

# Open Research Online

---

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

## Introduction. Placing Faces in the Country House

### Book Section

#### How to cite:

Perry, Gill; Retford, Kate and Vibert, Jordan (2013). Introduction. Placing Faces in the Country House. In: Perry, Gill; Retford, Kate and Vibert, Jordan eds. Placing Faces: the portrait and the English country house in the long eighteenth century. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2013 The Editors



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:

<https://manchesteruniversitypress.co.uk/9780719090394/placing-faces/>

---

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's [data policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

---

[oro.open.ac.uk](http://oro.open.ac.uk)

# INTRODUCTION: PLACING FACES IN THE COUNTRY HOUSE

**Kate Retford, Gill Perry and Jordan Vibert**

## **Placing Faces**

On 24<sup>th</sup> September 1776, Samuel Curwen, once a Salem merchant but at this date a loyalist exile in England, arrived at the seat of Henry Hoare (1705-85, usually referred to as Henry II) at Stourhead in Wiltshire. After he and his two companions had refreshed themselves at the inn with ‘a cold Collation’ and ‘a bottle of most excellent cyder’, they set off to view the house:

one passes on a flight of noble steps to the center door letting into the hall, by appearance the common sitting room of the owner, when he makes this house his residence; in this hall hangs a full length picture of Mr. Hoare on horseback drawn in younger days, the face, the drapery and the Horse executed by different hands, as the Housekeeper told yet the lines of different pencils are not to be discerned.<sup>1</sup>

Hoare was, by this date, in his early 70s, but the portrait by Michael Dahl, horse by John Wootton, shows him as a young man just after his father had died (plate 01). At the time of its execution, the sitter had not only just inherited the lucrative family business, Hoare’s Bank, but had also recently married Ann, the daughter of Lord Masham.<sup>2</sup> The picture was clearly intended to mark his newfound status. It is a strikingly assertive image, not least in its vast size as the canvas measures roughly three metres square. In his vibrant red waistcoat and

blue coat, Hoare appears calm and in control (perhaps to a degree of boredom), even though his large grey-white stallion rears up onto its hind legs. An expanse of landscape illuminated by the glow of a sunset suggests an ample estate, whilst the column to the left conveys a typical hint of status and the country seat. It was quite an image to be greeted with immediately on walking into the house, and Horace Walpole the decade before had been similarly struck: '*In the Hall; Mr Henry Hoare on a white horse; the horse by Wootton, large as life & good.*'<sup>3</sup>

'Mr Henry Hoare' has to be seen 'In the Hall' at Stourhead: face and place are indelibly linked (figure 01). The messages conveyed by a portrait, indeed any image, are clearly affected by (and affect) the location in which it is displayed: by architecture and adjacent décor; by other pictures and surrounding objects. In recent years, a number of historians of eighteenth-century art have explored such issues of context, but predominantly in relation to the public exhibitions which began in London in the 1760s. The seminal show, *Art on the Line*, held at Somerset House in 2001-2, unpicked the viewing conditions experienced in spaces such as the Royal Academy Great Room, and the ways in which exhibits were presented, experienced and received. In the accompanying volume of essays, scholars such as David Solkin, Marcia Pointon and Gill Perry, amongst others, explored the ramifications of this environment for portraiture, viewers participating in a 'convivial activity of identification, recognition, self-recognition, emulation and self-projection': 'Visitors...would have viewed images of public and private figures interactively, matching existing knowledge and hearsay to what they saw on view, speculating about personal histories, and sharing anecdotes.'<sup>4</sup> Portraitists with business sense tapped into this, painting the celebrities of the day. Joshua Reynolds, for example, was quick off the mark when Lawrence Sterne arrived in London in March 1760, flush with the resounding success of the

first two volumes of *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy*. Reynolds worked quickly enough not only to bring his portrait of the author in front of a curious public at the Society of Artists' exhibition the following year, but also to ensure that the mezzotint by Edward Fisher could be shown in the same display.<sup>5</sup>

But exhibited portraits were then delivered or restored to their owners, packaged up and sent off to the residence which was to be their ultimate destination.<sup>6</sup> And, crucially, much eighteenth-century portraiture either antedated the advent of exhibitions, or was transferred straight from the studio to the house. In the case of family portraits painted for the gentry and aristocracy, this was almost always the country house. You may have displayed your finest old masters in London, but your ancestors were always in the country. As Giles Waterfield has noted: 'The galleries filled with family portraits which Walpole so frequently encountered during his visits to country seats were not found in the capital.'<sup>7</sup> This was partly a matter of pragmatics. A family portrait collection did not have to get very large before it simply wouldn't fit in a town house. But, much more significantly, as is shown again and again in this collection of essays, it was the country house that lay at the heart of an elite family's identity. However much time they spent in London, they would always be 'the Spencers of Althorp' or 'the Herberts of Wilton'. Townhouses were often leased, whilst country houses were expressive of permanence, status and inheritance. They were associated with the founders of a family's fortune and status; they were linked to the land and estate which still underpinned economic and political power; and it was there that lineage and succession were most clearly expressed.<sup>8</sup> Arthur Devis's *Robert Gwillym of Atherton and his Family* (c.1745-7), on the front cover of this book, shows an owner embedded at the heart of his country estate. Gwillym's directive gesture may be restrained and polite, but it

propriatorially takes in his wife and children, his household family as represented by his steward, approaching across the lawn, and, crucially, Atherton Hall in the background.

The country house was not quite a rural equivalent to the exhibitions of the Society of Artists or the Royal Academy, but it is important to note at the outset that, as many of the essays show, these were scarcely ‘private’ homes. In addition to the presence of extended family members, friends, acquaintances, tenants, business and political associates and the like, there was a fair amount of tourism. Samuel Curwen’s perambulation in Wiltshire, trooping around the houses of the great and good, was a pretty characteristic activity for a member of the middling or upper classes at this date.<sup>9</sup> John Britton in 1801 was overdoing it when he claimed that ‘[p]eople of all ranks visited Stourhead’, but such trips were certainly a staple of ‘polite’ leisure time.<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, whilst the eighteenth century by no means saw the scale of country house visiting to be seen in the Victorian era, there was clearly already an imperative felt by all parties concerned that owners should make their properties and their possessions accessible.<sup>11</sup> The ways and degree to which they did that varied greatly. Letters of introduction were sometimes required, sometimes not (Curwen considers it worth noting that, on reaching the house at Stourhead, his party ‘gained an easy admittance’).<sup>12</sup> The largest properties and most important collections had accompanying published catalogues, other houses had a certain amount of information available on site. Many (like Stourhead at the time of Curwen’s visit) relied on the knowledge of the housekeeper or other servant who could escort the curious tourist around. Some owners were even considerate enough to ensure that accommodation was available in the vicinity. A nearby inn facilitated visitors to Kedleston Hall in Derbyshire, whilst the Golden Eagle at the entrance to Stourhead’s gardens was, as Mrs Lybbe Powys observed; ‘built by Mr. Hoare for the company that comes to see his place...’<sup>13</sup>

This, then, is the environment to be explored by the essays in *Placing Faces*, concerned with how our understanding of a portrait such as that of Henry Hoare II deepens and changes when we study it within the country house for which it was intended, and in which it was displayed.<sup>14</sup> This volume examines how such an image could contribute to a carefully choreographed display of wealth, power, lineage and/or political affiliation; how it could function as part of a positioned performance on the part of the owners. We have to take into account the location in which such a portrait was displayed. The function of a room within the overall plan of the house, its relative importance, the degree to which it was accessible to visitors, its décor - all affects its signification. A portrait might be hung in a grand gallery, one component of a traditional sequence of household heads - or a commemorative eulogy to military heroes, as explored in Desmond Shawe-Taylor's essay 'The Waterloo Chamber before the Battle of Waterloo'. It might take its place in a row above a series of bookcases, as in the library at Narford, the subject of Susie West's chapter, 'Life in the Library', absorbing and feeding into that room's associations with history, scholarship and shared learning. It is highly significant that Hoare's portrait was hung in the entrance hall of his country property, at the very threshold, rather than encountered later on in the house. It was shown in a room intended for the purpose of reception, and was immediately visible to every person who entered. There, it made a bold statement of the family's recently acquired wealth, status and power. The Hoares, significantly, were 'nouveau riche'.<sup>15</sup> Henry's grandfather, Richard, had been the son of a horse-dealer and a goldsmith's apprentice, but he had secured the Hoares' subsequent name and fortune when he had founded the family business in 1672. Henry's father, Henry I, had used some of their newly acquired wealth to purchase the manor of Stourton, pulling down the extant house and constructing one of the first country villas in the new Palladian style, designed by Colen Campbell. This was just

finished by the time of his death, but Henry himself didn't move in until after the death of his mother in 1741. By the time Walpole and Curwen came to peruse the family home, he had added to what was previously a fairly paltry collection to create an impressive display of works of art and, most significantly, had created the famous landscape gardens which still draw thousands of visitors today.

Shearer West has proposed that the country house acts as a frame for the portraits within it, and we also have to consider a portrait alongside the other portraits which accompany it.<sup>16</sup> As is shown so clearly in Susie West's chapter and Alison Yarrington's essay, 'Marble, Memory and Theatre', likenesses were engaged in 'conversations', their various meanings and significance amplified by and even dependent upon their mutual relationships. Today, Hoare's picture can be seen embedded in a vast display of family portraits which fills the entrance hall at Stourhead, so that one is rather overwhelmed by faces on arriving at the house. Dahl and Wootton's huge canvas dominates the south wall of the room, but it is part of a display hung, in many places, three pictures deep. On the west wall, a portrait by Jonathan Richardson of Richard Hoare as Lord Mayor (1712) begins the visual family tree. The 'founder' is effectively seated back to back with his heir, Henry I, who grasps a paper showing the elevation of the house (Michael Dahl; c.1722). The two wives of Henry II are also present: Susanna Colt, painted by Hans Hysing, at one end of the south wall (1733); Ann Masham by Dahl at the other (c.1726). *Henry Hoare II* needs to be seen in the context of the sitter's linear and nuclear families. In many cases, that is also true of the sitter's extended family. The web of connections visually evident in such a display often extends outwards, as the constant process of intermarriage and complex arrangements of inheritance continually bound families together. A visitor to Blenheim Palace, for example, can see the same Reynolds portrait of George, 4<sup>th</sup> Duke of Marlborough (1764) as can be

viewed in the colonnade room at Wilton, the doubling of the painted likeness expressive of the link between the two families and houses formed by the crucial marriage of the Duke's sister to the 10<sup>th</sup> Earl of Pembroke. Portrait, house, estate and family work together as a potent entity, and in the case of great houses such as Blenheim and Wilton, as will be discussed in more detail below, their cumulative meaning further extends outside the history of the families concerned to that of the nation. A visitor faced with the likeness of a great military or naval figure would be encouraged to reflect on battles won and lost, whilst the family portraits in the house of a major political dynasty prompted reflection on the sitters' various actions and allegiances.

However, seeing the portrait collection as a complex entity, emphasising the place of Hoare's portrait in that entrance hall display at Stourhead, immediately raises practical issues which have challenged the contributors to this volume. Henry's equestrian portrait may have already functioned as an elaborate nameplate to the house by the time Walpole and Curwen entered the front door, but it was not surrounded by all the family portraits we see today. Inevitably, country house tourists such as these rarely give us complete accounts of what they saw, but the first published catalogue to the house of 1800 tells us that it was, at that date, mostly surrounded by classical landscapes. The only portrait to have joined it was another large canvas depicting Henry's successor and grandson, Sir Richard Colt Hoare, with his own prospective heir.<sup>17</sup> It was Colt Hoare who soon afterwards made the decision to cluster the Hoares' portraits around these two large paintings, which effectively structure the display. He had certainly undertaken his remarkably systematic reorganisation of the pictures in the house by the date of the next edition of the catalogue, 1818, and he explained his rationale in his *History of Modern Wiltshire* of 1822:

family portraits [are] a very appropriate decoration for the first entrance into a house, as well as for the pannels of a dining-room. They remind us of the genealogy of our families, and recall to our minds the hospitality, & c. of its former inhabits, and on the first entrance of the friend, or stranger, seem to greet them with a SALVE, or welcome.<sup>18</sup>

Colt Hoare makes, here, a number of crucial points. The family portrait collection is a visual family tree, and, indeed, in some houses the visitor would actually be presented with a diagrammatic version in order that each individual likeness might be mentally positioned in his or her correct place in the line. In his account, he regrets that the various sizes of the pictures mean they ‘cannot be conveniently placed in chronological order’, but rectifies that in his text by structuring the discussion around a clear progression through the generations. He begins with the portrait of Richard Hoare as the ‘personage...to whom the present family owes its chief opulence’, and then moves onto Henry I and Henry II, noting the presence of the portraits of the latters’ wives.<sup>19</sup> Colt Hoare also clearly builds on the external orientation of Henry’s grand equestrian portrait, but tempers its rather strident and bombastic message. Multiplying the likenesses, adding quantities of smaller portraits, he creates a sense of sociability and offers a rather friendlier gesture of greeting to the newly arrived visitor.

But Colt Hoare changes the original display. *Henry Hoare II* has to be seen in the context of the portrait collection, of the house and the estate, but, as is shown in many of these essays, those are constantly evolving and developing phenomena. In ‘Dirty Dancing at

Knole', Gill Perry notes how the new wife of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Duke of Dorset (understandably) moved the nude statue of his former mistress, the dancer Giovanna Baccelli, by Locatelli out of its prime position at the foot of the Great Staircase at Knole House. Yarrington unpicks the 6<sup>th</sup> Duke of Devonshire's many rearrangements of his sculpture gallery at Chatsworth, whilst Shawe-Taylor explores the ramifications of various and changing displays of military portraits in the Royal Collection in the early nineteenth century. A visitor to Stourhead today ascends one of two staircases to a freestanding portico constructed in 1838, and not the single large flight to the engaged frontispiece which Curwen would have encountered in the 1770s. A visitor to Stourhead today experiences the portrait in the context of a hang organised by the sitter's grandson, and not that conceived by the sitter himself. Portraits are always being acquired, reorganised within the house – and even reorganised between different houses belonging to a family. Sometimes, they are sold or given away – in the case of Wanstead, the subject of Kate Retford's essay, 'The Topography of the Conversation Piece', along with the entire collection prior to the house's destruction in 1823. It is only on occasion that a particular hang of interest survives intact, and something of its attendant spatial dynamics and visual effect are fully appreciable. Portraits set in overmantels, or shown in fixed schemes within plaster frames, have often been more resistant to the whims of subsequent owners. This is true of the family portraits by John Verelst at Beningborough Hall, set into overdoors; the plasterwork frames installed in the parlour at Rousham in the 1760s, to house new and reworked portraits; and the extraordinary series of historical portraits manufactured by Biagio Rebecca for Audley End, incorporated into arched frames within a new decorative scheme the following decade. In such cases, the portraits become part of the very fabric of the house, literally united with the building in conveying the family's history and identity.<sup>20</sup> In such cases, the desire for permanence was fulfilled. In so many other examples, however, extant

hangs have to be put next to visitor accounts, catalogues, inventories, sketched records of displays and any other available scraps of material in order to recover any single scheme.

Fixed displays may have been intended as a bulwark against the vagaries of history, and scholars may engage in re-creative research in order to circumnavigate sales, rehangs, fires and so on, but those processes can sit in tension with the country house's crucial nature as a palimpsest. Both the story of a family, and the story of a country house, inexorably evolve with the passage of time. That important sense of progress would be evident even in one lifetime, as the portrait of a young boy at the knee of his mother was joined by a Grand Tour portrait of that same sitter, now in his early 20s. Another likeness might be produced, linked to a further key life stage such inheritance, the building of a new family seat, or the substantial redecoration of an extant property. After all, a portrait has to have somewhere to hang, and the substantial building and rebuilding of houses in the English countryside in this period provides an important backdrop to the essays presented here.<sup>21</sup> A marriage portrait and/or a family group showing the next generation might be further additions.<sup>22</sup> Jonathan Richardson claimed in 1715 that 'In Picture[s] we never...grow older', but the picture *collection* always emphasised the successive life events and stages which rendered that process more than apparent.<sup>23</sup> Interestingly, Colt Hoare's reorganisation of his family portraits at Stourhead was not a solely backward-looking enterprise. He notes in his 1822 account that 'space [in the hall] is left for the *nati natorum*, and for the future possessors of this mansion', and, in the process of excusing the length of his narrative, he evokes his descendants who, he hopes, will benefit from the recorded information: 'We ought to consider ourselves as existing not solely for ourselves, and to bear in mind the *non sibi sed posteris...*'<sup>24</sup>

Any descendant's new addition to a portrait collection would have to take into account that setting and its current occupants.<sup>25</sup> An artist might actually represent that environment within the picture, as in the case of Joseph Nollekens's portrait of the Tylney family at Wanstead (1740). As Retford explores, this shows the sitters within the Saloon at Richard Child's palace, and is relatively unusual within the genre of the conversation piece for a detailed accuracy of setting which enables a strong, significant relationship with the fabric and flow of the house and estate. Or, a portrait might have to be painted on a particular scale, as in the case of Reynolds's portrait of Theresa Parker at Saltram House, Devon (1770-2), intended to hang as a pendant to a full length of one of her husband's ancestors. A compositional reference might be made to an earlier work, a motif might be adopted from an important extant portrait in the collection, or an heirloom might be included which had passed though and been pictured by various generations. The same artist might be used: Dahl significantly not only painted Henry Hoare II, but also his father and one of his wives. The sitter might be garbed in van Dyckian dress, as in the case of the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> Dukes of Norfolk painted by Thomas Gainsborough (1783 and c.1788 respectively). The vogue for early seventeenth-century costume in portraiture at this date was to do with a fashionable nostalgia for the Caroline court and its modishness at masquerades, but it also suggested lineage – and here the passage of time between these Dukes of Norfolk and their predecessors at Arundel Castle, painted by the likes of van Dyck and Mytens, is ellipsed in a vision of continuity.<sup>26</sup> The classical drapery in which so many of Reynolds's female sitters are swathed was about lifting portraiture closer to the hallowed status of history painting, and bestowing an air of dignity and grandeur. But it was also about circumnavigating fashion and custom, again allowing some sense of permanence. Combined with other techniques, such as use of bitumen to give a warm old masterly glow, Reynolds hoped his portraits would have an effect

praised by Fanny Burney at Knole; ‘they are so bewitching, and finished in a style of taste, colouring, and expression, so like their companions, that it is not, at first view, easy to distinguish the new from the old.’<sup>27</sup>

### **Houses, Homes, and ‘Mistresses’**

Through this combination of imposing architectural context and strategically positioned portraits, country houses could ‘bewitch’, inform and enthrall the visitor, whether an eminent invited guest or an eighteenth-century ‘tourist’. These decorated spaces offered up narratives of dynasty, family history and political endeavour that this collection seeks critically to examine. However, the extent to which such houses or so-called ‘stately homes’ were in fact ‘homes’ in the modern sense is a question that has informed this study, especially in relation to gender. Evolving definitions of the modern ‘home’, the idea of ‘dwelling’ and its relationship with the structure of the house have enriched recent debates within the spheres of cultural geography, architectural and design history, history, literature, anthropology, sociology and philosophy, among others.<sup>28</sup> As a fertile research area that straddles disciplines, the historical idea of the ‘home’ is of special interest to this collection, informing our understanding of the social significance of these imposing country houses and their contents. Influential cultural historians such as Philippe Ariès and Witold Rybczynski have both charted the evolving concept of the ‘home’ in Europe from the medieval period to the twentieth century, suggesting that the term was increasingly separated from the word ‘house’.<sup>29</sup> While Ariès viewed the home as the setting for his ground-breaking (yet controversial) exploration of family life and an emerging concept of ‘privacy’ in the eighteenth century, Rybczynski charted the evolution of the idea of ‘home’ that is (as he argues) enmeshed with developing, and culturally specific, notions of ‘comfort’,

‘domesticity’, ‘intimacy’ and family privacy.<sup>30</sup> He argues for the evolution of an idea of ‘comfort’ in the ‘European consciousness,’ that in eighteenth-century France revealed the ‘extent of the influence of bourgeois values on court life.’<sup>31</sup> But he also suggests that the preference for country houses within upper-class and bourgeois English society resulted in a style of living that was more relaxed than its French counterpart, and that ‘eventually produced a different domestic ideal’.<sup>32</sup> These are bold generalisations, drawn from observations about the nature of the British court and aristocracy, and the proliferation of country seats, especially in Georgian England. He argues that, during this period, the English aristocracy were more powerful and more independent from a centralised court than their French counterparts:

They were landed gentry whose wealth, and whose pride, were their rural properties. There was, then, no equivalent in England to the French courtly style; instead the countryside was held in high regard, and it was not considered provincial to live there. Out of this state of affairs emerged a singular phenomenon, the English country house, which supplemented, if it did not replace, the city as the locus for social life. This prompted the American ambassador to remark: “Scarcely any persons who hold a leading place in the circles of their society live in London. They have *houses* in London in which they stay when Parliament sits, and occasionally visit at other seasons; but their *homes* are in the country.”<sup>33</sup>

Such general observations need some critical unpacking, especially in relation to Rybczynski’s ideas of increasing domestic intimacy, not to mention the on-going scholarship on the relative importance of ‘town houses’.<sup>34</sup> For many scholars of the period, the

development of the eighteenth-century 'home' is inseparable from an emerging notion of domesticity, especially within the middle classes.<sup>35</sup> That said, this collection is concerned with the various ways in which the nobility and the upper classes negotiated evolving ideas of domesticity in the organisation, management and decoration of their large country estates. In an attempt to explore and redefine an eighteenth-century concept of 'home' for the elite, some recent research has considered issues of *how*, *when*, and *for whom*, such grand houses might have constituted 'homes', and the picture that emerges is inevitably complex and variable. For example, Dana Arnold and Judith S. Lewis have considered the gendered implications of the idea of the 'home' in relation to these country estates and their relationship with the 'town house'.<sup>36</sup> They have both addressed the question of how aristocratic women might have experienced country houses that they first inhabited after marriage, and were often encouraged to leave after the accession of the eldest son. Some recent scholarship has also explored patterns of consumption among upper-class women, revealing a complex picture of women's relationships to the building, design and furnishing of some of these large country houses.<sup>37</sup>

The OED offers a definition of the home dating back to 1460 as 'a place of ones dwelling and nurturing'.<sup>38</sup> More modern notions, like those developed by Rybcznski, have emphasised notions of comfort, privacy and intimacy, that sometimes sit uneasily in relation to eighteenth-century houses in which divisions between public and private spaces are often difficult precisely to identify, not to mention the burgeoning academic discourse on the shifting relationship between the public/private spheres during the period.<sup>39</sup> Amanda Vickery has argued that despite the claims of writer such as Ariès, 'the elite hostess' of the landed gentry and nobility would have engaged in an 'open-handed hospitality [that] was crucial to maintenance of social credit and political power'. Such convivial liberality might be seen to

be at odds with the theory that the country house became an increasingly inward-looking, private space. She writes, ‘the idea that the home was a refuge insulated from the social world is one that would have perplexed the rural gentry of this period’.<sup>40</sup>

The eighteenth-century country house then offers us a rather more complex notion of ‘home’ or the supposedly ‘private’ inhabited domain than does the modern middle-class house with its well-established associations with feminine domesticity. Moreover, as we have seen, the ‘homes’ encompassed within these grand buildings were culturally and politically enmeshed with their family histories. They were conceived of primarily as ‘family homes’, as spaces that nurtured dynasties, handed down over generations. Hence, the metonymic concept of the ‘family seat’. Chapters in this book reveal how the strategic display of family portraits helped to narrate such dynastic histories. And, as noted above, family portraits were most often displayed in the country home, rather than the town house.<sup>41</sup> In fact one of the definitions of ‘home’ offered by the OED, dating from 1595 embraces a nationalistic sense of family history: ‘One’s own country, one’s native land: the place where one’s ancestors dwelt.’<sup>42</sup> The eighteenth-century notion of ‘family’ could carry several associations for an aristocrat. As Naomi Tadmor has shown, it could involve both historical and national lineage, and (more modern) kinship.<sup>43</sup> This collection explores the diverse ways in which ideas of lineage, kinship, power and gender relations might be represented through the content and positioning of portraits in the country house.

But lineage was determined, of course, by the male line. Women only rarely inherited the houses in which they were born, and after marriage would usually move to their husband’s house or estate. Moreover, the problem of primogeniture and the patriarchal

system of inheritance concerned several eighteenth-century writers, among them Fanny Burney. Her novel *Cecilia, or Memoirs of an Heiress*, first published in 1782, presents her eponymous heroine as a kind of pseudo-male; after the deaths of her parents the will according to which she inherits the family estate stipulates that her husband must take her name on marriage.<sup>44</sup> If she, or her husband, refuses these conditions, then she loses her estate. As ancestral achievements and status were associated with the male lineage and title, she is compelled to keep the masculine part of her name. As a woman who inherits - or an heiress, 'she is not seen as an independent person but as a conduit for conveying money from one man's family to another'.<sup>45</sup> Elizabeth Atherton, the wife and mother in Devis's *Robert Gwilym of Atherton and his Family*, was just such a conduit. The clear narrative of patrilineal descent and heritage embedded in the composition of the painting, indicating that Atherton Hall is to pass to the small boy to the right of the image, belies the fact that it was she, a wealthy heiress, who had brought the house and estate into the Gwilym family. Such broken lines and indirect descent did not tend to feature in advertised stories of elite dynasties and their country houses.<sup>46</sup>

Notwithstanding such intractable social conventions and constraints, there is increasing evidence that many upper-class women valued and helped to develop and decorate their country houses, and even formed emotional attachments to them. Enabled by an education in drawing and mathematics, some elite women became involved in the design of their houses.<sup>47</sup> And women's roles as 'mistress' of house and home, and both patron and subject of family portraits, have increasingly intrigued studies of the period.<sup>48</sup> The decorating, planning and collecting skills of elite women such as Louise de Keroualle, Duchess of Norfolk, Caroline Lennox, Baroness Holland or Theresa Parker are now well documented.<sup>49</sup> Parker, for example, took a leading role in extending the art collection at Saltram; she and her

husband John commissioned several family portraits by Reynolds, intended for display in the house.<sup>50</sup> Theresa also bought four works on classical themes by Angelica Kauffman that now hang on the main staircase, but may have originally been intended for the Great Room at Saltram, a relatively 'public' position in the house that would have helped to convey the educated, classical credentials of the family collection. That same acquisition of cultural capital was affirmed through the display of art works collected on the Grand Tour.<sup>51</sup> In 1771 Theresa appealed to her brother Lord Grantham to: 'remember if you meet with anything abroad, of pictures bronzes etc. that is valuable in itself, beautiful and proper for any part of Saltram we depend so much upon your taste and judgement that you must not lose an opportunity of procuring it for us.'<sup>52</sup> Theresa Parker then was both the subject of - and an active agent in - the development of the collection at Saltram. The visibility and tastes of such 'mistresses of the house' offer rich and varied material for further research, as is demonstrated in essays in this collection by Emma Barker, Ruth Kenny, Gill Perry and Jordan Vibert.

While Vickery has questioned the eighteenth-century notion of 'home' as an increasingly private and inward-looking space, Judith S. Lewis has posited the possibility of a nuanced definition of 'home' for aristocratic women in her study of the domestic lives of Sarah Duchess of Marlborough at Blenheim, Frances Viscountess Irwin at Temple Newsam, and Frances, Viscountess Boringdon at Saltram House. Although each of these women formed different relationships with the spaces of their country estates during different historical periods (across the eighteenth century), Lewis argues that there is evidence in each case of 'a spirit of domesticity' and attempts to incorporate into these buildings *both* grand display and sites of family intimacy.<sup>53</sup> The history of Sarah Duchess of Marlborough is, perhaps, among the best documented of these aristocratic lives, especially after she married

John Churchill in 1678, and helped to oversee (and often to challenge) Sir John Vanburgh's plans for a grandiose, baroque monument to the Duke of Marlborough, largely bank-rolled by Queen Anne.<sup>54</sup> Blenheim Palace was begun in 1705 and completion continued after the Duke's death in 1722, under Sarah's management (figure. 02). In fact after the Duke had suffered a stroke in 1716, she had already taken control of the project, fallen out with Vanburgh and fired him. According to reports, she was in constant dispute with the architect, as 'where he wanted to create a national monument, she wanted a grand but comfortable home.'<sup>55</sup> The Duchess of Marlborough was famously ambivalent about Blenheim, and although she played a key role in the decoration, furnishing and selection of art works for the palace, she also directed the building of two other, less grandiose homes for the Marlborough family. Firstly, she managed the building of Marlborough House in Pall Mall, commenced in 1709, and her home when she died in 1744. In 1732-3 she also directed the building of her own country villa at Wimbledon, designed by Robert Morris and Henry Herbert, 9<sup>th</sup> Earl of Pembroke. Here she commissioned a simple, neo-classical design that according to Frances Harris was 'plain and clean' and easily accessible on one floor.<sup>56</sup> For Sarah Duchess of Marlborough, then, different houses suggested different definitions of 'home'. While the stately Blenheim Palace was the ancestral home that spoke of lineage, power and military achievements, Wimbledon represented her own preferences and housed many of her own possessions, suggesting a more modern, personalised notion of home that evoked comfort and her own identity.<sup>57</sup>

However, there were many other eighteenth-century elite women who managed to integrate a more modern notion of home into the imposing ancestral spaces that they took on after marriage. Lewis has cited the example of Frances, Viscountess Irwin who moved into her marital home, Temple Newsam in Yorkshire in 1758 (figure. 03). Known as the

‘Hampton Court of the North’, Temple Newsam was distinguished by its Tudor and Jacobean history and was renovated rather than rebuilt in the eighteenth century, a plan of works that included landscaping by Capability Brown. Significantly in the context of this book, the house’s enormous Jacobean Gallery was transformed into a Picture Gallery and Library, affirming the important role of such public spaces for the display of family portraits and art acquisitions. Lady Irwin’s letters are full of expressions of pleasure in her country house, and demonstrate a consistent association of the house with her immediate family and the intimate activities of kinship. They reveal Lady Irwin’s association of country life with domesticity and sincerity; according to Lewis, she chose ‘to cultivate a rural, domestic self.’<sup>58</sup> Temple Newsam was very much her ‘home’, in all the senses of that term explored thus far.

These multivalent notions of ‘home’ within the long eighteenth century are, of course, closely related to other social, cultural and architectural shifts. Following the two revolutions between 1650 and 1714, a republic and a change of dynasty, the landowning class became increasingly powerful, and property and land became a vital measure of status. As Mark Girouard has described it: ‘the polite world saw themselves as an elite, whose claim to run the country was based on having a stake as property owners, and was reinforced by the culture, education and *savoir faire* of which its country houses were an advertisement...The members of the property owning elite moved among themselves with relative equality. They no longer found the rigid hierarchies of a formal house a sympathetic setting.’<sup>59</sup> Girouard posits the notion of ‘a social house’ that enabled more mobility between - and more social mixing within - the houses of the nobility and the gentry. In formal houses of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the state apartments were usually found in a line following the main axis of the house, often between a large hall and saloon. These were replaced in some early eighteenth-century houses by long enfilade suites of rooms that could be used for

communal activities and that followed a social hierarchy, leading to the private apartments, as, for example, at Blenheim. These shifts both enabled the development of the 'social house' but also allowed more privacy in the separate apartments. As we have seen and as contributors to this collection amply reveal, the positioning of portraits within different spaces of this social hierarchy of rooms could affect the meanings that the works conveyed to a contemporary audience. These portraits and their positioning played crucial roles in fashioning the reputations of their sitters. They could also help to define and redefine spaces, contributing to a complex interplay between gendered boundaries of 'public' and 'private'. A portrait that was displayed in a private bed chamber, dressing room or closet would have been viewed by fewer people than one displayed in a grand hall, gallery, or on the main staircase, and might be seen to signify a more intimate or personal relationship with the main viewer. For example, Kenny's essay, 'Apartments that are not too large', explores the functions of pastel portraits in women's dressing rooms, arguing that such spaces acted as a locus for a wide range of feminine domestic activities - a kind of 'stage set' for the acting out of femininity. In contrast, Perry suggests that the strategic positioning of that life-size sculpture by Locatelli of Baccelli by the main stair case at Knole House encouraged a more public and male-dominated discourse on her (unmarried) social status, her sexuality and mythological precedents. If the portrait subject was a woman, her status as legally married wife - or mistress - could be implicated in her positioning. If the latter, her sexuality would frequently be the object of concerned debate, and any claims to make the country house her 'home' would inevitably be fraught with cultural, moral and even political problems.

## **Portraits of Power**

We have seen how Lady Irwin sought ‘a rural, domestic self’ at Temple Newsam, and, from the early eighteenth century, retirement to the country was frequently conjured in the popular imagination of the cultured elite as a retreat from the concerns of public life. Influenced by classical conceptions of the pastoral handed down in Virgil’s *Eclogues* and Horace’s *Epodes*, the country was imagined as an idealised space set apart from the vice and folly of the city and removed from the worlds of political ambition at home and bloody warfare abroad.<sup>60</sup> In the course of the eighteenth century, this mode became increasingly gendered as feminine, and came to dominate in women’s poetry.<sup>61</sup> Portraits of the period, and particularly portraits of women, contributed to this fantasy of rural retirement in relation to the country house in several ways. The kind of portraits created by Reynolds and others in the 1760s and 1770s, depicting women seemingly at leisure in country estates, offered viewers precisely this idealised fantasy of pastoral life, as Jordan Vibert discusses in her essay, ‘Framing Sir Francis’. While many of these portraits were exhibited in London and circulated as prints, such as those sold as a series of engravings under the general title of *The Beauties of the Present Age*, they were more often than not ultimately destined to hang in those very country houses where the leisured retirement they depicted was supposedly taking place.<sup>62</sup> Reynolds’s portrait of Georgiana Cavendish, Duchess of Devonshire, painted in 1776 and engraved as one of the *Beauties* in 1780 (figure. 04), for instance, hung in her mother’s bedroom at Althorp in Northamptonshire, and was probably originally intended for more public display within the house as a companion piece to a contempera retirement.<sup>63</sup> As much as the country house provided a frame for such a portrait, serving to anchor its vision of pastoral retirement to a specific place, such portraits also provided a frame for the house, helping to link it to idealised notions of country retirement set apart from public concerns. As Mark Hallett has suggested, *The Beauties of the Present Age*, painted during the American War, may be read as pictorial versions of the kind of poetry of the period which ‘promoted the fictions of the

pastoral and the environs of the country estate as representational alternatives to the narratives and imagery of a troubled military conflict'. They could thus serve to establish the estates in which they hung as offering retreats from the more public, masculine concerns of nation and empire, played out in the bloody battlefields of North America and the fraught political arena of London.<sup>64</sup>

This would have been particularly apparent, as Vibert reveals, in paired portraits of men and women, either consciously painted as companion pieces, or brought together in their display within the country house so as to engender comparisons or parallels between them. Desmond Shawe-Taylor suggests, for instance, that Reynolds's portrait of Jane Fleming, later Countess of Harrington (1778), standing in a windswept rural landscape, was displayed as a pair, probably at the family's country seat of Elvaston Castle in Derbyshire, with a slightly later military portrait of the sitter's husband, a famed military hero of the American War. Her gesture left thus served to direct the viewer's attention towards her spouse.<sup>65</sup> Through this hang, war – and the American War, in particular – is set against a contrasting scene of pastoral peace and feminine retirement. Reynolds's portrait of Ann, Viscountess Townshend (1779-80), issued as an engraving in 1780 as one of the *Beauties of the Present Age*, worked in a similar way.<sup>66</sup> This was painted as a companion piece to Reynolds's portrait of Lady Ann's husband, Viscount George Townshend (1778-79), dressed in full armor, contrasting her apparently peaceful rural retirement at Raynham Hall, the Townshend family's ancestral home, with his engagement in the work of war as Master-General of the Ordnance.<sup>67</sup> Significantly, Lord Townshend was himself engaging in fantasies of idyllic retirement in his letters to Lady Ann at the time, positioning Raynham as a retreat from fashionable London life. 'Do me ye justice Ann to believe', Lord Townshend wrote to his wife in April 1773, shortly before their marriage, 'I had rather feed your horses at Rainham than be at ye

Masquerade.’<sup>68</sup> In other, later letters, Townshend’s longing for the peaceable retirement of Raynham stands in stark contrast to his marked despair at the world of war and politics as the American War reached its bloody climax. ‘Ye character of ye Country is lost and the national strength and abilities are crumbling into ruin’, he lamented to Lady Ann in December 1778, placing the situation in an all too jarring contrast with ‘our clemency and retirement’ at Raynham.<sup>69</sup> While it’s unclear where Reynolds’s portraits of Lord and Lady Townshend were ultimately displayed – little evidence, in this case, survives of the final hang – their most obvious intended home would have been Raynham. Townshend’s portrait, at least, was recorded in the state dressing room there in 1811.<sup>70</sup> Displayed together at Raynham Hall, the portraits would have acted as a cue for reading the house as the site of peaceable rural retirement, gendered as feminine, far removed from the more public masculine concerns of nation and empire.

However much the country house was associated with retirement from the masculine world of war and politics in this period, though, it was undoubtedly the site and symbol of just such kinds of civic activity and power. The boom in house building in this period can be attributed to the crucial role country houses played in establishing the wealth, power and status of their owners. Around one hundred and fifty houses were built in Britain in the first half of the eighteenth century alone, often at great expense. Blenheim Palace, for example, cost £260,000 in 1716, the equivalent over thirty million pounds today. At the end of the century, Fonthill Abbey in Wiltshire cost William Beckford no less than £400,000, a cool twenty-five million in today’s money.<sup>71</sup> Houses could also change hands for vast sums. A few years after his ascension to the peerage of Ireland in 1762, for example, Lord Robert Clive – Clive of India – bought Claremont Hall in Derbyshire for £30,000 from the recently widowed Duchess of Newcastle.<sup>72</sup> Whether inherited, built or bought with ‘new’ money amassed

through commerce or industry, the country house and its estate was, as Dana Arnold writes, ‘a symbol of the power and wealth of the landowner and more broadly the social, political and cultural hegemony of the ruling classes’, functioning as ‘a place of business, whether political or estate’, a cultural repository of artistic productions and a space in which the ‘social rituals’ of the elite took place.<sup>73</sup>

For those with ‘new’ money, such as the Hoares or the Childs, building or buying a house could enhance their social status. The country house and estate also crucially legitimised its male owner in the political sphere, with such property securing his right to vote and to sit in parliament.<sup>74</sup> If in possession of an aristocratic title along with this land, he was further guaranteed a seat in the House of Lords.<sup>75</sup> For Whig grandees of the period, brought up on classical republican ideals of landed virtue, inherited property developed more particular political associations, signifying the financial independence and freedom from Crown influence that guaranteed political independence.<sup>76</sup> And country houses could act, of course, as symbols of military power. Blenheim Palace was a great and lasting monument to Marlborough’s status as a feted military hero, decorated with carved stone symbols of his heroic deeds which cost over £4,000.<sup>77</sup> A hundred years later, in 1817, the Duke of Wellington was gifted Stratsfield Estate in Hampshire by the nation, and plans were made to replace the old house with a new one, to be named Waterloo Palace in commemoration of his great triumph.<sup>78</sup> Though never realised, the planned house clearly suggests the capacity of the country house to communicate strong military as well as political narratives.

Portraits could play a significant part in defining and making visible these narratives of political and military power which clustered round the country house. As this collection

shows, the use of the family portrait as a visual marker of ancestry and lineage served to underscore the owner's political, as well as social legitimacy, vested in the estate and the title so often handed down with it. Images of ancestors and other prominent political figures could communicate specific political messages. At Kedleston Hall in Derbyshire, the ancestral home of the Tory Curzon family, for example, portraits deliberately bought for and displayed in the State apartments over the course of the eighteenth century – including a portrait of Mary Curzon, Countess of Dorset, who was governess of Charles I's children – strongly suggested the family's Jacobite sympathies.<sup>79</sup> In the mausoleum at Wentworth Woodhouse in Yorkshire, commissioned in 1783 and completed in 1788 (figure. 05), on the other hand, a series of portrait busts of prominent Whigs such as Edmund Burke, surrounding a statue of Whig prime-minister Charles Watson-Wentworth, 2nd Marquess of Rockingham in the stance of a Roman orator, was an overt display of the family's involvement in Whig politics and of their adherence to the classical republican ideals that underlay it.<sup>80</sup> These political meanings were also enhanced by structures in the wider landscape. On the neighbouring estate of prominent Rockingham Whig, Thomas Howard, 3<sup>rd</sup> Earl of Effingham, a hunting lodge built for and named in memory of the Boston Tea Party in 1774 faced and overlooked the Wentworth estates, drawing the shared landscape into a complex metaphor of Whig affiliation, landed virtue and the associated defence of liberty locally and in relation to North America.<sup>81</sup> Set in this wider landscape, the Rockingham Mausoleum and the portraits it contained would have also accrued associations with and memories of the family's leading involvement in the defence of liberty during the American War.

The portraits of family which lined the walls of so many rooms in the country house could also communicate aggrandizing narratives of military power by representing men in military attire, often alluding to specific battles. Such portraits were highly conventional and

came to define, as Shawe-Taylor illustrates in his essay, a particular kind of heroic ideal. Within the country house, these portraits could provide models for the men of the family to imitate. As Richardson commented, in his influential *Essay on the Theory of Painting*, looking at the kind of portrait that offered ‘an Abstract of one’s life’, a male viewer might be ‘excited to imitate the Good Actions, and persuaded to shun the Vices of those whose examples are thus set before them.’<sup>82</sup> The replication of poses or gestures across portraits could serve to suggest just this process of imitation across the generations, indicating a continuing ancestral narrative of military endeavour spanning the centuries. Reynolds’s portrait of Lord Townshend in full armour, posed with one hand on a table and the other on his hip, would have resonated with a series of seventeenth-century portraits installed in the saloon at Raynham Hall in the 1620s, depicting a band of volunteers raised by the sitter’s ancestor, Horace Vere, Baron Vere of Tilbury, to defend the Palatinate of Frederick V, the propagator of the House of Hanover, against the Spanish.<sup>83</sup> According to surviving descriptions of the portraits, dating from the time of their removal and sale, many of the men stand in the same pose that Lord Townshend adopts in Reynolds’ portrait.<sup>84</sup> Working in dialogue with these older portraits at Raynham, the portrait of Lord Townshend would have positioned him as following the example of this great ancestor, suggesting a continuing ancestral legacy of martial activity in defence of the nation, and specifically in defence of the Protestant succession (particularly since both Lord and Townshend and Horace Vere held the role of Master General of the Ordnance).

Apart from their political and military messages, portraits could also draw attention to and make explicit broader narratives of imperial expansion and dominion which underlay the English country house. Since Raymond Williams so succinctly exposed the economic relationship between the country estate and slavery, it has been impossible to ignore the

extent to which the country house was embedded in Britain's imperial project.<sup>85</sup> A huge number of the nation's country houses were built, bought or improved from fortunes made in Britain's colonial possessions: Beckford's Fonthill was funded by a family fortune made from slave plantations in the West Indies, while Lord Clive's purchase and improvement of Claremont was funded through the vast personal fortune he had amassed expanding the British empire through his involvement with the East India Company.<sup>86</sup> The many black servants who appeared in portraits of the period draw sharp attention to the origins of the money by which the country estate was bankrolled.<sup>87</sup> In the collections of Seaton Delaval Hall, for instance, a portrait of Sir John Hussey Delaval's eldest son, John Delaval, painted by William Bell in 1770, depicts him with bow in hand, alongside a black servant carrying a set of arrows. John and this servant are positioned in a landscape which recalls that around Ford Castle in Northumberland, a house and estate in the family's possession which John's father had spent considerable sums rebuilding and improving in the 1760s. That newly rebuilt property can be seen in the background of a companion portrait of John's mother, Susannah Hussey Delaval, painted by Bell the same year.<sup>88</sup> Bell's portrait of John is evidently a showy display of landownership, with the young Delaval's status as heir to the estate before him encoded in his right to hunt within it. The inclusion of a black servant alongside John also draws attention to the colonial landownership and slavery by which these estates and improvements were funded. The Delavals had financial interests in North Carolina and, in the later 1760s, John's father had sought advice from a Liverpool slave trader on how to run a plantation in East Florida.<sup>89</sup>

Portraits could also work with the interiors of houses to establish bombastic narratives of imperial conquest and containment. As Hermione De Almeida and George H. Gilpin note, a portrait of Lord Clive of India commissioned from Benjamin West, which shows him

receiving revenues from the Moghul of Bengal, was displayed in his dining room at Claremont amongst ‘plaster reliefs of elephants, camels and other exotic motifs’ symbolic of India.<sup>90</sup> Here, the use of exotic animals speaks directly to the kind of colonial improvement and containment in which Clive was involved through his work for the East India Company. As De Almedia and Gilpin suggest, ‘elephants were a distinct symbol of British possessions in India’, not least because they were thought to be ‘easily tamed.’<sup>91</sup> These symbolically ‘tamed’ elephants are contained and improved through their representation within the architectural and decorative modes of the English country house, and would have worked in dialogue with portraits depicting Clive’s involvement in Britain’s imperial expansion into India, creating a grand narrative of imperial conquest. In this room, Clive and his guests would have been faced with a constant reminder that they were dining – perhaps quite literally – off the fruits of Britain’s Indian empire.

However, the ways in which portraits created or contributed to more public masculine narratives within the country house, were not always easily readable, as many essays in this collection reveal. Portraits could often interact with their surroundings to create more complex and sometimes unstable narratives about the very people and events they purported to celebrate. For example, while the mausoleum at Wentworth Woodhouse seems to celebrate Whig allegiance, the positioning of those sculptural portraits in a space that is fundamentally about loss and mourning engenders a curious coincidence. Associated with loss, these portraits may inadvertently resonate with wider narratives about the splits amongst the Whigs that had followed Rockingham’s death and the creation of the Fox-North Coalition followed by the opposing Foxite and Pittite parties.<sup>92</sup> No longer was there a united Whig party or Whig interest as in Rockingham’s day: the Earl of Effingham, for example, whose neighbouring hunting lodge stood as a visible symbol of such political strength and unity, had seceded at

the point of the Fox-North coalition and became a firm follower of Pitt.<sup>93</sup> Is the Rockingham mausoleum to be read as a confident celebration of continuing Whig affiliation - or as a more troubled and melancholy memorial to a political golden age now past? How do individuals who lurk on the outside of the mausoleum, such as the Earl of Effingham, but who are not represented within it, shape or contribute to its meanings? Uncertainties and hesitations over the meanings of memorials also cluster around monuments to Captain James Cook, as Harriet Guest reveals in her essay, 'Commemorating Captain Cook in the Country Estate'. Comparatively small and modest monuments to Cook at Stowe House and The Vache in Buckinghamshire, Guest argues, may reflect the unease and uncertainties surrounding Cook's involvement in imperial expansion against the backdrop of the fraught American War. Here, mourning Cook may also become a way of mourning a particular vision or ideal of empire which has been lost. More broadly, the memorials to the dead heroes at Stowe, who had been so central to the bloody fight for empire, also bring notions of imperial landownership to the estate; the local landscape becomes an imperial landscape, a space in which the tensions and uncertainties of imperial power abroad might be articulated and negotiated. Alison Yarrington identifies a similarly complex topographical conflation in her essay, revealing how a portrait of Napoleon in a barren landscape suggestive of his political exile, and two portrait busts suggestive of Russian imperial rule, come to be associated with the gardens at Chatsworth through reflections caught in a looking glass, producing a melancholy and meditative narrative of empires won and lost grafted onto an English estate.

Portraits of women could also cause all sorts of problems or difficulties for bombastic and celebratory narratives of political activity and military conquest, even when those portraits seemed so fundamentally distanced from more masculine concerns of nation and empire. Perry illustrates, for instance, how images of the dancer Baccelli crossed and

complicated the boundaries between the public and private and domestic at Knole in relation to feminine identity and celebrity culture. She also underscores how such complications surface in terms of the political connotations and functions of Knole as representations of Baccelli became almost unavoidably embedded in the political history and identity of the house. Pairings of men and women of the kind Vibert explores also reveal how female portraits could come drastically to complicate and undermine apparently confident displays of martial heroism within the house. Acting as representational 'stand-ins' for men engaged in the work of war, women depicted in portraits could, rather than adding a complimentary gloss, suggest the kind of blurring of gendered boundaries and resulting effeminacy that characterised narratives of national impotency and emasculation from the Seven Years' War through the American War.<sup>94</sup> Reynolds's companion pieces of Lady Mary Worsley and Sir Richard Worsley (c.1776), at leisure in rural settings probably intended to indicate their family estate, provide a good example. Lady Worsley is garbed in a riding habit fashioned from the regimental uniform of the South Hampshire Militia, worn by her husband.<sup>95</sup> On the one hand, *Lady Worsley* becomes an apt analogy for her husband's anticipated participation in the defence of the nation. On the other, her cross-dressing could come to undermine her husband by making him appear less masculine. Such a reading could have resonated with uncertainties or anxieties about Worsley's involvement in the war as a military man seemingly content to stay within the English militia, where he would have avoided seeing any direct action, rather than volunteering for action in North America, for example.<sup>96</sup> Even portraits of women that seem far removed from the more masculine, public concerns of nation and empire may, it seems, when framed in certain ways within the country house, turn tail and present a far more troubling vision of political power and military heroism than may have been intended by those who hung them on their walls.

This introduction has explored some of the multivalent ways in which portraits engaged with their country house settings. When we view Wootton and Dahl's portrait of Henry Hoare II in the entrance hall at Stourhead, we can understand its declaration of the family's newfound wealth, power and privilege. When we consider the particularities of Blenheim Palace, a vast, expensive monument to the Duke of Marlborough's military triumphs; of Saltram House, with its careful evocation of the Parker family's classical, educated credentials; of Raynham Hall, representing a peaceful rural retreat for its owners – then we can start to understand the various meanings of the portraits displayed within those spaces. The individual likeness provides us with characterisation, dress, attributes, composition, and so on, with which to work. The likeness within the broader context of the portrait collection reveals much more: complex networks of linear, nuclear, extended and household family ties; male, female and heterosocial friendship circles; political affiliations of varying persuasions and types. Within a carefully coordinated display, within the country house and its estate, the portrait pulls in external narratives of war and empire, attempting to work those narratives to the owners' advantage, but sometimes instead creating something altogether more ambiguous or even negative.

The essays in *Placing Faces* explore these themes in detail, and are arranged into three, overlapping sections. 'A Walk around the House' focuses on some discrete locations within the country house, and the ways in which portraits interacted with those spaces: the Saloon and the Ballroom at Wanstead; the Library at Narford; the Sculpture Gallery at Chatsworth. The processes and meanings of display are at the forefront of these essays by Kate Retford, Susie West and Alison Yarrington, together with the interactions between

pictures, objects, people (resident, visiting and represented/referenced) and designed environments. The next section, entitled 'Women's Space', is, above all, concerned with the complex relationships between different types of femininity and private and public spaces within the country house. Whilst Ruth Kenny and Emma Barker explore narratives of family and kinship, Gill Perry's essay unpicks how the representation of a mistress, and a mistress with a visible public profile at that, could work within the long established walls of Knole. Indeed, this raises a key theme of *Placing Faces*. Although portraits of family members, living and deceased, were certainly at the heart of the eighteenth-century country house collection, these were far from the only faces to be found there. As well as mistresses, there were friends, there were Kings and Queens, and there were historical figures of note alongside contemporary worthies. This latter group included great military heroes, past and present, who feature in the final section of this volume: 'Imperial Designs'. Here, Desmond Shawe-Taylor, Jordan Vibert and Harriet Guest explore the significance of likenesses of such figures as Captain Cook and the Duke of Wellington within collections, working through the complex ties between families, their houses and imperial conflicts including the Seven Years' War, the American War of Independence, and the Napoleonic campaigns.

These thematically arranged essays range back and forth across the long eighteenth century, taking us from Sir Richard Child in the 1720s through to the 6<sup>th</sup> Duke of Devonshire in the 1840s. We move from full-length, even outsized oil portraits through sculpted busts and monuments to modestly proportioned pastels. We encompass 'amateur' works by Mrs Grenville and Lady Burlington as well as renown performances by the foremost portraitists of the day: Thomas Gainsborough, Joshua Reynolds, Thomas Lawrence, Antonio Canova. The houses considered span relatively modest dwellings such as The Vache, great houses such as Wanstead, Chatsworth and Knole, and the Royal residence of Windsor Castle. And the

chapters take us around those houses, from entrance halls to saloons and staircases, from the intimacy of the dressing room to the grandeur of the gallery. They employ a range of methodological approaches, marrying exploration of complex questions about such matters as space, power and gender with in-depth research into collections and their display. Yet, there remains so much more work to do. Our knowledge of these houses and their collections is constantly deepening, as tools to assist research (such as the work of the Public Catalogue Foundation) develop and become ever more sophisticated. And the country house portrait collection provides an ideal forum in which to continue to nuance our understanding of the complex nature of ‘home’ and ‘family’, and the fluid boundaries between such categories as public and private; masculine and feminine; domestic, national and imperial.

---

<sup>1</sup> A. Oliver, ed., *The Journal of Samuel Curwen, Loyalist*, 2 vols. (Cambridge M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1972), I, p. 229

<sup>2</sup> For the Hoares, Stourhead and the collection, see the guidebook, *Stourhead, Wiltshire* (London: National Trust, 1997); Alistair Laing, *Stourhead: Illustrated List of Pictures and Sculptures*, published online, 2010; Alistair Laing, *In Trust for the Nation: Paintings from National Trust Houses* (London: National Trust in association with the National Gallery, 1995), pp. 237-8. See also Christopher Hussey, ‘Stourhead, Wiltshire’, *Country Life*, LXXXIII, 2161 (18 June 1938), pp. 638-42; St John Gore, ‘Prince of Georgian Collectors: The Hoares of Stourhead - I’, *Country Life*, CXXXV (30 January 1964), pp. 210-12 and ‘A Worthy Heir to Greatness: The Hoares of Stourhead - II’, *Country Life*, CXXXV (6 February 1964), pp. 278-80; John Cornforth, ‘Stourhead, Wiltshire’, *Country Life*, 188 (8 September 1994), pp. 64-7

---

<sup>3</sup> Paget Toynbee, ed., 'Horace Walpole's Journals of Visits to Country Seats', *Walpole Society*, 16 (1927/8), p. 41. Mrs Lybbe Powys visited Stourhead the month before Curwen, and also noted Hoare's portrait – although she was more taken with Carlo Maratti's *Marchese Niccolò Maria Pallavicini Guided to the Temple of Virtue by Apollo, with a Self Portrait of the Artist*, 1705, then also in the hall. Emily J. Climens, ed., *Passages from the Diaries of Mrs Philip Lybbe Powys, 1756-1808* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1899), p. 171

<sup>4</sup> Marcia Pointon, 'Portrait! Portrait!! Portrait!!!', in David H. Solkin, ed., *Art on The Line: The Royal Academy Exhibitions at Somerset House, 1780-1836* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001), pp. 93-109, at pp. 95, 96; Gill Perry, 'The Spectacle of the Muse: Exhibiting the Actress at the Royal Academy', in Solkin, *Art on The Line*, pp.111-126. See also Mark Hallett, 'Reading the Walls: Pictorial Dialogue at the British Royal Academy', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 37, 4 (Summer 2004), pp. 581-604.

---

<sup>5</sup> Martin Postle, ed., *Joshua Reynolds: The Creation of Celebrity*, exh cat (London: Tate Publishing, 2005), cat. 33, p. 144

<sup>6</sup> Kate Retford, 'Reynolds's Portrait of Mrs Theresa Parker: A Case Study in Context', *British Art Journal*, 4 (2003), pp. 80-6

<sup>7</sup> Giles Waterfield, 'The Town House as Gallery of Art', *The London Journal*, 20, 1 (1995), pp. 47-66, at p. 51. See also M.H. Port, 'Town House and Country House: Their Interaction' in Dana Arnold, ed., *The Georgian Country House: Architecture, Landscape and Society* (Stroud: Sutton, 1998), pp. 117-38; M.H. Port, 'West End Palaces: The Aristocratic Town House in London, 1730-1830', *The London Journal*, 20, 1 (1995), pp. 17-46; Francis Haskell, 'The British as Collectors', in Gervase Jackson-Stops, ed., *The Treasure Houses of Britain:*

---

*Five Hundred Years of Private Patronage and Art Collecting* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985), pp. 50-9

<sup>8</sup> J.M. Robinson, 'Ancestral Piety' in *The British Face: A View of Portraiture 1625-1850* (London: P. & D. Colnaghi & Co., 1986), pp. 11-3

<sup>9</sup> Adrian Tinnisword, *A History of Country House Visiting: Five Centuries of Tourism and Taste* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell in association with the National Trust, 1989); Esther Moir, *The Discovery of Britain: The English Tourists, 1540-1840* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964), chp. 6; Ian Ousby, *The Englishman's England: Taste, Travel and the Rise of Tourism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

<sup>10</sup> John Britton, *The Beauties of Wiltshire*, 2 vols (London: Vernor & Hood, 1801), II, p. 3

<sup>11</sup> Peter Mandler, *The Fall and Rise of the Stately Home* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997), prelude and chp. 2

<sup>12</sup> Oliver, *Journal of Samuel Curwen*, I, p. 229

<sup>13</sup> Climenson, *Diaries of Mrs Philip Lybbe Powys*, p. 168

<sup>14</sup> For previous scholarship which has informed the discussion in this introduction, see, in particular, Marcia Pointon, *Hanging the Head: Portraiture and Social Formation in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993), section I, part I; Oliver Millar, 'Portraiture and the Country House', in Jackson-Stops, ed., *Treasure Houses of Britain*, pp. 28-39; Francis Russell, 'The Hanging and Display of Pictures, 1700-1850', in Gervase Jackson-Stops, et al., *The Fashioning and Functioning of the British Country House* (Washington D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1989), pp. 133-53

<sup>15</sup> Hussey, 'Stourhead', p. 639 made an interesting suggestion that Hoare may have been emulating the similarly 'nouveau riche' Child family at Wanstead (discussed in Kate Retford's essay) in employing Campbell as their architect.

---

<sup>16</sup> Shearer West, 'Framing Hegemony: Economics, Luxury and Family Continuity in the Country House Portrait', in Paul Duro, ed., *The Rhetoric of the Frame: Essays on the Boundaries of the Artwork* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 71. For work on the portrait hangs at Narford Hall, Raynham Hall and Wolterton Hall, see Andrew Moore, 'Hanging the Family Portraits', in Andrew Moore and Charlotte Crawley, *Family and Friends: A Regional Survey of British Portraiture* (London: HMSO, 1992), pp. 31-8. For work on that at Clandon Park, see Karen Stanworth, 'Picturing a Personal History: The Case of Edward Onslow', *Art History*, 16, 3 (1993), pp. 408-23. For the portraits at Blenheim, see Mark Hallett, 'A Monument to Intimacy: Joshua Reynolds's *The Marlborough Family*', *Art History*, 31, 5 (2008), pp. 691-720. For Kedleston, see Kate Retford, 'Sensibility and Genealogy in the Eighteenth-Century Family Portrait: The Collection at Kedleston Hall', *The Historical Journal*, 46 (2003), pp. 533-60. For Radburne Hall, see Martin Myrone, *Bodybuilding: Reforming Masculinities in British Art 1750-1810* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005), pp. 123-7

<sup>17</sup> *A Description of the House and Gardens at Stourhead* (Salisbury: J. Easton, 1800), pp. 7-10

<sup>18</sup> *A Description of the House and Gardens at Stourhead* (Bath: Messrs. Barratt and Son, 1818), p. 6 Richard Colt Hoare, *The History of Modern Wiltshire*, 6 vols (London: J. Nichols & Son, 1822), I, p. 70

<sup>19</sup> Hoare, *History of Modern Wiltshire*, I, pp. 70-1

<sup>20</sup> West, 'Framing Hegemony', p. 70 ff.

<sup>21</sup> Christopher Christie, *The British Country House in the Eighteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000); R. Wilson and A. Mackley, *Creating Paradise: the*

---

*Building of the English Country House, 1660-1880* (London: Hambledon, 2000); Arnold, *The Georgian Country House*, *passim*.

<sup>22</sup> Shearer West, 'Patronage and Power: the Role of the Portrait in Eighteenth-Century England', in Jeremy Black and Jeremy Gregory, eds., *Culture, Politics and Society in Britain, 1660-1800* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), pp. 136-42

<sup>23</sup> Jonathan Richardson, *An Essay on the Theory of Painting*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn (London: A. Bettesworth, 1725), p. 7

<sup>24</sup> Hoare, *History of Modern Wiltshire*, I, p. 85

<sup>25</sup> Kate Retford, *The Art of Domestic Life: Family Portraiture in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006), chapter 5 and conclusion.

<sup>26</sup> Deborah Cherry and Jennifer Harris, 'Eighteenth-Century Portraiture and the Seventeenth-Century Past: Gainsborough and van Dyck', *Art History*, 5 (1982), pp. 287-309.

<sup>27</sup> Charlotte Barrett, ed., *Diary and Letters of Madame d'Arblay*, 6 vols (London: Macmillan & Co., 1904), I, p. 272

<sup>28</sup> The literature on this theme across disciplines is exhaustive. Apart from the work of Ariès and Rybczynski discussed below, perhaps one of the most influential twentieth-century studies of the 'home' is Gaston Bachelard's *The Poetics of Space: The Classic Look at how we experience Intimate Places* (Boston: Beacon Press, first pub. 1958, trans. 1964). The book reveals the author's background in psychoanalysis and phenomenology, and offers poetic and imaginative exploration of the meanings of the house and home within modern culture. More recently, the disciplines of Cultural and Human Geography have made significant contributions to modern debates on spaces of the home, including the work of Alison Blunt and Robyn Dowling in their collection *Home* (London: Routledge, 2006) and Doreen Massey's influential writings on space. Beatriz Colomina's edited collection, *Sexuality and*

---

*Space* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1992) has also helped to place gender issues firmly on the map in the analysis of domestic space within Design History. Within eighteenth-century studies the idea of the ‘home’ has been interrogated (directly or indirectly) through studies focussed on different areas, including architectural history, and/or issues of gender, class and the family. Mark Girouard’s *Life in the English Country House* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978) and Christie’s *British Country House* have been influential in their explorations of the social and spatial meanings of eighteenth century country houses. For literature on gender and the family see footnotes 35, 36, 37 and 43 below.

<sup>29</sup> It should be noted here that the English language is rare in having the term ‘home’, although the latin *domus* has multiple usages. In many modern languages to say one is ‘at home’ often requires the use of several other words, using the ‘house’ as a metonym. Thus one is *a la maison* in French, *zu Hause* in German, *en casa* in Spanish or *ba bayit* in Hebrew. For a fuller discussion of these issues see K.H. Adler, ‘Gendering Histories of Home and Homecoming’ in K.H. Adler and Carrie Hamilton, *Homes and Homecomings: Gendered Histories of Domesticity and Return*, (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), p. 4

<sup>30</sup> Philippe Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood: Social History of Family Life*, (New York: Vintage, 1962); Witold Rybczynski, *Home: A Short History of an Idea*, (London: Penguin Books, 1986)

<sup>31</sup> Rybczynski, *Home*, p. 88

<sup>32</sup> Rybczynski, *Home*, p. 106

<sup>33</sup> Rybczynski, *Home*, p. 105

<sup>34</sup> See, for example, Port, ‘Town House and Country House’, pp. 117-138; Rachel Stewart, *The Town House in Georgian London*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press,

---

2009). Joseph Friedman is currently undertaking important work on the town house. For the suburban house, see Elizabeth Mckellar's forthcoming book.

<sup>35</sup> Domesticity has been seen to have a close relationship with new concepts of sociability and women and/or femininity. See Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class 1780-1850*, (London: Routledge, 1992). However the roles of eighteenth-century middle class men in the domestication of the eighteenth century home have also recently come under scrutiny. See Karen Harvey, 'Men Making Home in Eighteenth-Century Britain, in Adler and Hamilton, *Homes and Homecomings*, pp. 66-86.

<sup>36</sup> Dana Arnold, 'Defining Femininity: Women and the Country House', in *The Georgian Country House*, pp. 79-99; Judith S. Lewis, 'When a House is not a Home: Elite English Women and the Eighteenth-Century Country House', in *Journal of British Studies*, 48, 2 (April 2009), pp. 336-363.

<sup>37</sup> See Judith S. Lewis, *Sacred to Female Patriotism: Gender, Class and Politics in Late Georgian Britain* (New York: 2003); Helen Berry, 'Women, Consumption and Taste', in *Women's History: Britain, 1700-1850, an Introduction*, ed. Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus (London: Routledge, 2005), pp. 197-99; John Styles and Amanda Vickery, eds., *Gender, Taste, and Material Culture in Britain and North America, 1700-1830* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007). Amanda Vickery has also published widely on the subject of the culture of 'gentlewomen' and the permeable boundaries between public and private lives, including her *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's lives in Georgian England*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998, 2003).

<sup>38</sup> *Oxford English Dictionary*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973) Vol 1, p. 976

<sup>39</sup> Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry in a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. T. Burger et al. (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992).

---

<sup>40</sup> Vickery, *The Gentleman's Daughter*, p. 196

<sup>41</sup> See section one, foot note 7 above.

<sup>42</sup> *Oxford English Dictionary*, Vol 1, p. 976

<sup>43</sup> Naomi Tadmor, *Family and Friends in Eighteenth Century England: Household, Kinship, and Patronage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001). Tadmor argues convincingly for multiple notions of the family co-existing within eighteenth-century social discourse. She also posits the notion of the 'household family' that were not defined by blood or marriage, but held together by a system of 'household management' (see pp. 18-42).

<sup>44</sup> Fanny Burney, *Cecilia or Memoirs of an Heiress*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

<sup>45</sup> Margaret Anne Doody, 'Introduction to *Fanny Burney*', *ibid.*, p.xvi.

<sup>46</sup> Kate Retford, 'Patrilineal Portraiture? Gender and Genealogy in the Eighteenth-Century Country House', in *Gender, Taste, and Material Culture*, eds. Styles and Vickery, pp. 315-7

<sup>47</sup> Women's roles in the planning of eighteenth century houses is discussed by Dana Arnold in *The Georgian Country House*, p. 85ff.

<sup>48</sup> Rosemary Baird has explored the varied roles of aristocratic women who upon marriage became mistresses of large country houses in *Mistress of the House: Great Ladies and Grand Houses 1670-1830* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 2003).

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, chapters 5, 7 and 12 and see footnote 50 below

<sup>50</sup> Including a full-length of John Parker (RA, 1773) and a portrait of *Theresa Parker with her son John* of 1772-5. Reynolds was a regular visitor to Saltram, and ten of his works are currently in the collection. For Saltram, see Richard Stephens's essay in Sam Smiles, eds., *Sir Joshua Reynolds: The Acquisition of Genius* (Bristol: Sansom & Co., 2009); Kate Retford, 'Reynolds's Portrait of Mrs Theresa Parker: A Case Study in Context', *British Art Journal*, 4 (2003), pp. 80-6 and Baird, *Mistress of the House*, chp. 12

---

<sup>51</sup> Dana Arnold has explored the importance of foreign tourism and the Grand tour in her chapter ‘The Illusion of Grandeur? Antiquity, Grand Tourism and the Country House’ in *The Georgian Country House*, pp. 100-116

<sup>52</sup> Letter of 23 August, 1771, cited in Baird, *Mistress of the House*, p. 204

<sup>53</sup> Lewis, ‘When a House is not a Home’, p. 29

<sup>54</sup> Apart from Judith S. Lewis’s study, see for example, Frances Harris, *A Passion for Government: The Life of Sarah Duchess of Marlborough*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991). She also features prominently in Baird, *Mistress of the House*, op. cit.

<sup>55</sup> Baird, *Mistress of the House*, p. 42

<sup>56</sup> Harris, *A Passion for Government*, p. 304

<sup>57</sup> As Lewis has argued ‘Multiple houses served different functions.’ (‘When a House is Not a Home’, p. 350)

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 352

<sup>59</sup> Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, pp. 189-190

<sup>60</sup> For discussions of the classical pastoral and eighteenth-century pastoral poetry, see M. Mack the elder, *The Garden and the City: Retirement and Politics in the Later Poetry of Pope* (Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press, 1969); M.S. Røstvig, *The Happy Man: Studies in the Metamorphoses of a Classical Ideal*, 2 vols (Oslo: Norwegian Universities Press, 1954)

<sup>61</sup> For a useful overview of female poets and the pastoral genre, see Paula R. Backscheider, *Eighteenth-Century Women Poets and Their Poetry: Inventing Agency, Inventing Genre* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2005), pp. 233-257. For some specific examples of this type of poetry, see Mary Darwall, ‘Rural Happinss. To a Friend’ and ‘Elegy on Leaving’ in *Original Poems on Several Occasions. By Miss Whateley* (London: R. and J. Dodsley, 1764), pp. 29-33, 34-35; J. Griffiths, ‘Anacreontic, Inscrib’d to Mr. P . . . ., Upon

---

asking the Author, why she did not Treat upon War' and 'A Pastoral' in *A Collection of Juvenile Poems, on Various Subjects* (Warwick: J. Sharp, 1784), pp. 9-11, 11-13.

<sup>62</sup> For the most comprehensive and illuminating discussion of these portraits, particularly in relation to notions of pastoral retirement, see Mark Hallett, 'Pall-Mall Pastoral: Sir Joshua Reynolds, Celebrity and Sensibility', paper presented at the Centre for Eighteenth-Century Studies Research Seminar, York, 4 December 2007. Thanks to Mark Hallett for very kindly providing Jordan Vibert with a copy of this paper. All citations, including page numbers in square brackets, refer to this copy of the paper. A version of the paper is forthcoming in Hallett's book on Reynolds.

<sup>63</sup> See also David Mannings, *Sir Joshua Reynolds: A Complete Catalogue of His Paintings*, 2 vols (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000), II, pp. 124, 427; Hallett, 'Pall-Mall Pastoral', pp. 17-18.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>65</sup> Desmond Shawe-Taylor, *The Georgians: Eighteenth-Century Portraiture and Society* (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1990), p. 156.

<sup>66</sup> Mannings, *Reynolds*, II, p. 445.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, II, p. 447. For a more comprehensive account of these portraits, in relation to each other and the country house, see Jordan Vibert, 'Women, Portraiture and Political Representation, 1765-1787' (PhD thesis, University of York, 2011), pp. 118-170.

<sup>68</sup> George Townshend, 4th Viscount Townshend, Portman Square, London, to Lady Ann Townshend, [Raynham Hall, Norfolk], April 26 1773, British Library, MS Letters (typescript Correspondence) of Ann, Lady Townshend, Blakeney Collection, Add. 63110, 67.

<sup>69</sup> George Townshend, 4th Viscount Townshend, Portman Square, London, to Lady Ann Townshend, [Raynham Hall, Norfolk], December 1778, BL, Letters of Ann, Lady Townshend, Add. 63110, 102.

---

<sup>70</sup> Mannings, *Reynolds*, II, p. 447.

<sup>71</sup> Christie, *British Country House*, pp. 4, 15-16. All figures have been calculated using the retail price index according to 'Measuring Worth' [<http://www.measuringworth.com/>]

<sup>72</sup> Christie, *British Country House*, p. 10.

<sup>73</sup> Arnold, *The Georgian Country House*, p. 16.

<sup>74</sup> For some clear overviews of the relationship between property and political power in this period, see Richard Price, *British Society 1680-1880: Dynamism, Containment and Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 242-244; W.A. Speck, *Stability and Strife: England, 1714-1760* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977), pp. 143-146

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 35-36; Christie, *British Country House*, pp. 4, 98-99.

<sup>76</sup> For a useful summary of this 'country party' ideology in relation to landownership see John Barrell, 'The Public Prospect and the Private View: the Politics of Taste in Eighteenth-Century Britain' in *Reading Landscape: Country-City-Capital*, ed. Simon Pugh (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990), pp. 28-29.

<sup>77</sup> Christie, *British Country House*, pp. 38-39

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 44-45.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 197. See also Kate Retford, 'Sensibility and Genealogy in the Eighteenth-Century Family Portrait: The Collection at Kedleston Hall', *The Historical Journal*, 46 (2003), pp. 533-60

<sup>80</sup> See M. J. Charlesworth, 'The Wentworths: Family and Political Rivalry in the English Landscape Garden', *Garden History*, 14, 2 (Autumn, 1986), pp. 134-35.

<sup>81</sup> For a fuller discussion of Boston Castle and its political resonances and meanings, see Vibert, 'Women, Portraiture and Political Representation', pp. 192-197.

<sup>82</sup> Richardson, *Essay on the Theory of Painting*, p. 14.

---

<sup>83</sup> Victoria Townshend Durham, *Short Guide Historical and Descriptive to Raynham Hall* (Fakenham, Norfolk: The Lancaster Press, Ltd, 1951), p. 9; D. J. B. Trim, 'Vere, Horace [Horatio], Baron Vere of Tilbury (1565–1635)' in *ODNB* online, [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28211>, accessed 22 July 2012].

<sup>84</sup> James Durham, *The Collection of Pictures at Raynham Hall, being 3 Annotated Catalogues* (Raynham, Norfolk: James A. C. Durham, 1926), pp. 11-13. See, also, the reproduction of one of these portraits in Quincy Lee, 'A Catalogue of British Old Master Paintings in the Collection of the Louisiana State University Museum of Art' (MA thesis, Louisiana State University, 2009), pp. 11-12 [Louisiana State University Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Collection, accessed 5 June, 2011, <http://etd.lsu.edu/docs/available/etd-04152009-092929/>.]

<sup>85</sup> Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), pp. 279-280. For a more recent and extensive discussion of the relationship between the country house and the British empire, see Stephanie Barczewski, *British Country Houses and Empire, 1700-1945* (forthcoming, Manchester University Press).

<sup>86</sup> Christie, *British Country House*, pp. 10-11.

<sup>87</sup> For the most comprehensive account of colonial subjects in eighteenth-century portraiture, see Beth Fowkes Tobin, *Picturing Imperial Power: Colonial Subjects in Eighteenth-century British Painting* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1999), pp. 27-55.

<sup>88</sup> Stafford M. Linsley, 'Delaval, John Hussey, Baron Delaval (1728–1808)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2011 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/39337>, accessed 22 July 2012].

<sup>89</sup> John Charlton, *Hidden Chains: The Slavery Business and North East England* (Newcastle: Tyne Bridge Publishing, 2008), pp. 127-8.

---

<sup>90</sup> Hermione De Almeida and George H. Gilpin, *Indian Renaissance: British Romantic Art and the Prospect of India* (Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006), p. 104.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 295

<sup>92</sup> For a useful overview of these splits and their causes see Ian R. Christie, *Wars and Revolutions: Britain, 1760-1815* (London: Edward Arden Ltd, 1982), pp. 146-157.

<sup>93</sup> George Thomas Keppel, sixth Earl of Albemarle, *Memoirs of the Marquis of Rockingham and his Contemporaries*, 2 vols (London: Richard Bentley, 1852), II, p. 408

<sup>94</sup> See Kathleen Wilson, *The Sense of the People: Politics, Culture and Imperialism in England, 1715-1785* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995, 1998), pp. 185-192, 202-203, 219-227, 253-54; Robert Jones, *Literature, Gender and Politics in Britain during the War for America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 34-35, 124-127, 237.

<sup>95</sup> Mannings, *Reynolds*, II, pp. 483, 482.

<sup>96</sup> Jordan Vibert is grateful to Robert Jones and Mark Hallett for an enlightening discussion about these two portraits, which has significantly contributed to her readings of them in this essay.