the President and Vice-President are likewise preparing under his immediate direction, and will be published in a few weeks.

Since no American engraving of the Jefferson is known, Stuart either could have changed his mind about getting one done here, or he may have been guilty of a little of his not infrequent prevaricating when he advertised that it was being prepared “under his immediate direction.” Whatever the case, the first known print after the life portrait of 1800 is an engraving made in London by Edward Orme and published there on August 1, 1801. It would, therefore, appear that Stuart had sent the original portrait to London for that purpose, and since it never has been located, that in all probability it never was returned to the artist.  

On the question of Stuart’s professed dissatisfaction with the 1800 portrait, it is difficult to judge its quality on the basis of the rather unattractive Orme engraving. Jefferson himself, however, in another of those letters to Henry Dearborn (dated March 26, 1820) dealing with his desire to acquire the 1805 portrait, apparently under the impression that Stuart still owned the earlier one, stated: “I shall be perfectly content to receive the original he drew in Philadelphia in 1800... There is something pleasanter in the aspect of that portrait which I liked better than the second drawn at Washington.” But even if Stuart had had the 1800 portrait, it would no longer have been of much use anyway. The very fact that there was (to use Jefferson’s own words) “something pleasanter in the aspect of that portrait...” would hardly have been consistent with the appearance of a man whose likeness had undergone certain pronounced changes during the course of five rather wearing years.

Although Stuart had been in Washington since late in 1803, and surely must have realized how useful (and lucrative) it would be to have a presidential likeness of Jefferson, that he apparently had not approached the man before June, 1805, doubtless was because he was reluctant to face a subject of such eminence who had paid him for an earlier portrait that never had been delivered. It is altogether likely that
the Bowdoin commission tipped the scales in inducing Stuart to summon up his courage to ask Jefferson to sit for him again. If Henry Dearborn played any role in smoothing Stuart's way, however, there is no evidence of it; nor, for that matter, is there any record that Jefferson knew of the Bowdoin commission.

If it was not the Bowdoin commission that impelled Stuart to ask Jefferson to sit for him in June, 1805, he certainly must have had it in mind when he posed his subject. Inasmuch as Bowdoin had ordered a portrait of Madison (see the following entry) as well as that of Jefferson, it was advisable for Stuart to think of them as pendants. Since he already had painted a portrait of Madison the year before, with the figure turned to the spectator's right, which could be used as a model for the half-length Bowdoin required, it was appropriate that Jefferson be posed in the opposite direction so that his portrait would face that of Madison. This Stuart did.

On May 21, 1821, Henry Dearborn's son, Henry A. S. Dearborn, who together with his father worked on Stuart for more than two years, was able to write Jefferson: "I have procured your picture from Mr. Stuart at last and ship'd it..." And on August 17 Jefferson finally received the portrait for which he had sat more than sixteen years before. On the basis of the manner in which it was procured and its subsequent provenance, this likeness, known today as the "Edgehill Portrait," is, in the opinion of the present writer, the original study of Jefferson Stuart painted in 1805, and that from which the Bowdoin half-length was derived.

One important piece of documentary evidence testifying to the fact that the Bowdoin half-lengths of Jefferson and Madison were not painted from life is to be found in the holograph "Catalogue of Paintings in the Picture Gallery at Bowdoin College," a manuscript which apparently dates from c. 1855. Interpolated between the entries relating to these two portraits (nos. 30 and 31) is the following note: "Stuart declared in 1821 that he regarded them as good as originals. A.S.P." The initials are those of Alpheus Spring Packard, a member of the Bowdoin Faculty from the year of his graduation, 1816, until his death in 1884. Inserted in the same fashion after Catalogue no. 33, "The Governor of Gibraltar
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—An original by Vandyke” (later identified as a copy, believed by some to be by Smibert,14 of Van Dyck’s Jean de Montfort), is another note in the same hand and with the same initials, which reads: “I heard Stuart say that he recognized it as an original by Vandyke, having seen it forty years before in Europe—This was said in 1821 or about that time.” Stuart’s observations on four other pictures in the collection are cited in the original text of the manuscript in the hand of the unidentified cataloguer.

These notes can be explained by the fact that Stuart apparently had to come to Brunswick in connection with a commission he had received about 1820-21 from John Doggett, a Boston art dealer and frame maker, for half-lengths of his portraits of the first five Presidents. The Doggett Jefferson unfortunately was destroyed by fire in the Library of Congress in 1851, and the only record of it that remains is the Maurin lithograph after it, made in 1825 in Paris where the portrait had been sent for that purpose. If the Maurin lithograph is a reliable copy of the original portrait, the Doggett Jefferson, although similar to the Bowdoin Jefferson in some respects (the position of the head and the figure), is sufficiently different in others (the hands, folded, and arms are resting on the table) to preclude any final decision that the Doggett replica was based on that at Bowdoin.15 In fact, the Doggett commission may have come in time for Stuart to have been able to use the “Edgehill Portrait” before it finally was shipped to Jefferson in May, 1821. But since Stuart had no Madison portrait, the nearest replica having been at Bowdoin since 1813, he would have had to have made the trip anyway.16 The terminus ad quem for the Doggett pictures is June 20, 1822, the date on which the exhibition of the set was announced in the Boston Daily Advertiser.

That Stuart had not completed either the Jefferson or the Madison commissioned by James Bowdoin III by June 27, 1805, we know from the letter (quoted above in full) from Henry Dearborn to Thomas L. Winthrop, which stated that the artist “will take them with his other effects to Boston and when completed will deliver them to you, to be forwarded to Mr. Bowdoin. . . .” There is no way of ascertaining what work remained to be done on the portraits in Boston, although it probably was just the accessories, for as Kimball pointed out, the chair in
which Jefferson is seated, a Directoire bergère, appears only in those portraits painted by Stuart in Boston, such as, for example, that of James Sullivan (Massachusetts Historical Society), painted in 1807.17

There is no precise record of exactly when the portraits were completed, but they certainly were finished by August 14, 1807, when Thomas L. Winthrop wrote James Bowdoin III: “The Pictures of Mr. Jefferson & Mr. Madison remain with Mr. Stewart; you have omitted to give any directions respecting them.”18 Bowdoin originally had intended them for his embassy in Madrid, but due to circumstances which developed after his departure from Boston, he never went to the Spanish capital, and in fact already had resigned his appointment and was making plans for his return to the United States (see his biography under his portrait attributed to Stuart in the present catalogue) when he wrote to Winthrop on October 13, 1807: “With respect to Mr. Jefferson’s and Mr. Madison’s pictures, I wish them to be retained to be put up in my house.”19 There they were to remain until 1813 when they came as a part of his bequest of pictures to Bowdoin College.

Although the present portrait of Jefferson was not painted from life, it was painted from a study which, as we have seen, in all probability was painted so that James Bowdoin III’s commission could be fulfilled, and painted immediately after that study. And the Bowdoin replica remains one of the most splendid portraits of Thomas Jefferson, member of the Virginia House of Burgesses, member of the Continental Congress, Governor of Virginia, Minister to France, Secretary of State, Vice-President and President of the United States; “Author of the Declaration of American Independence, of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom, and Father of the University of Virginia.”

1. James Bowdoin III Letterbooks, Bowdoin College Library.
2. Original in the museum’s files (presented by Robert C. Winthrop, Jr.).
3. Quoted in Kimball, p. 331. (The “Medallion Portrait” is now in the Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University.)
4. An argument has been advanced that a portrait of Jefferson purchased at public auction in New York in 1937 is the original of the 1805 life portrait by Stuart, and that this portrait was painted over the 1800 life portrait of Jefferson by Stuart. Cf. Orland and Courtney Campbell, The Lost Portraits of Thomas Jefferson.
son Painted by Gilbert Stuart, published in conjunction with an exhibition of the "double-portrait" cited above at the Mead Art Building, Amherst College, June 12–30, 1959. The present writer remains unconvinced by the evidence presented in the above study relating to the 1800 life portrait of Jefferson by Stuart; and on stylistic grounds, as well as on the basis of the manner in which the "Edgehill Portrait" finally was obtained from Stuart and its subsequent provenance (see footnote 11 below), cannot accept the portrait of Jefferson visible on the surface of the painting in question as the work of Stuart. Mount, pp. 263, 370, argues that Stuart's receipt of Dec. 22, 1803, for $50 from Senator Samuel Smith "in part payment of a Portrait of Mr. Thomas Jefferson to be delivered in six weeks" was for the 1800 life portrait. In the opinion of the present writer, Stuart's stipulation that the Jefferson was "to be delivered in six weeks" surely meant that any portrait Senator Smith might receive had yet to be painted.

5. The unattractiveness of the Orme engraving has partly to do with the fact that it was done on the same plate from which another portrait (that of Muzio Clementi, the pianist and composer) had been burnished out. (This information was first published by the Messrs. Campbell, op. cit., p. 12.) Another engraving, published shortly after that by Orme on Oct. 1, 1801, by Venor and Hood, cannot be said to have improved very much on the Orme version.

6. Quoted in Kimball, p. 335.

7. Although Stuart may have been trying to avoid Jefferson until he finally got up courage to approach him in June, 1805, Jefferson must have known of his presence in Washington from late 1803, and probably just slipped when he stated in his letter of July 5, 1819, to Henry Dearborn (quoted above) that Stuart had come to Washington in 1805.

8. Entry in Jefferson's pocket account books for June 7, 1805: "pd. Gilbert Stuart for drawing my portrait 100 D." Quoted in Kimball, p. 329, as in payment for the "Medallion Portrait" done shortly after the "Edgehill Portrait."

9. Quoted in Kimball, p. 336. Henry A. S. Dearborn's role in procuring the 1805 Jefferson portrait from Stuart is explained in a letter of Nov. 16, 1818, from his father to Jefferson: "As there has been a much greater intimacy between my Son and Stewart than between Stewart & myself I requested my son to call on him and endeavor to obtain such frank & explicit information from him as you desire." Quoted in Kimball, p. 332.

10. On that date Jefferson wrote Dearborn: "The portrait by Stuart was received in due time and good order and claims, for this difficult acquisition, the thanks of the family." Quoted in Kimball, p. 336.

11. This portrait derives its name from the fact that after Jefferson's death it
descended to his family at Edgehill, where it remained for seventy-five years. In 1902 it was purchased by Francis Burton Harrison, a collateral descendant of Jefferson's. In 1927 the Babcock Galleries of New York purchased it from Harrison for John G. Winant, who later sold it to Percy S. Straus, who bequeathed it to his son, Donald B. Straus, the present owner.

12. These facts were first established by Kimball in 1944, and are held by Alfred L. Bush in his monograph, The Life Portraits of Thomas Jefferson (Catalogue of an Exhibition at the University of Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, April 12-26, 1962), published by The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, Charlottesville, Va., 1962, pp. 71-73. On the other hand, Park, Stuart, I, 439 (published in 1926) accepted the Bowdoin Jefferson (Park no. 441) as “painted from life,” and in reference to the “Edgehill Portrait” (Park no. 443, pp. 440-41) stated: “Said to have been painted from life.” John Hill Morgan, Virginia Historical Portraiture, 1930, p. 251, concurred that the Bowdoin Jefferson was painted from life. The 1895, 1903, 1906, and 1930 editions of the Descriptive Catalogue of the Art Collections of Bowdoin College held the same view, but the Illustrated Handbook of the Bowdoin College Museum of Fine Arts, 1950, was noncommittal. The Messrs. Campbell, op. cit., regarded the Bowdoin Jefferson as a replica (p. 17), but rejected the “Edgehill Portrait” in favor of their own picture (p. 25). Most recently (1964), Mount regarded the Bowdoin Jefferson as a replica (pp. 266-67, 370) but rejected the “Edgehill Portrait” in favor of the portrait of Jefferson originally belonging to Madison and now in the collection of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc. (pp. 290, 312, 370). On this last point Jefferson in a letter to Joseph Delaplaine of Philadelphia (who had written Jefferson requesting information concerning an “approved portrait” of Jefferson for a “work relating to the general history of America”) of May 3, 1814, referred to the “two original portraits of myself taken by Stuart. . . . The President has a copy from that which Stuart considered the best of the two. . . .” (Quoted from Kimball, p. 338.) The “President” was of course Madison and “that which Stuart considered the best of the two” was of course the 1805 life portrait. Jefferson’s veracity aside, it hardly seems likely that Stuart would have surrendered his life portrait of Jefferson to Madison and kept a replica for himself.

13. Since this manuscript catalogue, all of the original entries of which clearly were written at the same time, contains the twenty-five paintings given to the College in 1852 by Colonel George William Boyd, it cannot be dated before that year, and it seems likely that it was written about the time that the pictures were installed in the first real “Gallery” on the Bowdoin campus in the Bowdoin Chapel in 1855.

15. A bust of Benjamin Franklin, apparently a copy of the Houdon, is on a pedestal at the upper left in the Maurin lithograph (ill. Kimball, p. 339), looking benignly down on Jefferson. Such a bust exists today in the Bowdoin College Library. Louis C. Hatch in his History of Bowdoin College (Portland, 1927), p. 432, stated that it was “given by Franklin to Benjamin Vaughan and presented by him to the College.” Although the present writer has been unable to locate any documents relating to such a gift, Vaughan, who was a generous donor of books to the Bowdoin Library during the early nineteenth century, may well have received a Houdon bust from Franklin, who was his friend, which he later presented to the College. Whether it was at Bowdoin by the time of Stuart’s visit is not known. Of course, the Maurin lithograph may not have been a faithful copy of the Doggett Jefferson; and even if it was, there were other copies of the Houdon bust, such as the one which came into the possession of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in Boston in 1803, which Stuart could have used for the painting.

16. Stuart painted another set of portraits of the first five Presidents (this time, bust-size) for Colonel George Gibbs. Since the set almost certainly was not painted before 1816 (the year Monroe was elected to the Presidency), the same circumstances which governed the execution of the Doggett set may have applied to that done for Colonel Gibbs; another possibility is that the latter was based on the former. Sometime after Colonel Gibbs’s death in 1833, his widow sold the Stuarts to Joseph Coolidge, the husband of Thomas Jefferson’s granddaughter, Eleonora Randolph. They are owned today by Mrs. T. Jefferson Coolidge III, Manchester, Mass., whose late husband was a great-great-great-grandson of Thomas Jefferson.

18. Winthrop Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society.
19. James Bowdoin III Letterbooks, Bowdoin College Library.

Exhibited:

Exhibition of Historical Portraits 1585-1830, Virginia House, Richmond, Va., May, 1929.

1813.55 Bequest of James Bowdoin III.

JAMES MADISON (1751-1836)

Oil on canvas, 48¼ x 39¾, 1805-07

On June 3, 1804, Dolly Madison wrote her sister Mrs. Anna Cutts: “Stuart has taken an admirable likeness of Mr. Madison; both his and
mine are finished.”

It was this likeness (now in the collection of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.), the only life portrait Stuart is known to have painted of the subject, that the artist used as a model for the half-length of Madison he had been commissioned to paint, together with a pendant of Jefferson, by James Bowdoin III in 1805. As Bolton has pointed out, the only significant difference in the likeness between the two is in the sitter’s glance: in the life portrait, Madison looks directly at the viewer; in the Bowdoin picture, he looks to the right. The Bowdoin half-length, begun a year after the life portrait commissioned by the subject himself, and completed in Boston (probably just in terms of its accessories) not later than August 14, 1807, portrays Madison as Jefferson’s Secretary of State, the office he held just prior to his own accession to the Presidency in 1809. (For a full exposition of the circumstances under which this portrait was executed see the preceding entry.)


2. The best summary of Stuart’s portraits of Madison (including the 1804 life portrait and the Bowdoin replica) is given in Bolton, op. cit., pp. 30-31, 39, 41-43, figs. 5-8. Kimball (1944), p. 340, stated: “In the case of the Madison there can be no doubt that Bowdoin did not receive a life portrait; the picture, a seated half-length uniform with the Jefferson, follows the head and shoulders painted for Madison himself in 1804.” Park (1926), Stuart, I, 497 (no. 516), merely stated: “This portrait was painted for the Honorable James Bowdoin. . . .” Mount (1964), p. 266, accepts the Bowdoin half-length as a replica of the 1804 life portrait. As in the case of the Bowdoin Jefferson, the 1805, 1903, 1906, and 1930 editions of the Descriptive Catalogue of the Art Collections held that the Madison was painted from life, and the Illustrated Handbook of the Bowdoin College Museum of Fine Arts, 1950, was noncommittal. The Doggett replica, painted from the Bowdoin half-length on a visit Stuart made to Brunswick about 1821 (see the preceding entry) is at Amherst College. (For information concerning the Gibbs replica, also see the preceding entry, especially footnote 16.)


1813.54 Bequest of James Bowdoin III.
HENRY ALEXANDER SCAMMELL DEARBORN (1783-1851)

Oil on panel, 28 x 22½, c. 1812

Henry Alexander Scammell Dearborn was born in Exeter, New Hampshire, the son of Henry Dearborn and his second wife, Dorcas Osgood (widow of Isaac Marble). His father, who started out in life as a physician, was a leading military figure in the Revolution; his third wife was Sarah, the widow of James Bowdoin III. After a boyhood spent on a farm in Maine, Henry A. S. Dearborn entered Williams College, but when his father became Jefferson’s Secretary of War he transferred to William and Mary, from which he graduated in 1803. He studied law under William Wirt (later Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court). Dearborn, who had very little taste for a career in the legal profession, practiced only briefly (in Salem, Massachusetts).

In 1806, doubtless through the good offices of his father, Dearborn was appointed to superintend the erection of new forts in Portland harbor. In 1812 he succeeded his father (who had been made senior Major General in the United States Army in command of the Northeast Sector) as Collector of the Port of Boston, a position which he held under Madison, Monroe, and J. Q. Adams, until he was replaced by President Jackson in 1829. In that year Dearborn was elected to the Massachusetts House of Representatives from Roxbury, and was shortly afterward appointed a member of the Governor’s Council. The following year he was a delegate to the State Constitutional Convention and was elected to the State Senate from Norfolk County. Dearborn also served one term in Congress, 1832-33.

In 1835 Dearborn was appointed Adjutant General of Massachusetts, in which capacity during 1838-39 he acted as commissioner for the sale of Seneca Indian lands. For his role, in the absence of the Governor, in lending state arms to the government of Rhode Island for the purpose of suppressing Dorr’s Rebellion, Dearborn was removed from office in 1843. His last political office was the mayoralty of Roxbury, to which he was elected in 1847, and which he held until his death.

Dearborn, who like his father before him had risen to the rank of
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Major General, was throughout his life extremely active in numerous endeavors in addition to the political offices described above. Together with Daniel Webster and Edward Everett, he was one of the leading figures responsible for the erection of the Bunker Hill monument, of which he was first chairman of the committee to solicit subscriptions and later chairman of the building committee. Dearborn also was one of the first to encourage the construction of a railroad from Boston to the Hudson and the Hoosac Tunnel. "For this I was termed an idiot," he later said. "An idiot I may be, but the road is made and the tunnel through the Hoosac Mountain is in course of construction."³

In 1829 Dearborn was one of the founders of the Massachusetts Horticultural Society, of which he was the first president. In relation to his activities in this area, it was said: There are thousands who may never speak his name, who unconsciously follow his teachings and copy his ideas in the flowers and trees that adorn their homes and delight their eyes. . . . He, more than any one man, put in train those agencies which introduced to the knowledge and love of all classes of our people a greatly-extended variety both of the useful and ornamental products of the ground. He loved the beautiful and taught his countrymen to love it.² And while many eminent Bostonians talked about a rural cemetery, it was "when Dearborn took practical hold of the matter, selected the ground, planned the improvements, measured the walks and drives, then Mount Auburn was born."³

One of the most eminent Bostonians of his day, Marshall Wilder, later said of Dearborn: No enterprise was too bold for him to attempt, no sacrifice was too great for him to make, no labor too arduous for him to perform, in order to promote the intelligence, the refinement, the welfare, and renown of his countrymen.⁴ Something Dearborn himself once said may help to explain the attitude which motivated him in a lifetime of abundant and useful activity. Whether the object of accomplishment or investigation be the construction of a Roman aqueduct or the stringing of a lute, the geology of the globe or the anatomy of the beetle, the discovery of a new world or a new plant, there must be brought into vigorous action the highest powers of intellect and the most zealous determination of purpose.⁵

The present portrait, which is a pendant to that of Mrs. Dearborn (following), is dated by Park "c. 1812," the year in which Stuart painted
the subject's father, Major General Henry Dearborn (the original version of which is in The Art Institute of Chicago). This seems entirely possible, although the portrait may have been painted slightly later, after July, 1813, when Stuart took up residence in the house of Dr. John Bartlett in Roxbury, the suburb of Boston in which the Dearborns lived. Because, like the portrait of General Dearborn, Sr., it was painted on a panel, it almost certainly dates from the period 1812-15, when, owing to the War of 1812, Stuart was unable to procure prepared canvas of the type he preferred from London.⁶

1. From an address delivered at a railroad convention in Portland in 1850, quoted in Daniel Goodwin, Jr., The Dearborns (Chicago, 1884), p. 36.
2. Dr. George Putnam, probably from an address delivered in Roxbury in 1851 after Dearborn's death, quoted in Goodwin, op. cit., p. 39.
5. From an address delivered before the Massachusetts Horticultural Society in 1835, quoted in Goodwin, op. cit., p. 38.
6. According to a note in the museum's files, John Hill Morgan, an authority on Stuart's work, was of the opinion that the frames on this portrait and its pendant of Mrs. Dearborn were original and probably were made by John Doggett of Boston.

Bibliography:
Lee, p. 38 (there incorrectly called "General Henry Scammill Dearborn").
Mason, p. 172.
Mount, p. 367.
Park, Stuart, I, 271 (no. 227); III, pl. 138.

Exhibited:
An exhibition of Stuart's portraits held in Boston after his death in 1828 (no. 199).

1921.3 Bequest of Miss Mary J. E. Clapp, the granddaughter of the sitter. (A life interest in the portrait was kindly waived by Miss Sarah Dearborn, another granddaughter of the sitter.)
MRS. HENRY ALEXANDER SCAMMELL DEARBORN
née Hannah Sweet Lee (1784-1869)

Oil on panel, 283⁄8 x 227⁄8, c. 1812

Hannah Sweet Lee was born in Marblehead, Massachusetts, the daughter of William Raymond Lee and Mary Sweet Lemmon.* Her father was first captain of Glover's Marblehead Regiment in 1775 and later became a Colonel in the Continental Army. In 1777 he was appointed Adjutant General by General Washington, which he declined in favor of Timothy Pickering (later Secretary of War and Secretary of State under Washington). Lee was Collector of the Port of Salem from 1802 to 1805.


For a discussion of the probable dating of this portrait, please consult the preceding entry dealing with its pendant, the sitter's husband.

* See under Park, Stuart, in bibliography below.

Bibliography:
Lee, p. 38.
Mason, p. 172.
Mount, p. 367.
Park, Stuart, I, 272 (no. 228); III, pl. 139. (Park incorrectly stated that the sitter was the daughter of Hannah Tracy, an error that probably arose due to the fact that the sitter's brother Samuel changed his given name to that of his father, i.e., William Raymond, and it was he who married Hannah Tracy. Cf. William Lee, The Descendants of John Lee (Albany, 1888), pp. 42-43.)

Exhibited:
An exhibition of Stuart's portraits held in Boston after his death in 1828 (no. 198).
John Trumbull and His Contemporaries, Lyman Allyn Museum, New London, Conn., March 5-April 16, 1944. (Here Mrs. Dearborn is confused with Sarah Bowdoin, the widow of James Bowdoin III, who was Henry Dearborn, Sr.'s third wife.)
MRS. THOMAS COGSWELL UPHAM née Phebe Lord (1804-82)

Oil on canvas, 30\(\frac{3}{4}\) x 25\(\frac{3}{4}\)

Phebe Lord was born in Kennebunkport, Maine, the daughter of Nathaniel Lord and Phebe Walker. On May 18, 1825, she married Thomas Cogswell Upham, who the preceding September had been appointed Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy at Bowdoin College, a position he held until his retirement in 1867.

Thomas Cogswell Upham (1799-1872), a graduate of Dartmouth College (class of 1818), attended Andover Theological Seminary, where he proved such a brilliant student that after his graduation in 1821 he remained for two years as a tutor in Hebrew. In 1823 he published the first of what was to be more than sixty books and pamphlets he was to write during his lifetime, a translation from the Latin of Jahn's *Biblical Archaeology. Brought to Bowdoin to oppose the doctrines of Kant and his school, he found himself after long effort unable to refute the teachings of the German metaphysician, and was on the point of resigning his professorship when suddenly he conceived a distinction between the intellect, the sensibilities and the will which he embodied in his *A Philosophical and Practical Treatise on the Will (1834), his outstanding work.\(^1\)

Later called "one of the first original and comprehensive contributions of American scholarship to modern psychology,"\(^2\) this study, together with his *Imperfect and Disordered Mental Action (1840), "made him to be regarded more as a psychologist than a theologian, and did much to liberate American philosophy and theology from the thralldom of the elder Jonathan Edwards.\(^3\)

Among Upham's many other interests was international peace, of which he was one of the earliest American advocates. He wrote several articles on the subject, which revealed his extensive reading in European political history. First published in the press under the pseudonym "Perier" (taken from the name of the eminent French statesman Casimir Perier, who was a minister under Charles X and Louis Philippe), they later were incorporated in one of the four essays in William Ladd's *Prize Essays on a Congress of Nations (1840).
Upham also was an ardent member of the antislavery movement, a conviction which he and his wife shared with Harriet Beecher Stowe, who, when she first came to Brunswick in 1850 with her husband (who had been appointed to the Bowdoin Faculty), stayed briefly in the Upham house. Five years earlier Mrs. Stowe had found so much comfort in Professor Upham’s The Interior Life that she had written two discussions of it for the New York Evangelist. The Uphams and the Stowes frequently gathered for discussions on the slavery question with Professor and Mrs. William Smyth, whose home was a station in the “underground railway.”

Although mistress of a household of six adopted orphan children, Phebe Upham, perhaps influenced by her husband’s unceasing literary efforts, found time to write five small volumes herself during her years in Brunswick. All of a religious nature, one of them, A Narrative of Phebe Ann Jacobs, published by the American Tract Society about 1851, dealt with the life of a former slave, who “loved to pray,” and appropriately enough, as a servant in President Allen’s household, “prayed for the college.”

The present portrait of Mrs. Upham is dated by Park “c. 1825.” It is not known whether the portrait was commissioned by Phebe’s mother (her father, a wealthy shipowner, had died in 1815) or Thomas Upham, but since Stuart apparently never painted Professor Upham, it may be that Phebe’s portrait was painted before her marriage, possibly (judging from what her age might be in the likeness) as early as 1823 or thereabouts.

A letter in the museum’s files from the donor, Edward D. Jameson, the son of one of the sitter’s adopted daughters, dated Boston, May 17, 1919, states: Regarding the Stuart portrait of Mrs. Upham, my wife had an old diary of Mrs. Upham’s in which she informed me that when Mrs. Upham was a young girl she was with her parents in New York, and that Stuart fell in love with the girl and wished to paint her portrait. At this writing I am unable to find the diary, as on my wife’s death all such things were packed away. I will, however, endeavor to make a search for it and see if it cannot be found; and if successful I will forward same to you. And in a letter of June 17, 1920: Regarding the diary of Mrs. Upham’s in reference to the portrait I have
Gilbert Stuart  Mrs. Thomas Cogswell Upham
searched everywhere high and low but have been unable to locate it. Think it must have been destroyed.

While it is not difficult to believe that Stuart might well have fallen in love with an enchanting young girl like Phebe, the above correspondence conflicts with the evidence of the portrait itself, as well as what we know about Stuart’s career. Since, as we have seen, Phebe’s father died in 1815, and there is no record that her mother ever remarried, Phebe would not have been more than eleven when she could have gone anywhere with her “parents.” As far as Stuart’s career is concerned, he moved to Boston in 1805 and, as far as the present writer is aware, made no painting trips to New York after that time. If there is any truth at all in the diary (or Mr. Jameson’s recollection of it), it probably has something to do with Stuart’s attraction to the sitter and further may lend some support to the suggestion made above that the portrait was painted before Phebe’s marriage.

6. A sixth was published later (see footnote 5 above).

Bibliography:
Lee, p. 35.
Mount, p. 376.
Park, Stuart, II, 773-74 (no. 863); IV, pl. 538.

Exhibited:
Smith College Museum of Art, June, 1936.
Masterpieces of Painting, Art Association of Montreal, January-April, 1942.

1919.1 Gift of Mr. Edward D. Jameson, son of one of the adopted daughters of the sitter.
JOHN TRUMBULL (1756-1843)

John Trumbull was born in Lebanon, Connecticut, the youngest of the six children of the future governor of Connecticut (1769-84) Jonathan Trumbull and his wife Faith Robinson. At the age of four or five he severely injured his left eye in a headlong fall down a flight of stairs, and forever after suffered near-monocular vision.

Trumbull, who began to draw at a very early age, wanted to be an artist almost from the beginning. He attended Nathan Tisdale’s excellent school in Lebanon until in the middle of his junior year; at the age of fifteen and a half he was deemed ready to enter Harvard (his father’s, brothers’, and Master Tisdale’s alma mater). Although Trumbull tried to persuade his father to let him study with Copley instead, the Governor, who later admonished his son, “You appear to forget, sir, that Connecticut is not Athens,” wanted him to be a minister or a lawyer. Trumbull was admitted to Harvard as a junior, did excellently, and graduated the following year, a member of the class of 1773 (the first college-educated artist in American history).

On the very eve of his enrollment at Harvard, however, Trumbull met Copley and saw his paintings. Seventy years later Trumbull was to remember the event (in his Autobiography): “[Copley was] an elegant looking man, dressed in a fine maroon cloth, with gilt buttons—this was dazzling to my unpracticed eye!—but his paintings, the first I had ever seen deserving the name, riveted, absorbed my attention, and renewed all my desire to enter upon such a pursuit.”

After a couple of brief and helpless periods during which Trumbull tried his hand at painting in Lebanon (1773-74, classical subjects; 1777, portraits), interrupted by service in the Continental Army (which included a few weeks as Washington’s aide-de-camp), the aspiring artist set off for Boston in hopes of improving his ability. There he rented (1777-79) what had once been John Smibert’s studio, which still contained copies of old masters, some of which Trumbull copied. “Mr. Copley was gone to Europe, and there remained no artist in Boston from whom I could gain oral instruction,” Trumbull later wrote, “but these copies supplied the place, and I made some progress.”

While in Boston, Trumbull became acquainted with John Temple,
who suggested he go to London to study with Benjamin West. In spite of the fact that Trumbull had fought in the Continental Army, and although his father was the rebel Governor of Connecticut, Temple secured permission for the young painter to go to London. Armed with a note of introduction from Benjamin Franklin in Paris, where he had gone first, Trumbull presented himself to West in London in 1780 and commenced his studies. Trumbull’s first stint in West’s studio, however, was a brief one, for he was arrested and imprisoned “on suspicion of treason,” although the real reason probably was in reprisal for the hanging of Major André. (Trumbull was very nearly incarcerated again on similar false charges in France in 1794, but his friend, the French painter Jacques-Louis David, intervened and saved him.) After his release (achieved through the good offices of Charles James Fox and Edmund Burke), Trumbull returned home, where for the next two years he engaged in business and toyed with the idea of giving up art altogether for the greater security of commerce.

As soon as possible after the Treaty of Paris, however, Trumbull returned to London to resume his studies. Working under West’s guidance, Trumbull’s first major picture, The Death of General Warren at the Battle of Bunker’s Hill (original oil, Yale University Art Gallery), was to forecast the mainstream of his career—the painting of events from contemporary history.

Among those who were quick to encourage Trumbull in this pursuit was Thomas Jefferson, then Minister to France. His course now clear, Trumbull returned to the United States where, between 1789 and 1794, he traveled up and down the coast painting those who had played roles in some of the major events of the American Revolution, and who, later incorporated by Trumbull in scenes of these events, would play them again. These were Trumbull’s greatest years; he would never after equal them.

Trumbull spent the next decade (1794-1804) abroad, as secretary to John Jay, the American envoy to Great Britain, and later as one of the Commissioners for implementing the Jay Treaty. In London in 1800 he married Sarah Hope Harvey, a woman eighteen years his junior, whose life before she met Trumbull still remains very much a mystery, and
about whom Trumbull wrote only a few lines in his otherwise quite detailed *Autobiography.*

Upon his return to America, he set up shop in New York, after deciding not to face competition with Stuart in Boston. During these years (1804-08), Trumbull had few portrait commissions, but painted instead many landscapes and several panoramas of Niagara Falls. Once again he tried England, where he first met with considerable success as a fashionable portraitist, but the War of 1812 intervened, and his portrait commissions diminished greatly. With the cessation of hostilities Trumbull sailed for home, only to find back in New York that his waning talents were not sufficient to cope with the skills of a new generation of portraitists, which included Morse, Sully, Jarvis, and Vanderlyn.

In Washington, however, Trumbull was commissioned by Congress to paint four Revolutionary scenes in the rotunda of the Capitol. Although Trumbull had wanted to paint the figures half life-size, President Madison insisted that they be “as large as life.” Trumbull spent the next seven years painting the four twelve-by-eighteen-foot canvases of the Surrender of General Burgoyne at Saratoga, the Surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown, the Declaration of Independence, and the Resignation of Washington. These enlargements, based on earlier and fresher small versions of the same subjects, were not successful. Of the *Declaration of Independence,* John Quincy Adams observed, “It may be said of Trumbull’s talent as the Spaniards say of heroes who were brave on a certain day: he has painted good pictures. I think the old small picture far superior to this large new one.”

During these same years Trumbull’s cantankerous and unreasonable behavior as president of the American Academy of Fine Arts drove his younger colleagues out of the organization to form the National Academy of Design (1826). In 1831 he gave his remaining unsold pictures to Yale for a picture gallery in return for an annual pension of $1,000 for the rest of his life. Whereas his underwriters had expected the seventy-six-year-old artist to survive only six years at most, Trumbull outfoxed them and lived twelve.

In his brilliant and affectionate biography of Trumbull, Theodore Sizer said, “The tragedy of the bilingual, one-eyed soldier-turned-
painter was that most of his good work was produced before he was forty and he lived to be eighty-eight.” A fitting epitaph may be found in what Abigail Adams wrote 180 years ago about one of Trumbull’s finest early efforts, *The Death of General Warren at the Battle of Bunker’s Hill*: “[Trumbull] is the first painter who has undertaken to immortalize by his pencil those great actions that gave birth to our nation.”

1. Trumbull copied a copy (which he believed to be by Smibert) of Van Dyke’s portrait of Cardinal Bentivoglio. In 1789 Trumbull gave his copy to Harvard College, where it now is. His copy of what he believed to be Smibert’s copy of Poussin’s *Continence of Scipio* is unlocated. (A discussion of the *Scipio* bequeathed to Bowdoin College in 1811 by James Bowdoin III, and which may have been the one in Smibert’s studio, which Trumbull copied, will be found in Appendix B, *James Bowdoin III as Art Collector.*)

2. John Temple was the son-in-law of James Bowdoin II, who was a good friend of Trumbull’s father. Further information about Temple may be found in the biography of his wife, Elizabeth Bowdoin, given under her and her brother’s double portrait by Blackburn in this catalogue. Footnote 2 in that entry deals with Trumbull’s portraits of the Temples.

3. Earlier in his life, Trumbull had fallen in love with a beautiful young girl named Harriet Wadsworth, but she died before anything came of their association. Shortly thereafter, Trumbull, to use his own words, “became a little too intimate with a Girl,” who, though named Temperance, “had at the same time some other particular friends;—the natural consequence followed, and in due time a fine boy was born;—the number of Fellow labourers rendered it a little difficult to ascertain precisely who was the Father; but, as I was best able to pay the Bill, the Mother using her legal right, judiciously chose me.” John Trumbull Ray lived with and was supported by his “Uncle John,” who ultimately bought him a lieutenant’s commission in the British Army.

CHAUNCEY ALLEN GOODRICH (1790-1860)

Oil on panel, 25 1/8 x 21 1/8, 1827

Chauncey Allen Goodrich was born in New Haven, Connecticut, the son of Elizur Goodrich and Anne Allen. After graduating from Yale in 1810, Goodrich served for nearly two years as rector of Hopkins Grammar School in New Haven. From 1812 to 1814 he was a tutor at Yale and also studied theology with President Timothy Dwight. Goodrich
received his license to preach from the New Haven Association of Ministers in the fall of 1814, and in the following spring received calls from three of the churches at which he had preached—the Park Street Church in Boston, and the Congregational Churches in Salisbury and Middletown, Connecticut. He accepted the call to Middletown, where he was ordained and installed on July 24, 1816. On October 1, 1816, Goodrich married Julia Frances (originally Frances Juliana) Webster, the daughter of the lexicographer.

In September, 1817, Goodrich was invited to fill the newly founded Chair of Rhetoric at Yale, an offer he was glad to accept, his health having proved “unequal to the demands of the pastorate.” He continued to maintain his theological interests, however, and was among those who helped to establish a department devoted to that area of study at Yale in 1822. In 1828 he purchased the Christian Spectator, founded in New Haven in 1819, which he published and edited from 1829 to 1836 as the Quarterly Christian Spectator, espousing the so-called “New Haven Theology” of Nathaniel Taylor. In 1839 Goodrich gave Yale $5,000 to establish a professorship to train students in preaching and pastoral work. When the first appointee declined the chair, Goodrich himself was transferred to it, in which position he remained for the rest of his life, “the most distinctly vital religious influence in the place.”

Just as Goodrich once had not given up theology for rhetoric, he did not give up the latter when he returned to the former, and in 1852 took advantage of his rhetorical studies by publishing a nearly thousand-page tome entitled Select British Eloquence, “embracing the best Speeches entire, of the most eminent Orators of Great Britain for the last two Centuries; with sketches of their lives, an estimate of their genius,” etc., etc. Goodrich also published works as diverse in subject as Greek and Latin grammars and (anonymously in 1844) Can I Conscientiously Vote for Henry Clay?, a defense of a Christian’s supporting Clay. In 1829 he edited an abridgment of his father-in-law’s Dictionary, and after Webster’s death in 1843, Goodrich prepared a new revision published in 1847 of the original Dictionary.

But Goodrich is almost as interesting for what he wasn’t as for what he was. He wasn’t president of Williams or Bowdoin. In 1821 Goodrich
was elected president of Williams College, but he declined, perhaps because he felt his frail health might have hampered his ability to cope with the then faltering Williams, whose much-admired President Ze-phaniah Moore had just resigned to become the first president of Amherst College, where he was followed by half the student body of Williams. In 1838 the Trustees of Bowdoin were predominantly Unitarians and the Overseers, Orthodox Congregationalists. Realizing that they could not elect one of their own persuasion president, the Trustees settled upon Goodrich, a moderate Congregationalist, but the Overseers vetoed his election.

It was roughly between these two happenings that the seventy-one-year-old Trumbull, who had long since passed his prime as a portraitist, now even further diminished in power by his seven-year struggle with his monumental (and unsuccessful) efforts for the rotunda of the Capitol, disgruntled by his contest with the younger members of the American Academy of Fine Arts (who had the year before deserted to form the National Academy of Design), painted this rather indifferent portrait of Chauncey Allen Goodrich. Yet this picture, which is dated 1827 on the basis of an evidently contemporary inscription on the back of the frame, is not without merit both in terms of painting and as a portrait which captures likeness and reveals character; and if Trumbull’s flame had burned low, it had by no means been extinguished.

Bibliography:
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REMBRANDT PEALE (1778-1860)

Rembrandt Peale was the son of a painter, Charles Willson Peale (and his first wife, Rachel Brewer), and the brother of the painters Raphaelle and Rubens; his uncle, James, also painted, as did his cousins, James, Jr., Maria, Anna Claypoole, Margaretta Angelica, and Sarah Miriam. Rembrandt—at one time he even briefly changed his name to just this in an effort to escape being confused with all his painting rela-
tives—was born on February 22, 1778, on the Vanarsdalen Farm in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, where the Peales had fled from their home in British-occupied Philadelphia while Charles Willson was in the army at Valley Forge.

As a schoolboy in Philadelphia, Rembrandt is said to have been as gifted in poetry as he was precocious in drawing. He began studying painting with his father, and did his first oil, a self-portrait, when he was only thirteen; and it was not long before Charles Willson came to look upon Rembrandt as the best painter among his sons, more talented in fact than himself. Even though the elder Peale was an excellent portraitist, he had another perhaps even more engrossing interest: a remarkable natural history museum (which ultimately contained more than one hundred thousand items) coupled with a gallery containing portraits of notable contemporary personages both American and European. And it was in connection with commissions from his father to paint portraits for the gallery that Rembrandt was principally occupied for the first fifteen years of his career.

One of the most important events of Rembrandt’s life took place in September, 1795, when Washington came and sat for the last of many portraits by Charles Willson, for Rembrandt also was permitted to paint him. This likeness, of which the seventeen-year-old Peale soon thereafter made ten replicas (or so he said) during a visit to Charleston, South Carolina, where he had gone to paint notable citizens for his father’s gallery, was to occupy the center of the stage of much of his later life.

In 1801 Rembrandt assisted on a dig which uncovered a number of skeletons of mastodons, one of which was successfully reassembled (with Rembrandt helping to carve replicas of some of the missing parts) in his father’s museum. Another was sent off to Europe in the care of Rembrandt and his younger brother Rubens, then training to be a naturalist, to be shown there. During a year in London (autumn to autumn, 1802-03) Rembrandt published two studies dealing with the “Mammoth” as he called it, studied with Benjamin West, and exhibited two portraits at the Royal Academy. Owing to the war in France, however, the Peales returned home without taking their show to the Continent.
Upon his return to Philadelphia, Peale opened a painting room in the State House, where his father's museum and gallery now were situated. Later in the year both were among the founders of the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts.

Again commissioned by his father, Peale went to Paris in the spring of 1808 to paint portraits of such French luminaries as Houdon and David. He also painted a portrait of Denon, the director-general of museums, who offered him government patronage if he would remain in France. The unsettled political conditions there, however, persuaded Peale to turn down the invitation, and he returned to Philadelphia in October, 1808. But Peale went back to Paris the following year where, to complete his father's original commission, he remained until the fall of 1810. Returning to Philadelphia, Peale painted a large equestrian portrait of Napoleon, exhibited in his own picture gallery which in 1812 was renamed the "Apollodorian Gallery of Paintings."

In 1814 Peale opened a museum and gallery in Baltimore patterned after Charles Willson's, but the venture did not prosper and Rembrandt disposed of it in 1820 to his brother Rubens, who had managed their father's establishment in Philadelphia. In the same year Rembrandt painted a huge canvas, thirteen by twenty-four feet, containing twenty-three life-size figures, entitled The Court of Death (Detroit Institute of Arts). Exhibited in several cities, it brought its author $8,886 in entrance fees in little more than a year.

After painting for about a year in New York, Peale reopened his gallery and painting room in Philadelphia in 1823. It was during this period that he returned again to his likeness of Washington. After repeated earlier attempts, so intense was Peale's desire to achieve in this "last effort" the highest pitch of perfection of which he was capable that, by his own admission, his wife "burst into a flood of tears and exclaimed with great emotion that Washington was my evil genius and she wished he had never been born." But, as Peale went on, I commenced and devoted all my time to it to the neglect of every other business. ... For three months it was my constant occupation, working at it all day and absolutely dreaming of it every night. My father who visited me daily was much grieved, to see me so earnestly engaged in what he considered a vain pursuit. I had worked up my
imagination to a sort of frenzy and in extreme excitement imagined I was succeeding in my effort. My father came to the door,—I could not speak, but gently touched him not to enter. I locked the door and continued to paint as if Washington had just left me. When Charles Willson came again with a “distressed countenance,” Rembrandt finally let him look at the portrait. “He gaily clapped me on the shoulder saying—’You have got it at last! It is the best of Likenesses.’” But Rembrandt was still enough in possession of himself to realize that the old man, fearful of his son’s sanity, probably was trying to humor him. “Although it was not the perfect Washington equal to my insatiable desire,” Rembrandt wrote, “I felt I could do no more, and was conscious that others who knew Washington would see something of life in it.”

Peale returned to New York in 1825, and during his residence there was elected president of the American Academy of Fine Arts, succeeding John Trumbull. He subsequently lived for a time in Boston, where he painted portraits and became interested in lithography (his head of Washington in that medium won the silver medal of the Franklin Institute).

In 1829-30, and again in 1831, Peale traveled in Europe; in Italy he copied old masters in addition to painting some original studies and several portraits. He exhibited the 1823 Washington portrait in London, Florence, and Rome, where it met with general approbation; on his return home it was purchased for the Nation by a unanimous vote of the United States Senate. Peale’s final trip abroad was made in 1832 to England, where he had been commissioned to paint some portraits.

After his return to Philadelphia in 1834, Peale devoted most of the remainder of his life to his so-called “porthole” portrait of Washington, based on the 1823 version purchased by the government which depicted the subject behind a simulated stonework oval. All told, Peale painted about seventy-five replicas of this likeness, which successively became more and more bland and sentimentalized. He published a pamphlet of testimonials of those who had known Washington and had said this likeness was authentic; and traveled around the country giving lectures on the circumstances under which it was made, probably not failing to mention that he had been born on Washington’s birthday, and trading heavily
on the fact that he was "now the only painter living who ever saw Washington." Peale died on October 3, 1860, at the age of eighty-two.

WILLIAM ALLEN (1784-1868)

Oil on canvas, 26⅜ x 22, probably 1825

William Allen was born in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, the son of the Reverend Thomas Allen, the famous "Fighting Parson" of the Battle of Bennington, and his wife Elizabeth Lee, a descendant of Governor William Bradford of Plymouth. William graduated from Harvard at the age of eighteen, a member of the class of 1802. (His other degrees were an A.M. from Harvard in 1805 and from Dartmouth in 1812, and a D.D. from Harvard in 1821.) Allen studied theology with the Reverend John Pierce of Brookline, Massachusetts, and was licensed to preach by the Berkshire Association in 1804. From 1805 to 1810 he was an assistant librarian and regent (making up quarterly bills and keeping records of absences) at Harvard, during which time he also published the first edition of his Biographical and Historical Dictionary.

Upon his father's death in 1810, Allen was chosen to succeed him as pastor of the First Congregational Church of Pittsfield. In 1813 Allen married Marie Malleville Wheelock, the only daughter of President John Wheelock of Dartmouth College. Wheelock, a Democrat (or, then, Republican), frequently had been at odds with the predominantly Federalist trustees of Dartmouth, and in 1815 a majority of them voted to oust him as president.

When in the next state election a legislature and governor politically sympathetic to Wheelock were elected, his supporters succeeded in persuading the former to change the name of Dartmouth College to Dartmouth University, and to enlarge its board of trustees; and the latter to appoint pro-Wheelock men to the additional openings on the board.

In February, 1817, Wheelock's son-in-law, William Allen, who already had earned for himself quite a reputation as a scholar and whose politics were right, was appointed Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the new university. Shortly thereafter, the boards elected Wheelock president, and when he died less than two months later Allen was elected to succeed him.
But Dartmouth University was not to be long-lived. After considerable litigation in the lower courts, Daniel Webster argued the case of the college before the United States Supreme Court in 1819. In one of its most famous and far-reaching decisions, the Court held that the college’s charter was a contract between the state and a private corporation, and that according to the United States Constitution, it could not be violated by legislative action. The university was no more, and William Allen was out of a job.

In December of the same year, however, Allen was elected third president of Bowdoin College by a unanimous vote of both the Trustees and the Overseers on the first ballot. If the Boards were convinced of Allen’s academic qualifications, they also probably were not unaware that his political background (with which they were not entirely sympathetic) might be useful in dealing with what was to be a Democratic-controlled legislature of the new state of Maine. They may have been somewhat reassured, however, when before accepting the position, Allen wrote to Professor Parker Cleaveland to inquire “of what nature as to the morals is the society of your village . . .?” And they are said not to have been displeased when the Allens rode into town in style in their own two-horse carriage. (Mrs. Allen, at any rate, had ancestors and property which “may have helped to soften the heart of Federalist respectability.”)

But Allen was not to be a popular president. As one student of the time later described him, “There was the impassive, inflexible Allen, precise, stately, stiff . . .” If he also had to admit that Allen was “just and kind and faithful . . . with a warm and generous heart beating unseen and unsuspected beneath the cold exterior,” he nevertheless felt that Allen “never courted popularity, and so, perhaps, he never deserved it.” The class of 1825 (which included Messrs. Hawthorne and Longfellow) so disliked Allen that half of them did not attend the reception he gave them on their graduation.

One of the circumstances which had encouraged Allen to accept the presidency of Bowdoin was the possibility of establishing a medical school there. In order to accomplish this, it was necessary for the College to apply to the legislature for a revision of its charter. This the Boards were loathe to do, fearing that the legislature would involve itself fur-
ther in college matters. Although some members of the Boards opposed the move "with earnest and even pathetic eloquence," Allen felt that the establishment of a medical school was worth the risk of involvement with the legislature. And if the College was to have such a school, it would also require financial assistance from the State. "Shall the College fail to allow the Commonwealth to render it the assistance alike needed and deserved?" he argued. The medical school came into being, and the only immediate price the College had to pay was the enlargement of its Boards by the legislature. True, Governor King appointed mostly Democrats (and was even himself later appointed a Trustee), but it turned out that "his appointees were men of character and ability and suited for their position." Allen would have cause to rue the day, however, because if the New Hampshire legislature had made it possible for him to be president of Dartmouth University, the Maine Legislature would later deprive him of the presidency of Bowdoin College.

Certain changes were made in the curriculum during Allen’s administration, but when the visiting committee of 1827 inquired of the Boards, "Whether the courses of instruction ought not to be more of practical and less of a scholastic character, and to this end whether the study of the Greek language in this College ought not to be optional with the student," various subcommittees were appointed to study the matter until the Visiting Committee of 1841 (after Allen’s time) decided that the College should wait and see what happened to other institutions that were implementing such changes "and thereby gain the benefit of the trial without risking anything ourselves by a hasty innovation."

It was also during President Allen’s administration that Longfellow was appointed to teach French and Spanish in 1829, a position he held until his resignation to accept a call to Harvard in 1835.

If Allen was rather on the liberal side politically, he was much more rigidly conservative in matters of morality. Although he had built one of the best faculties in the history of the College, they all happened to be Orthodox Congregationalists (like himself); and one writer of a series of letters in the Portland Argus maintained that the faculty was "driving fourteen-year-old boys almost insane with anxiety and fear." While this accusation was doubtless extreme, it nevertheless did reflect the pub-
lic's generally unfavorable attitude about the College at the time. Against this background the College was in the unfortunate position of just then having to apply to the legislature for additional financial assistance. Although the matter was further complicated by the fact that other newer Maine educational institutions were at the time doing the same, Allen was held largely responsible for Bowdoin's unsuccessful application.

In March, 1831, a Bowdoin alumnus introduced a bill into the Maine Senate whereby no president of a Maine college should hold office beyond the ensuing commencement unless he were reelected by a vote of two-thirds of his boards. Disguised as a general law, the bill, which passed, clearly was designed to get rid of Allen. Although there was some debate on the Bowdoin Boards as to whether or not the act was constitutional, they finally concurred in it, offering to help Allen save face by reelecting him, but insisting that if they did so, it would be on condition that he then resign. This Allen refused to do, and the Boards did not reelect him. (Unable to settle on his successor, they chose three members of the faculty to run the College until they did.)

Allen thereupon engaged counsel to take his case to court. He was in the paradoxical situation of having to argue for his present position on the basis of the very ruling that had deprived him of his former position at Dartmouth University—that a college's charter was a contract between the state and a private corporation which could not be violated by legislative action. In May 1833, the Circuit Court, referring to the famous Dartmouth decision of 1819, nullified the act of the legislature by which Allen had been deprived of his position and ordered him restored to it.

By winning his case Allen not only had taken the College completely out of the hands of the legislature, restoring it to the Boards (who could not have been less than grateful for that benefit); but he also captured the imagination of the students (who greeted his return with a "simultaneous burst of applause") for the first time in his administration.

But the honeymoon was not to last. Allen was the same man the Boards and students had not liked before, and by 1838 his position had again become so unpleasant that he tendered his resignation to take effect the following year. If he had hoped that the generous nature of his letter
of resignation, admitting his mistakes and confessing his faults, might sway the Boards into refusing it, he was wrong.

There was no magnanimity in Allen’s farewell address in which he took up his grievances against the students, faculty, Boards, legislature with devastating impartiality, according to a student who witnessed it, who also reported that Allen had “thanked the Lord that as he had only remained here for the sake of the good moral influence which he knew he had exerted in the chapel on Friday afternoons, he had by that means been enabled to save some souls.” When Allen announced the last hymn to be sung, the choir rose, and instead of singing it, marched out.

Allen spent the remainder of his years in Northampton, Massachusetts, where he lived for nearly two decades with his second wife, Sarah Johnson Breed, whom he had married in 1831 after the death of Marie Malleville Wheelock in 1828. His time was spent in literary endeavors, mainly in expanding his *American Biographical and Historical Dictionary* to 7,000 entries in the edition of 1857 (the first edition of 1809 having had only 700, and the second of 1832, 1,800). He also published two books of verse, *Wunnessoo, or the Vale of Hoosatunnuk, a Poem* (1856) and *Poems of Nazareth and the Cross* (1866).

The present portrait is a pendant to that of the first Mrs. Allen (following). Inasmuch as Marie Malleville Wheelock Allen died in 1828, the two portraits almost certainly were not painted after that year. Since Peale is known to have been in Boston in 1825, and in view of the fact that the Allens could more easily have traveled there than to New York or Philadelphia, it seems likely that they were painted in Boston at the time of Peale’s visit. In addition, Mr. Allen was forty-one in 1825 and Mrs. Allen, thirty-seven, which is consistent with what their respective ages could easily be in the two portraits.

1950.13 Gift of Mrs. Malleville McC. Howard, the great-granddaughter of the sitter.
MRS. WILLIAM ALLEN née Marie Malleville Wheelock
(1788-1828)

Oil on canvas, 26 3/8 x 22, *probably* 1825

Marie Malleville Wheelock was the daughter of John Wheelock, president of Dartmouth College (1779-1815) and Dartmouth University (1817), and his wife Marie Suhm, a daughter of the Governor-General of the Danish West Indies. At the age of twelve, Marie was sent to Boston to study at Elisha Ticknor’s school, where she remained for three years, living with the Ticknors.

Supposedly because of difficulties with a rejected suitor, Marie left Hanover at about the age of twenty to spend some time with an aunt in Newark. On a visit to Boston, where owing to her excellent social connections she was invited to many parties, Marie was introduced at one to President Madison and is said to have made quite an impression on him. Marie preferred Newark to Boston, however, saying, “The inhabitants are just the thing for me, free from that disgusting formality, the characteristic of Boston.”

Marie first met her future husband when he presented a copy of his *Biographical and Historical Dictionary* to her father in Hanover. Which of the two Wheelocks William Allen really had come to see is not clear, but it was said that he disposed of a copy of his book and his heart on one and the same visit. Marie Wheelock (“in a dress of cambric so fine it could be concealed in clasped hands”) married William Allen in her father’s house in Hanover on January 28, 1813.

From 1813 to 1817 the Allens lived in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, where he had succeeded his father as pastor of the First Congregational Church. When William became professor of Logic and Metaphysics at the new Dartmouth University in 1817, the couple moved to Hanover, where they remained when he succeeded her father as president of the University and until its dissolution in 1819. In 1820 William was elected president of Bowdoin College, and the Allens moved to Brunswick, where Marie died eight years later, leaving her husband and eight children.

For reasons given under the pendant portrait of her husband, the
Rembrandt Peale  Mrs. William Allen
present portrait probably was painted in Boston in 1825 when Marie was thirty-seven.

1. Marie’s mother evidently had once charmed another president, James Monroe, when he was a wounded young lieutenant at the Battle of Trenton and she the volunteer nurse who cared for him. The acquaintance was renewed when Monroe passed through Hanover on July 21, 1817, and was entertained in the Allen house. Marie Suhm Wheelock died in Brunswick in 1824.

1950.14 Gift of Mrs. Malleville McC. Howard, the great-granddaughter of the sitter.

THOMAS SULLY (1783-1872)

Thomas Sully was born in Horncastle, Lincolnshire, England, the son of Matthew Sully and Sarah Chester, actors. In 1792, at the behest of Matthew Sully’s brother-in-law who was a theater manager in various southern cities in the United States, the Sullys and their nine children emigrated to Charleston, South Carolina, where a new theater was about to open. Because the Sully’s with their large brood were in need of more financial assistance than their acting could bring them, they sent their fourth son, Tom, at the age of twelve, to learn the insurance business. His employer is said to have told Tom’s father, however, that Tom was more adept at multiplying “figures of men and women” than numbers, and that “the boy should be made a painter.”

Tom had his first taste of painting from Charles Fraser, a native Charlestonian only a year older than he, who, though he later studied law and actually practiced for more than a decade, had started out to be a miniaturist, an occupation which he resumed on a full-time basis in his later life. Sully afterwards said of Fraser that “he was the first person that ever took the pains to instruct me in the rudiments of the art, and although himself a mere tyro, his kindness, and the progress made in consequence of it, determined the course of my future life.”

The young Sully also received some early instruction from a Frenchman named Jean Belzons (known as “Zolbius”), a miniaturist, who claimed to have studied with David, and who married one of Sully’s sisters in 1794. Belzons had a mean temper, however, and the young Sully left his studio in 1799.
Sully then moved to Richmond to live with his favorite brother Lawrence and his wife. Lawrence, also at work as a miniaturist, provided his younger brother with additional instruction. The brothers moved to Norfolk, where Tom painted his first miniature from life, a portrait of his brother Chester, on May 10, 1801. He painted his first oil in the following year, after having received some instruction from Henry Benbridge, who had studied abroad, and whom he probably had met in Charleston where Benbridge had worked before moving to Norfolk about the same time as the Sully brothers.

Almost from the beginning Tom began to keep a careful "Account of Pictures," in which he recorded the date a portrait was begun, its size, the sitter's name, the date it was finished, and the price he received (or the value he placed on it)—a practice which he continued throughout his life.

Tom continued to work in Norfolk and Richmond with Lawrence until the latter's death in 1803. Two years later Sully married his brother's widow, the former Sarah Annis, whom with her three children he had supported during the intervening years. They were to have nine children and enjoy an unusually happy and harmonious family life.

In November of the following year, on the advice of Thomas Abthorpe Cooper, a distinguished English actor who had admired Sully's work in Richmond, Sully moved to New York. Here he immediately enjoyed a wide patronage among Cooper's circle of friends, so that by the end of his first full year there (1807) he had painted seventy pictures for a return of $3,203 (a far cry from the five and six hundred dollars a year he had been able to earn in Richmond). And the New York earnings even included a significant number of "thrift" portraits done for only $30, necessitated by the economic depression occasioned by the Embargo.

In the same year, 1807, Cooper gave Sully a letter of introduction to a friend of his in Boston, the British consul there, Andrew Allen. If Allen was not to be a customer for a portrait, it was because he happened at the time to be sitting to none other than Gilbert Stuart. But this circumstance, as it turned out, was even more fortuitous for Sully, inasmuch as Allen took him with him to his next appointment with Stuart. As Sully
later related, “I had the privilege of standing by the artist’s chair during the sitting, a situation I valued more at that moment than I shall ever again appreciate any station on earth.” And as if this were not enough, during the same sitting an intimate friend of Stuart’s, Isaac P. Davis, happened by and it forthwith was arranged that he sit to Sully so that Stuart might have an example of the younger artist’s work upon which to offer helpful criticisms. After examining the result, Stuart advised, “Keep what you have got, and get as much as you can.” As Dunlap subsequently observed, “There is more encouragement in this oracular sentence than at first meets the eye. Most young artists have got to get rid of ‘what they have got,’ or the greater part of it, as well as to get ‘as much as they can.’” Sully’s cup must have run over.

In 1808 Sully decided to settle in Philadelphia, which was to remain his home for the rest of his life. Among the letters of introduction he carried with him was one from a young American writer exactly his contemporary, who was then engaged in writing his History of New York. Although Sully evidently never painted Washington Irving from life (he did a posthumous portrait at the very end of his career in 1871), the author’s letter to Rebecca Gratz opened many doors for the young newcomer. Good as Sully’s portraits were, however, he earned very little, mainly due to the Embargo which forced him to continue his “thrift” prices for at least twenty-six of them. He therefore concluded that if he could afford to do so, now was the auspicious moment for him to go to London, where he might learn to improve his abilities.

Six of Sully’s friends advanced him $200 each so that he could make the trip. In return for this money he agreed to paint for each of the gentlemen a copy of some old master, a pledge which he faithfully kept, although he later said, “I will not dwell upon the slavery I went through nor the close economy used to enable me to fulfill my engagement; but although habitually industrious, I never passed nine months of such incessant application.”

Having become an American citizen a month before his departure, Sully arrived in Liverpool on July 13, 1809. Shortly thereafter, armed with letters of introduction, he presented himself to Benjamin West who, as was his custom, received the newcomer cordially. But like Stuart,
he too wanted to see a sample of Sully’s work before proceeding with any instruction, so Sully painted a portrait of the American artist Charles B. King, who befriended Sully in London, and with whom he later shared rooms. Although West had many good things to say about the portrait, he evidently detected a certain anatomical indecision about it and suggested that Sully study osteology, especially, as a portraitist, the structure of the head.

This Sully did (although it was never his forte to do powerfully three-dimensional portraits), but since West by this time was himself painting mostly historical paintings, he suggested that Sully seek out portraitists for more pertinent experience. Sully possessed as well a letter of introduction from Edward Miles, an English-born miniaturist who had worked in the Czarist court before finally settling in Philadelphia, to Sir Thomas Lawrence. Presenting himself to Lawrence, Sully, who found him “the most finished gentleman I ever met,” was warmly received. Lawrence, who was a great friend of the Kembles, presented the young American artist, whose parents had been actors, to them. Sully later painted two or three portraits of Charles Kemble, and about a dozen of his daughter Fanny, often in some of her most famous theatrical roles, when they were in this country in the early 1830’s. From Lawrence himself Sully carried away an infusion of that artist’s style which was to remain with him, particularly in his portraits of women, forever after.

Back in Philadelphia in 1810 Sully, while continuing to paint portraits, also started to do compositions based on scenes from plays. Established as a “History and Portrait Painter,” his career during the next few years met with sufficient success to relieve him from his former financial difficulties. In 1818 when the North Carolina legislature asked him to paint two full-length portraits of Washington, Sully proposed instead a large scene showing Washington crossing the Delaware. Evidently through some slip-up, Sully never learned that there was no place large enough in the North Carolina capitol building to receive a 17’ 4” x 12’ 5” painting, so Sully finally had to sell it for $500 to the Boston frame maker and picture dealer John Doggett (who previously had commissioned Stuart to paint copies of five of his presidential portraits, including those of Jefferson and Madison at Bowdoin). Doggett
sold the Sully to the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston where it now hangs.

With the death of Charles Willson Peale in 1827 and Gilbert Stuart the following year, Sully found himself the most eminent portraitist in the land. In 1837 he decided to go once again to England to try his hand in a field since vacated by the deaths of many of the portraitists (especially Raeburn and Lawrence) who had flourished there at the time of his first visit. When his projected trip was announced, a subscription of about $300 was raised among several admirers, whose treasurer was John Vaughan (one of the versions of whose portrait by Sully is in the present collection), and Sully was presented with some memento or the actual purse.

On the eve of Sully’s departure for London he was commissioned by the Society of the Sons of St. George in Philadelphia to paint a portrait of the newly crowned Queen, Victoria. The Queen consented, and Sully painted an oil sketch as well as several other studies upon which he based a half-length version for the St. George Society. While in England, Sully painted several other portraits (one of which, that of Miss Elizabeth Anne Bates, about to become Mme Van de Weyer, is in the present collection).

After a brief trip to Paris to see the Louvre and other collections, Sully returned to Philadelphia in the fall of 1838. His fame greater than ever, he enjoyed an extensive patronage which continued almost until the end of his life. Sully, who had been the recipient of many kindnesses from artists in his youth, was in his turn helpful to younger artists after he had become successful. Although his Hints to Young Painters, dealing with his method of painting portraits, was prepared for the press in 1851, it was not published until a year after his death in 1873.

JOHN VAUGHAN (1756-1841)

Oil on canvas, 30 x 25, 1823

John Vaughan was born in London, the son of Samuel Vaughan and Sarah Hallowell. In 1783 he and his father came to the United States, to Philadelphia where the following year both were elected members of the American Philosophical Society. As secretary (1789-91), treas-
urer (1791-1841), and librarian (1803-41), John Vaughan was “for half a century the voice and heart of Franklin’s Philosophical Society.” A bachelor—although “from his social qualities many a fair one wondered why it should be so”—Vaughan was known for his breakfasts which were held in the rooms of the society, which were as intellectual as they were convivial.³

Vaughan was a wine merchant and for a time apparently housed at least part of his stock in the cellars of (or belonging to) the American Philosophical Society, for which he paid £250 in advance for the period 1790-1800.⁴ Perhaps as an outgrowth of his business activities in this area, he was also Portuguese Consul in Philadelphia.⁵ In addition, he was merchant agent of the Dupont’s powder factory.⁶

But Vaughan’s business interests were not so extensive as to preclude considerable attention to the affairs of the American Philosophical Society, and during the period of his association with that organization his name appeared more frequently in its Proceedings than that of any other member. Although some of his activities in relation to the society were rather mundane in nature (as, for example, directing the “fixing up of Lightning conductors”), it was he who conceived the idea of a picture gallery in the society, and who was mainly responsible for the building up of its library. It was in fact largely because of his efforts in respect to the latter that his portrait was ordered for the former. The following appears in the minutes of a meeting of the society on June 20, 1823: Resolved, that the librarian, Mr. John Vaughan, on consideration of his extraordinary care and attention to the library, for his great exertions in procuring contributions for it and for his own, very liberal donations, receive the special thanks of the Society, and Resolved, that he be requested to sit for his portrait to be executed at the expense of the Society, and preserved in their Hall, as a token of the sense which they entertain of his merits and services. Unanimously adopted.

According to Sully’s “Account of Pictures,”⁷ his portrait of Vaughan for the American Philosophical Society was begun on July 29 and finished on September 13, 1823.⁸ The portrait was exhibited at a meeting of the society on October 3, 1823, and an appropriation of $100 was authorized in payment of Sully’s fee. The version of the portrait in the
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Bowdoin College collection was, according to Sully's "Account of Pictures," painted "for myself" and was begun on August 20 and finished on September 12, 1823.9

Vaughan was a friend and admirer of Sully's, and when Sully went to London in 1837 Vaughan was the treasurer of a subscription of about $300 which was presented to the artist either in the form of a memento or of the actual purse itself. Sully, who painted a total of six portraits of Vaughan,10 showed him in the present example, appropriately enough, with his hand upon a volume stamped with the initials of the society he loved. After Vaughan's death a fellow Philadelphian described him in the following terms: No one of our citizens has ever been more widely known. . . . The delight which other men take in making money, he took in rendering services, in discharging benevolent offices. . . . He was "given to hospitality." In this respect he gave a character to our city; and, in the minds of hosts of strangers from all parts of the country and from abroad, the name of Mr. Vaughan represented the city as faithfully as its own name, "Brotherly Love." His vivacity never wore out.11

1. The ligature "TS" together with the date 1823, which according to a record in the museum's files once existed in the lower right corner of the volume stamped "APS" Vaughan is holding, are no longer visible to the naked eye.
3. One such breakfast which took place in Nov., 1818 is described in a letter of Jared Sparks (later president of Harvard). Quoted in Herbert B. Adams, The Life and Writings of Jared Sparks (Boston and New York, 1893), pp. 133-34.
5. Adams, loc. cit.
6. Ibid.
7. Sometimes referred to as "Sully's Register." (Original manuscript in The Historical Society of Pennsylvania.)
8. Hart, no. 1742; Biddle and Fielding, no. 1842.
9. Hart, no. 1744; Biddle and Fielding, no. 1843. Both sources mistakenly state that this version was in The Historical Society of Pennsylvania. An old label formerly on the verso of the present version stated that it "passed into possession of the Pinckneys of South Carolina and came into the possession of Ed-
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ward Abbott through Gen. Huger (?) of Virginia in 187(?)." The Reverend Edward Abbott, the donor, was the son of John Vaughan's niece, Harriet Vaughan of Hallowell, Maine.

10. Sully painted two portraits of Vaughan before those described above: One, listed by Sully as "for myself" (Hart, no. 1740; Biddle and Fielding, no. 1844), started July 1, 1815 (no date of completion given); and the other, "copied from my 1st" (Hart, no. 1741; Biddle and Fielding, no. 1845), started Jan. 10, 1822 (no date of completion given). Two more, smaller than all the others, were also painted in 1823: a "Head—for sale" (Hart, no. 1743; Biddle and Fielding, no. 1845), started Aug. 18 and completed on Sept. 17; and a version "10 x 8" (Hart, no. 1745; Biddle and Fielding, no. 1846), Sept. 17-20.


1908.27 Gift of the Reverend Edward Abbott, grandnephew of the sitter.

ELIZABETH ANNE BATES (1820-78)

Oil on canvas, 30 x 25
Signed and dated l.l. TS 1837

Elizabeth Anne Bates was the daughter of Joshua Bates and his wife Lucretia Sturgis. Elizabeth was born in London, where her father had gone shortly after the failure of a business partnership in Boston during the War of 1812. Joshua Bates ultimately became a partner in the banking house of Baring Brothers in London, and in 1852 was a founder of the Boston Public Library, where Bates Hall is named in his honor. In addition to his original benefaction of $50,000, Bates later made a second donation of nearly 27,000 volumes to the library.

According to Sully's "Account of Pictures," this portrait of Elizabeth Anne Bates was the first he painted after his arrival in London. It was begun on November 29 and completed on December 26, 1837, and the price listed is $250. Sully and his twenty-three-year-old daughter Blanche, who had accompanied him to England, apparently knew the Bates family socially as well, for in a letter Blanche wrote home she speaks of having been entertained in the Bates house where she was introduced to the Belgian Minister, of whom she said: "by the way, he has
the handsomest legs I ever saw.” This gentleman, Sylvain van de Weyer, married Elizabeth Anne Bates the following year. After the overthrow of the kingdom of The Netherlands (which had included both Holland and Belgium) in the Revolution of 1830, Van de Weyer was one of the five delegates to represent the grievances of Belgium to the Dutch king. When, with the consent of the British government, Belgium became an independent kingdom, Van de Weyer was appointed Minister to the Court of St. James, a post which he held until 1867. He died in 1874. Like Elizabeth’s father, her husband also was a lover of books, of which he formed a distinguished private collection.

It is particularly fitting that the final portrait in this catalogue should have been painted in the year that marked the conclusion of an epoch, by an artist who a few weeks later would paint another portrait of a young girl almost exactly the same age, a queen who had just ascended the English throne, and who would give her name to a whole new era.

1. Hart, no. 93; Biddle and Fielding, no. 100. (See footnote 7 in the preceding entry.)

1962.2 Gift of Mr. John Halford, class of 1907, and Mrs. Halford.
APPENDIX A
PIERRE BAUDOUIN AND THE COMING OF THE BOWDOINS TO AMERICA

Pierre Baudouin* was a French Huguenot, who fled with his wife Elizabeth and their four children, John (who may have been the eldest), James, Elizabeth, and Mary, from France not later than 1684, as a result of the persecution of Protestants which culminated in the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. Before coming to America, the Baudouins resided for about two years in Wexford, near Dublin, Ireland, where Pierre found employment in the customs service.

The Baudouins probably sailed for America shortly after May 6, 1686, the date of a Wexford document certifying that customs had been collected from “Peter Bodwin merchant” on the merchandise aboard the barque John of Dublin. (A Dublin deposition of July 17, 1684, attested to the ownership of that vessel by “Peter Bodouin a protestant stranger.”) The family arrived in this country sometime before November 9, 1686, the date of a document written in Salem in which “Peter Baudouin” accepted payment for the sale of the John of Dublin and referred to himself as a resident of Salem.

In a document written some time before August 2, 1687 (the date it was endorsed by its recipient), Baudouin, writing in French, petitioned Governor Edmund Andros as follows: The rigors now being exercised against the Protestants in France obliged him to depart thence with his family and seek refuge in the realm of Ireland in the city of Dublin in which place it pleased the receivers of His Majesty’s customs to employ him in that service; but afterwards there was a change of officials and he was left without employment. This was what caused the petitioner and his family which numbers six persons to withdraw into these territories, in the town of Casco in the county of Mayne; and since there are many lands which are not occupied there . . . may it please your Excellency to decree that they may be delivered up to the petitioner up to the amount of a hundred acres so that he may be able to support his family.

The grant was made, and while no house is mentioned in the official description of the claim dated November 30, 1687, it is possible that the Baudouins may have lived on a piece of land of some five acres in what is now Portland, purchased from Anthony Brackett and entered
in the Book of Eastern Claims on April 4, 1687. Two other documents place Pierre in Maine the following year.

It should also be mentioned, however, that a “Peter Bowden” was listed on the Boston Tax List for the year 1687, although the only property he was recorded as owning was a horse. “Peter Bowden” was also named as one of twelve “honest and lawful men” impaneled on a Boston jury the same year, but without the designation “merchant of Boston” applied to the other eleven jurors.

If we cannot be certain of exactly when the Baudouins may have come to Maine, or for how long they could have lived there, they surely must have left before the siege and destruction of Falmouth (now Portland) by the French and Indians in May of 1690. There is ample evidence that the family was living in Boston in the last decade of the seventeenth century, and it was doubtless during this period that their surname evolved into its present form, for Pierre Baudouin’s last will and testament of June 16, 1704 (two years before his death) is signed, “Peter Bowdoin.”

* The information contained in this biography was drawn from the researches on the Bowdoins in Gerard J. Brault’s “Pierre Baudouin and the Bowdoin Coat of Arms,” The New England Historical and Genealogical Register, Vol. 114 (1960), pp. 243-68. (Professor Brault, a former member of the Bowdoin College faculty, is now on the faculty of Pennsylvania State University.)

1. As early as 1698 John is mentioned in the court records of Northampton (now Accomack) County, Virginia, where he later is known to have been engaged in business. In 1703 John and his brother James (“Marriners in the Towne of Boston”) purchased 200 acres of land there, but James sold his interests in Virginia to his brother in 1707.

2. Either before or after her brother John became interested in Virginia, Elizabeth married Thomas Robins, one of the proprietors of Chincoteague Island in Northampton County.

3. Mary married the Boston merchant Stephen Boutineau in 1708. Portraits of their son James and his wife Susannah Faneuil, which appear to be by Feke, were discovered in London in 1960 and are now in a private collection in this country. It seems reasonable to assume that they were done in Boston in 1748, the same year Feke painted their Bowdoin aunts and uncles, and probably were taken to England when the Boutineaus fled Boston before the Revolution. James, one of Governor Gage’s Mandamus Councillors, was one of the “notorious Conspirators” listed in the Massachusetts Conspiracy Act of April 30, 1779 (confiscating all his properties).
APPENDIX B

JAMES BOWDOIN III AS ART COLLECTOR

In his will James Bowdoin III bequeathed to Bowdoin College “all my pictures excepting family pictures.” Since this catalogue has dealt with the family portraits, which were subsequently bequeathed to the college by Mrs. Bowdoin, it would also seem an appropriate place to discuss a few of the paintings and drawings bequeathed by her husband, with special emphasis on those which have been associated in one way or another with John Smibert. Documents relating to the paintings acquired by James Bowdoin III during the course of his diplomatic mission will be reviewed, and a few letters which disclose his interest in sculpture (even though none was included in his bequest) will be cited.

On March 22, 1805, just before his departure for Spain, Bowdoin wrote President Jefferson as follows: Will you permit me to make a tender of my services in procuring for you any specimens of ye Arts, either in sculpture or painting: & although I am no adept, yet from having been in Italy & having viewed the works of ye best Masters, if you would entrust me with your Commissions, I would execute them in the best manner in my power. Accident having thrown in my way a handsome piece of Modern Sculpture, a Cleopatra copied & reduced from the ancient one now at Paris, which for many years lay at the Palace of Belvidere at Rome: as I think it for the fineness of its Marble & the Neatness of its workmanship & finishing, among the best of ye Modern pieces of Sculpture, you will do me the favour to accept it & to place it in a Corner of your hall at Monticello: for which purpose I shall take the liberty of shipping it to you by ye first convenient opportunity. I was told it was purchased of a French Comissary in Italy, who wanted money: & that it had been taken from the apartments in ye Vatican, which were built by Pope Ganganelli Clement ye 14th, who was liberal as a Pope, & distinguished as a man of Taste & learning.

In Jefferson’s response dated April 27, 1805, while he made no mention of Bowdoin’s offer to be his agent in procuring works of art abroad for him, he thanked Bowdoin “for the sentiments of esteem you are so good as to express towards me and the mark of it you wish me to place at Monticello.” He then added, oddly enough for such a sculpture (even though it turned out to be an Ariadne instead of a Cleopatra).
"It shall be deposited with the memorials of those worthies, whose remembrance I feel a pride & comfort in consecrating there."

A letter (of which there remains only a fragment) written by Bowdoin from Paris, probably to his nephew Grenville Temple in Rome (see Bowdoin's subsequent letter of May 1, 1807, to the same recipient, below), is apparently the first in which Bowdoin expressed his interest in acquiring some sculpture for himself. He wrote: *As soon as I can arrange our affairs with Spain, or by ye means of placing them upon the basis of War or permanent peace, I shall aim to return to ye U. S. and I shall be obliged to you for your enquiries respecting some pieces of Statuary for my Hall in Boston. I believe Florence or Leghorn are the best places to procure them. Perhaps 4 or 6 pieces would be as many as I could wish for. I should like a few Busts for the ornament of my Library. I shall be much obliged to you for yr enquiries & for your judgement of such as you should think suitable. The Hall is 11 ft 4 inches high.* In a letter of May 1, 1807, to Grenville Temple, Bowdoin wrote: *Being acquainted that Mr. John Sullivan was about to embark to Leghorn for Boston, & supposing that through him, I should have ye best opportunity of procuring the Marble Busts of which I wrote you, I desired Mr. Sullivan my Secretary to request his Brother to purchase me 6 Busts at Leghorn & to ship them on board ye same vessel in which he might embark, but unfortunately my instructions did not reach him timely & Mr. Richard Sullivan, in consequence of the departure of his brother without fulfilling the Commission presuming it wdc be agreeable to me, has bespoke them of one of the principal sculptors at Florence.* On June 18, 1807, Bowdoin wrote his nephew once again: *Mr. Richard Sullivan has authorized Mr. Dagen to procure for me six Marble Busts with Pedestals to be sent out by the first convenient opportunity for Boston & to draw upon me at Paris for the amount. I shall be obliged to you to write Mr. Dagen on the subject, that he may see them to be well executed and shipped as soon as may be, as my Residence at Paris may not be of much longer continuance. . . ." Bowdoin's last letter to Grenville Temple regarding these sculptures was written at Cherbourg on October 28, 1807: *With respect to ye Marble Busts ordered by Mr. Sullivan, I have not heard a word of them: if they have been shipped Mr. Dagen has not drawn upon me for their amount. . . ."* If Bowdoin ever did receive these sculptures, the present writer has not been able to locate any records relating to them.
Concerning paintings Bowdoin acquired during the course of his diplomatic mission, in a letter of May 13, 1806, addressed to a “Madam O’Brien,” who apparently supervised his house in Boston in his absence, he wrote: I have a box of Books & a box of Pictures. The Pictures I wish may be hung up in some safe place until my return: they are good pictures, original except in one or two instances & have been bought at small price. They cost 992 livres with their frames which with 13½ louis d’ors, the value of three portraits in ye Box, will make ye whole cost of ye pictures 1316 livres. There are thirteen pictures & three portraits: viz. Mrs. Bowdoin’s, Sarahs & Mr. Sullivans: ye two first are sent to you & Mrs. Winthrop as presents from Mrs. B. & Sarah. Mr. Sullivan desires that his may be sent to his mother.8 Regarding this shipment, on November 26, 1806, Mrs. Thomas Lindall Winthrop wrote her aunt, Mrs. Sarah Bowdoin, in Paris. After stating that she was at the time having her portrait painted by Stuart, referring to him, she said: He has seen these pictures, which were sent out from Paris, and thinks several of them have merit. He is also pleased with yours. Sarah he knows nothing of, but is surprised that you both have acquired the French character, which appears the case from these pictures.9

The only other known reference to paintings acquired by Bowdoin during this stay abroad appears in a copy of an undated document recorded in his letterbooks between copies of letters dated October 13 and October 15, 1807. The document is headed: “General Invoice of Effects belonging to James Bowdoin, minister of the United States near the court of his Catholic Majesty, to be shipped on board the Hiram, brig, lying at Nantes,” and item “No. 3” being “21 pictures and 2 picture frames 1308 livres.”

The total number of paintings (excluding the three portraits of Mrs. Bowdoin, Sarah Winthrop, and George Sullivan—see footnote 8) cited in the preceding two documents is thirty-four. If Bowdoin acquired additional paintings during the course of his diplomatic mission, the present writer has been unable to locate any record of them. In any event, there are reasons for believing that some of the seventy paintings James Bowdoin III bequeathed to Bowdoin College came from other sources. (Two of them—the portraits of Jefferson and Madison—were, of course, painted by Stuart on commission from Bowdoin.)
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Certain of the paintings in the Bowdoin bequest have been believed by some to be copies of old masters by John Smibert. Chief among these is a copy of Nicholas Poussin’s *Continence of Scipio*. The original was painted for Francesco Cardinal Barberini (1597-1679) in 1643; it was later in the De Morville Collection in France, and in the eighteenth century belonged to the Walpoles in England, where it was first at Houghton and later at Strawberry Hill until about 1784 when it was sold to Catherine the Great; it is now in the Hermitage, Leningrad.

The earliest document which identifies the Bowdoin *Scipio* as being a copy by Smibert is a manuscript “Catalogue of Pictures belonging to the Estate of the late Hon. James Bowdoin Esq. bequeathed by him to Bowdoin College,” which was given to the College in 1928 by a descendant of Jesse Appleton, president of Bowdoin at the time of the bequest, and which probably is contemporary with the bequest. The entry referring to the *Scipio* is as follows:

No 3  *Continence of Scipio*  
Scipio restores to the Celtiberian Prince, Allucicius, his spouse, a captive in the Roman camp. 

Painter unknown  
Copy by Smybert: Original lost at Sea.\(^\text{10}\)

In view of the fact that the manuscript catalogue cited above did not come into the possession of the museum until 1928, and since the inventory of the Bowdoin bequest of pictures made in Boston on February 5, 1813, by John Abbott, and transmitted to the College shortly thereafter, only identified the author of the *Scipio* as “Painter unknown,” no reference was made to its being a copy by Smibert in the manuscript catalogue of 1852-55\(^\text{11}\) or the printed ones of 1870, 1895, 1903, 1906, and (even) 1930. The next museum publication to deal, in part, with the Bowdoin Collection was the *Illustrated Handbook*, issued in 1950. In attributing the *Scipio* to Smibert, it stated: “In 1941, while X-raying the Bowdoin Collection, Mr. Alan Burroughs rediscovered the authorship and history of a series of puzzling paintings.” (The other two will be discussed below.) In connection with these pictures, however, Burroughs himself, in an article published in 1942, stated: “Only one of these has been recognized as by Smibert, *The Continence of Scipio*, which is a faithful and energetic copy of Poussin’s painting in the Hermitage.”\(^\text{12}\) It would seem
from this that the first information concerning the authorship of the *Scipio* had come from the manuscript catalogue from the Appleton papers, and that it probably had been considered before Burroughs X-rayed the picture in 1941. Foote, in his monograph on Smibert, published in 1950, accepted the Bowdoin *Scipio* as a copy by Smibert.  

There is ample evidence that a version of Poussin’s *Scipio* once existed in Smibert’s studio in Boston. On July 1, 1743, Smibert wrote Arthur Pond, his London dealer in artists’ supplies and prints, as follows: *I have for a long time intended to send for ye pictures etc which my Nephew left with you, but delayed on act. of the war, which as there is no appearance of being over think, it now best to have them over here again, for as you long ago wrote me you had sold none of them here so desires you will order them to be carefully packed up in a good case & sent by the first opportunity for this Port . . . amongst ye pictures which you my Nephew tells me he thinks you used to like ye Venus Nymphs etc. by Pooelenburgh, be so good as to accept of that picture to remember me by or any other of the Pictures you like except ye Scipio. . . .*  

Copley saw such a picture in Smibert’s studio and referred to it in a letter written from Paris on September 2, 1774, to his half brother Henry Pelham in Boston, as follows: *I shall return to the Pallais Royalle, which we saw yester Day. . . . In the chamber of Poussins are his Seven Sacra-
ments . . . they are very Dark, much more so than his Scipeo at Smibert’s, and about the same size of that.*  

The Poussins Copley saw in Paris, where they were then in the collection of the Duc d’Orléans, are now in the collection of the Earl of Ellesmere, and measure 45 1/2 x 69 1/2 inches which is very close to the size of the Bowdoin *Scipio*, which measures 45 1/2 x 62 3/4. (The original *Scipio* by Poussin, now in the Hermitage, measures 45 x 62.) Copley almost certainly knew Smibert and could have seen the version of the *Scipio* that was in Smibert’s studio as early as 1744 (described in Hamilton’s *Itinerarium*, to be discussed below). If Copley did not see such a picture before Smibert’s death in 1751, he saw it afterwards, when Smibert’s studio remained in the custody of his nephew John Moffatt, who continued to operate the Smibert “Colour Shop” throughout the years before Copley left America. Yet, if either Smibert or Moffatt told him it was a copy by Smibert, Copley omitted mention of that fact,
and moreover seems to have implied that what he saw was an original Poussin. That Copley did not say that the *Scipio* was a copy pure and simple (quite aside from the question of whether or not Smibert had done it) may have been because he had not seen the original, for when he did refer elsewhere in his correspondence with Henry Pelham to other pictures in Smibert’s studio as being copies, it was always in comparison with pictures the originals of which he had seen. In no case, however, did Copley ever state that any of these copies was by Smibert.

The first artist to do so was John Trumbull, who was in Boston from late in 1777 until late in 1779 and rented Smibert’s studio during part of that time. In a “list of drawings and pictures executed before my first voyage to Europe,” Trumbull cited three paintings he “copied from Smibert’s copy,” including “The Continence of Scipio; copied, with essential variations, from Mr. Smibert’s copy of N. Poussin; at Mr. Wadhsworth’s, Hartford, in perfect preservation.”

Unfortunately, Trumbull’s *Scipio* is unlocated. Despite its “essential variations” from the version he copied at Smibert’s, it would be helpful if it were possible to compare it with the one at Bowdoin, inasmuch as this version may not be the same as that which Dr. Alexander Hamilton saw in Smibert’s studio on July 24, 1744, which he described as follows: *I went this night to visit Mr. Smibert, the limner, where I saw a collection of fine pictures, among the rest that part of Scipio’s history in Spain where he delivers the lady to the prince to whom she had been betrothed. The passions are all well touched in the severall faces. Scipio’s face expresses a majestic generosity, that of the young prince in gratitude, the young lady’s gratitude and modest love, and some Roman souldiers standing under a row of pillars apart in seeming discourse, have admiration delineated in their faces. But what I admired most of the painter’s fancy in this piece is an image or phantome of chastity behind the solium upon which Scipio sits, standing on tip-toe to crown him and yet appears as if she could not reach his head which expresses a good emblem of the virtue of this action.* In the *Scipio* at Bowdoin, the “Roman souldiers” are not “standing under a row of pillars.” It should be pointed out at once that the original Poussin in the Hermitage has no such “pillars” either. It may be that Hamilton was mistaken about this point in his recollection of the picture, particularly inasmuch as he seems to have concentrated in
the main on a discussion of its psychological content. Yet, we cannot be
certain whether or not the Scipio Hamilton saw in Smibert’s studio in
1744 was the same one Trumbull copied there c. 1777-79. In any event,
we have only Trumbull’s word that the Scipio he copied was a copy by
Smibert, information that he might have learned from John Moffatt,
who died between July 9, 1777, the date of his will, and November 21,
1777, the date his will was probated. And the entry in the manuscript
catalogue from the Appleton papers, coupled with Burrough’s labora-
tory investigations and Foote’s opinion, constitutes the body of evidence
we have that the copy of Nicholas Poussin’s The Continence of Scipio at
Bowdoin is by Smibert.

Concerning the other two paintings referred to above as having been
X-rayed by Burroughs in 1941, in the same article published in 1942,
already mentioned in connection with the Scipio, Burroughs also stated:
What has not been recognized is that the bust portrait of Jean de Montfort
is painted in the same manner and may reasonably be considered a copy made by
Smibert from the three-quarter length portrait by Van Dyck which had been in
Florence since 1704. The difference between the copy and the original is inter-
esting, since Smibert strengthened the brushwork throughout. And he appears
to have attempted the same experiment, if he was actually the copier, in the por-
trait of Luigi Cornaro (Bowdoin College), the original of which was attributed
to Titian in the early XVIIIth century but was later (in the Pitti Palace, Flo-
rence) attributed to Tintoretto. Both copies are boldly done. Whether or not
Burroughs made the rather tentative suggestions given here more de-
finite, the present writer does not know, but in any event, Foote, in his
monograph of 1950 on Smibert, published the Bowdoin copies of the
Jean de Montfort and the Luigi Cornaro as being by Smibert. (No men-
tion was made of Smibert in connection with either of these portraits in
any of the manuscript or printed catalogues of the Bowdoin Collection.)
That Smibert could have seen the Van Dyck and the Tintoretto during
the three years he spent in Italy between 1717 and 1720, is altogether
possible; and that he painted copies of old masters was testified to by
George Vertue, the English artist to whom we owe much of what we
know about Smibert before he came to America, and who probably got
his information from Smibert himself. Vertue wrote that when Smibert
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was in Florence "there from ye great Dukes pictures he copyd several particularly the Card. Bentivoglo of Vandyke & many other heads making his whole study after Titian Raphael Rubens, &c." And in 1767 Pierre du Simitière, a Swiss artist and natural historian who came to this country about 1764, recorded that he had seen at Dr. Williams Smibert's: *a large collection of original Drawings of the best masters Prints mostly Italian, Pictures, several of them originals & some done by his father John Smibert a good painter chiefly portraits & a good collection of casts in plâisier of Paris from the best antiques, besides basso relievos seals & other curiosities.*

While the present writer is not convinced that the three copies cited above were painted by Smibert, it is possible that a case can be made for another picture in the Bowdoin bequest, a copy of Titian's *The Blinding of Cupid*, which was not mentioned by either Burroughs or Foote. This painting was cited in the manuscript catalogue from the Appleton papers as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 2</th>
<th>Venus blinding Cupid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An original by Titian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presented to Smybert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as a reward for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>his Industry, by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the grand Duke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Tuscany from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>his own Gallery—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where this information could have come from, we do not know, but since the original Titian has been in the Borghese in Rome at least since the Borghese inventory of 1613, the best Cosimo III, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, could have owned was a copy of it. Even if Smibert were not involved in our speculations, one would think immediately that the Bowdoin *Venus Blinding Cupid* was a copy by an eighteenth-century English hand. But Venus's face, in particular, recalls the facial types we find in Smibert's female portraits to such an extent, that one is inclined to believe that this copy could well be by his hand. Whether or not any of these paintings is a copy by Smibert, however, has yet to be proved. That they still may have come from his studio is a question we will take up after a discussion of a few of the drawings from the Bowdoin bequest. In a letter (in the Bowdoin College Library) from John Abbott to
Thomas L. Winthrop dated December 21, 1811, relating to the arrival of the Bowdoin drawings, together with some of the books from his library, the former were described only as follows:

Collection of Drawings, Folio No. 1
Collection of Drawings, Folio No. 2

Everything arrived safe, and opened in excellent order.

Of the 142 drawings in the Bowdoin bequest, three bear notations which relate them to Smibert, and were accepted as being by him beginning with what is the first known catalogue of the drawings made by the Reverend Fred W. Hall in manuscript in 1881 and continuing through the 1930 edition of the Descriptive Catalogue of the Art Collections of Bowdoin College.

One of these is a portrait in black crayon heightened with white, inscribed on the mount in an unidentified eighteenth-century hand: “Cosmo the 3rd—Grand Duke of Tuscany. from the life, by John Smibert.” Frank Jewett Mather, Jr., in an article on the drawings at Bowdoin published in 1914, although he stated that “Three sketches by the colonial portrait painter, John Smibert . . . deserve mention,” only cited the above example which he said “must have been made in 1717, when Smibert made his grand tour.” Hagen, in 1940, after an elaborate argument, concluded that the drawing was “a copy by Smibert after an original Magnasco.” Foote, who stated that “Professor Hagen’s theory is highly ingenious but not very convincing,” did not accept the drawing as being by Smibert. He also suggested that it probably was “bought by James Bowdoin when he purchased other pictures from Smibert’s studio at the time that its contents were dispersed.”

The second is a circular drawing in pen and wash, with a hollow center, the subject matter of which is unidentified, but which depicts soldiers leading sheep and cattle into a town and mules with provisions on their backs out of it into a military encampment with tents, with a battle scene in the background. In the center of the paper on which the drawing is mounted is written in pencil in an old hand: “John Smibeth.” The opinions of three authorities on old master drawings are recorded on the card for the drawing in the museum’s files. Sir Robert Witt believed that the drawing was “German c. 1550,” Hans Tietze felt that it was “At least
200 years earlier than Smibert,” and Frits Lugt stated that it was “Flemish 16th century, style of Hans Bol.” Foote was of the opinion that “The drawing appears to date from the sixteenth century, and there is no good reason for attributing it to Smibert.”

The third drawing is a study in pen and brush of Daedalus and Icarus. In the upper left-hand corner of the paper with which the drawing is backed, “John Smibert” is written in a neat eighteenth-century hand. Sir Robert Witt felt that the drawing looked “Italian about 1600,” and Hans Tietze was of the opinion that it was “not by Smibert—much earlier.” (There is no record of any remarks made by Frits Lugt.) Foote stated that the drawing “appears to belong to an earlier period,” and added, If the handwriting is Smibert’s, which is improbable, it might signify his ownership of the drawing. If the handwriting is by another it might signify either that the drawing had been in Smibert’s collection, or that it was mistakenly attributed to him.

The present writer shares the view generally held that none of these drawings is by Smibert. Foote’s suggestion that two of them might have belonged to Smibert is a good one, and it is possible that more, if not all, of the drawings in the Bowdoin bequest may have come from that source. The inventory of Smibert’s estate, made in 1752, cited “Drawings” valued at £4.16. It will be recalled that Pierre du Simitière had seen “a large collection of original Drawings of the best masters” in the possession of Dr. Williams Smibert, the artist’s son, in 1767. And the inventory of John Moffatt’s estate, filed in 1779 (two years after Moffatt’s death), contained the entry “Twenty-two Past board books with Various Drawings” valued at £49.13.1.

Some of the paintings in the Bowdoin bequest also may have belonged to John Smibert at one time. An advertisement in the Boston News-Letter of May 15-22, 1735, stated (in part): To be Sold, at Mr. Smibert’s . . . A Collection of valuable PRINTS, engrav’d by the best Hands, after the finest Pictures in Italy, France, Holland, and England, done by Raphael, Michael Angelo, Poussin, Rubens, and other the greatest Masters . . . being what Mr. Smibert collected in the above-mentioned Countries, for his own private Use & Improvement . . . At the same Time, there will be Sold a Collection of Pictures in Oil Colours. At Dr. Smibert’s, Du Simitière also had seen “Pictures,
several of them originals....” In the inventory of John Smibert’s estate, in addition to the “Drawings” already mentioned, there were “35 portraits” (£60.5.4); “41 History pieces & pictures in that taste” (£16); “13 Landskips” (£2.13); and “2 Conversation Pictures” (£23.6.8).\(^{35}\) In addition to the “Twenty-two Past board books with Various Drawings” in the inventory of John Moffatt’s estate, also cited were “Six large Pictures” (£40); “Twenty [illegible] Ditto smaller sorts” [value illegible]; and “Pictures from [illegible] to 64” [value illegible].

Just when James Bowdoin III may have acquired drawings and/or paintings which might have belonged to John Smibert, we do not know, but it seems likely that it probably would not have been before about 1780, the year in which Bowdoin married, and presumably began furnishing his own household. From whom Bowdoin could have acquired such works of art is not entirely clear, but it should be pointed out that even after John Moffatt’s death in 1777, the Smibert studio apparently remained partially intact at least until 1808, when John Johnston, who may have been its last occupant, sold Smibert’s Berkeley Group to Isaac Lothrop.\(^{36}\) (As noted earlier in this catalogue, Nathaniel Smibert’s unfinished portrait of Samson Occom, which was among the pictures James Bowdoin III bequeathed to Bowdoin College, could have been acquired by him from the Smibert studio, where it probably had remained after Nathaniel Smibert’s death.) Unfortunately, however, no final answer can be given at this time as to whether or not any of the paintings and/or drawings in the Bowdoin bequest came from Smibert’s studio; nor has the question of his possible authorship of certain of the copies of old master paintings been solved conclusively as yet. Perhaps upon the publication of the recently discovered Smibert Account Book (see the biographical notice of John Smibert in this catalogue), which does deal with his Italian years, we may find further evidence to help us in our investigations.

That James Bowdoin II ever acquired paintings or drawings from the Smibert studio, or anywhere else, seems improbable since none were listed in his will.\(^{37}\) The 125 “pictures” (otherwise unidentified) cited in the inventory of his household effects made in 1774 probably were prints rather than paintings, inasmuch as their total valuation was only
£7.3.\(^8\) Prints, of course, were sold in the Smibert "Colour Shop," and could have been acquired there by James II. And the above inventory also cited "5 figures in plaster of Pallas" valued at £5.5, which probably were not very different from those Du Simitière had seen at Dr. Smibert's, or those in the Moffatt inventory ("A parcel of Heads etc. in Plaister of Paris").

James Bowdoin III's taste in painting embraced the work of Italian, French, Dutch, Flemish, and German artists, ranging in subject matter from classical and religious works (of both the Old and New Testaments) to genre, still life, and landscape. But it is among the drawings, which include fine examples by such artists as Luca Cambiaso, Nicholas Poussin, and Pieter Breughel the Elder, that we find the most important works of art bequeathed to Bowdoin College by James Bowdoin III.

1. James Bowdoin III Letterbooks, Bowdoin College Library.
2. Jefferson Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society; Jefferson's (polygraph?) copy, Library of Congress; also, JB III Letterbooks, BCL.
3. Information supplied in a letter dated June 7, 1966, from James A. Bear, Jr., Curator, Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, to the present writer. Mr. Bear also wrote: "The statue was taken to Boston in 1828 where it was offered for sale at the Athenaeum with the bulk of the Monticello paintings. They were offered for sale again in 1833 at Chester Harding's studio. Few were sold at either sale." The Ariadne was among the pieces kept by Joseph Coolidge, the husband of Thomas Jefferson's granddaughter, Eleonora Randolph, and ultimately restored to Monticello by a descendant in 1928.
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9. Mason, p. 266. (Original letter, Winthrop Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society.)
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15. Copley-Pelham Letters, p. 245.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 55. The other two paintings were: "Head of Cardinal Bentivoglio; copied from Smibert's copy of Vandyck's celebrated portrait in the Florence Gallery" and "Heads of two boys (Charles and James 2d), copied from Smibert's copy of Vandyck's beautiful picture." In the case of the former, Trumbull's copy is at Harvard University, but "Smibert's copy" is unlocated; in the case of the latter, both copies are unlocated.
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25. *Ibid.*, pp. 230-31. Foote confused this painting with a copy of Titian's *Danaë and the Golden Shower*, which was in the original Bowdoin bequest. It was one of four pictures of "doubtful decency" (letter of Oct. 25, 1849, from Robert C. Winthrop, Sr. to President Leonard Woods in the museum's files) disposed of by the college about 1850 to help defray the expenses of restoring the paintings in the Bowdoin bequest. The others were (appropriately enough): *Venus and Adonis, Lot and His Daughters*, and *Diana and Nymphs Bathing*, of whose authorship there is no record. Concerning the matter of disposing of these works, the Visiting Committee of 1850 stated: "It is understood that there are several paintings in our collection unsuitable for public exhibition, and still more for the private inspection of the young of either sex. Some sections of our own country [Winthrop, in another letter of Oct. 23, 1849, to Woods—as one Yankee to another—thought New Orleans would be a good place to sell the pictures] and most foreigners may think this idea to be founded on a false delicacy but the purity of morals should in our opinion be allowed to hazzard no contamination from spectacles thought among us to be in bad taste, however they may be considered by others differently educated."
27. Hagen, p. 50. Concerning the inscription on the mount of the drawing, Hagen stated: "I am unwilling to believe that the Scot said his drawing was 'from the life' if it was a replica from another artist's picture. I would rather
believe that what was written on the original margin (which was eventually trimmed off) was something like this: 'after a drawing of Magnasco from the life. . . .' After trimming the damaged margin, the later owner copied the legend, but omitted the words 'after a drawing of Magnasco,' the unfamiliar artist and the fact itself were irrelevant to him.” Hagen believed that the drawing had been purchased in France by James Bowdoin III. Admitting that "nothing better than guesswork can tell how the drawing got to France," Hagen (p. 51) offered as a "hypothetical answer" the following: “The Grand Duchess of Tuscany, Marguerite of Orleans, living at Paris at the convent of Montmartre from 1676 to her death in 1721, used to amuse her royal cousin, Louis XIV of France, with funny reports on the latest imbecilities of Cosimo, her estranged husband. It is quite possible that a ‘cartoon’ of Cosimo was included in one of the letters on which her chronique scandaleuse was founded. Most of these letters came to her from her son, Prince Gian Gastone, who was, as we remember, the employer of Magnasco. If Gian Gastone sent his mother a caricature of the old man whom they both detested and ridiculed, it would most likely have been drawn by Magnasco, the Prince's sergeant painter. Moreover, if the Prince enclosed a replica, instead of the original with which he did not wish to part, it was likely to be done by an obliging Mr. Smibert who happened to be in Florence at the time.” (The drawing was exhibited as Smibert in a survey of American drawings from the seventeenth through the twentieth centuries at The Detroit Institute of Arts, April 3-May 30, 1948.)

28. Foote, Smibert, p. 232. Foote also stated: "There is evidence that a second copy of the same drawing was in James Bowdoin’s collection when it was bequeathed to the College in 1813. The College sold it in 1850, and it was last heard of in 1915, when it was advertised for sale.” The present writer can find no evidence that this was the case, and it seems likely that Foote confused his notes about this drawing with those about the Danaë (see footnote 25 above), which was sold in 1850, and the whereabouts of which was known as late as 1915. Foote was also in error concerning the date the drawing was bequeathed to the College, and in referring to the donor as James Bowdoin II in his notes about the drawing.

29. Ibid. (As will be seen in the text of this essay, the contents of Smibert’s studio were dispersed over a considerable period of time, extending as late as 1808.)
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