



# The Milltown Collection: reconstructing an eighteenth-century picture-hang

---

AIDAN O'BOYLE

THE MILLTOWN COLLECTION IS THE ONLY LARGE-SCALE IRISH GRAND TOUR COLLECTION of paintings and sculpture to have survived relatively intact.<sup>1</sup> In 1902 Geraldine Evelyn, 6th and last Countess of Milltown, bequeathed the contents of Russborough to the National Gallery of Ireland by deed of gift. This article considers these important collections of the Georgian period within their original settings by using a combination of documentary evidence and newly discovered Victorian photographs of the interiors at Russborough House. It thus presents a unique glimpse of attitudes to picture-hanging, display and interior decoration in the eighteenth-century country house.

Both Russborough house and its collections were largely the work of one man, Joseph Leeson, later 1st Earl of Milltown (1711-1783). A wealthy Dublin business family of Northamptonshire extraction, the Leeson's accumulated their wealth in property development and brewing. Joseph Leeson's father, Joseph Leeson senior, was described by Jonathan Swift as a 'fanatic brewer', and accused of sharp practice, having apparently bought new houses at drastically reduced prices from bankrupt Dublin tradesmen. In this way, according to Swift, Leeson senior was 'reported to have [accumulated] some hundreds of houses in this town'.<sup>2</sup> Joseph, the brewer's son, appears to have grown up in the shadow of his father, his obituarist, in 1783, noting that almost the whole of his vast property had been accumulated by the founder of the family and not his art-collecting son.<sup>3</sup> Between the brewer and the 1st Earl of Milltown, the family amassed vast estates in nine counties.<sup>4</sup> Joseph Leeson was both socially and politically ambitious. Having inherited a fortune built on trade, he acquired an estate near Blessington, county Wicklow. The ownership of property was the first step in a career that saw him enter the Irish parliament as MP for Rathcormack in 1743. Primate Stone writing to Chief Secretary Weston in 1748 recommended Leeson for a peerage:

---

1 – Sebastiano Galeotti, *REBECCA AT THE WELL* (also known as *REBECCA AND ELIEZER*) (detail) 1709, oil on canvas, 218.4 x 276.8 cm (courtesy National Trust: Iliffe Collection, Basildon Park)

His chief merits are a great fortune and constant attachment to the King and his Government. His demerits are of a common failing of a Bourgeois Gentlehomme ... In the course of a long Government, as I wish my Lord Harrington's to be, it will be difficult to steer ... clear of objections, and in an age where the Doctrine of Temporal Rewards ... is so firmly believed and practiced, this Gentleman would lie heavy upon your hands if he grows to think, that he stands particularly excluded.<sup>5</sup>

Leeson, with a fortune of £50,000 and an income of £8,000 a year, built Russborough House between 1741 and 1751 (Plate 2). Clearly it was intended as a symbol of his wealth, status and political ambition. He did not have long to wait for a peerage as he was created Baron Russborough in 1756, Viscount Russborough in 1760, and Earl of Milltown in 1763. Leeson's art collecting activities were conducted in tandem with the building of the house and his political career. In 1744, the year after he entered parliament, Leeson departed for Italy on his first Grand Tour. With his new house under construction, there was a pressing need to furnish it and to acquire a suitably grand collection of sculpture and paintings for its bare and ancestor-less walls.

In Florence he acquired a pair of tabletops from Don Pietro Belloni, while in Rome he was one of the first Grand Tourists, British or Irish, to sit to the celebrated portraitist Pompeo Batoni (1708-1787). This painting, signed and dated 1744 (NGI 701), is the first record of Leeson's presence in that city. Shown casually dressed in an expensive fur-lined *robe de chambre*, and posing against a red drape and pedestal, it is a portrait of Leeson as aspiring aristocrat, revealing no trace of his bourgeois origins.<sup>6</sup> Leeson was fortunate

2 – Russborough House, exterior, c.1864-70 (all b/w photos: private collection)



to have as secretary in Rome the distinguished Irish archaeologist and traveller Robert Wood (1717-1771), whose interests encompassed both architecture and painting.<sup>7</sup> Indeed, Wood may well have had a considerable influence on Leeson's purchases. On his first trip Leeson is believed to have acquired four paintings – two Roman landscapes and two *capricci*, dated 1742, by Giovanni Paolo Panini (1691-1765). In March 1745 he also commissioned a copy of Salvator Rosa's *Death of Atilius Regulus* (NGI 1045) from the French painter Claude Joseph Vernet (1714-1789). In that same month, perhaps not long before his departure from Rome, Leeson's collecting activities were dealt a severe blow. Horace Mann, in a letter to Horace Walpole dated 9th March 1745, noted that a vessel 'named the Augustus Caesar, with £60,000 worth of goods, and many statues, pictures, etc, of one Mr Leeson', had been captured by the French.<sup>8</sup> The full extent of the loss remains unclear but must have been substantial. It is unlikely that Leeson, with a new political career to attend to and an expensive house under construction, could have afforded the time or the money to readily assemble a second collection. The loss of the *Augustus Caesar* therefore necessitated Leeson's second Grand Tour of 1750-51, and it is the fruits of that tour which forms the focus of discussion in this paper.

## EARLY PHOTOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE

**D**URING THE COURSE OF RESEARCH, A UNIQUELY IMPORTANT SERIES OF PHOTOGRAPHS of the interiors of Russborough House were discovered. These images, now in a private collection, consist of an external view of the house and five views of the principal reception rooms. The rooms in question are the entrance hall, the large drawing room, the small drawing room, small dining room and the saloon. In the absence of family papers, these photographs are an exceptionally valuable source of information concerning the arrangement of the paintings and sculpture at Russborough prior to the removal of the Milltown Collection to the National Gallery of Ireland in 1906. The images, which are in the *carte de visite* format, are reduced copies of larger photographs taken by the studio of Blake & Edgar of 32 Midland Road, Bedford. This firm of photographers was in existence between 1860 and 1910, indicating that the photographs could be no earlier than 1860. The images have also been carefully examined by the photographic historian David Davison, and on the basis of format, paper and chemicals used, have been dated to the period 1860 to 1870. Furthermore, the identification of a seated marble statue of Erato (NGI 8207) in the small dining room by the English sculptor Nicholas Roskill (fl.1861-72) is dated 1864, a fact which further narrows the date range to the years 1864 to 1870. The accurate dating of these photographs is of particular importance as it enables us to view the Russborough interiors as they were in the mid-Victorian period, prior to any alterations or additions to the collection which were made by and during the long residence of Geraldine Evelyn, 6th and last Countess of Milltown (1841-1914). Edward Nugent Leeson, 6th Earl of Milltown (1835-1890), married Lady



Geraldine Evelyn Stanhope, daughter of the 5th Earl of Harrington, in 1871. In that same year he inherited Russborough from his unmarried brother Joseph Henry, 5th Earl of Milltown. The photographs of the interiors must, therefore, have been taken towards the end of the 4th Earl's life (d.1866) or during the short tenure of his son, the 5th Earl (d.1871). In any event, they illustrate the arrangement of the collections of paintings and sculptures before the addition of a substantial number of Victorian portraits and busts of various members of the Stanhope family.

The addition of these and other works in the late nineteenth century must, to some degree, have disturbed the arrangement of the collection as photographed in the 1860s. This is particularly true in relation to the appearance of the entrance hall, which became the repository for many of the Stanhope paintings and sculpture. Without the photographic evidence it would be impossible to reconstruct what was, in all likelihood, the original eighteenth-century arrangement. While the photographs of the other rooms reveal a good deal of nineteenth-century furniture disposed in a typically cluttered Victorian manner, the arrangement of the paintings conforms well to what is known of eighteenth-century hanging practice.

## THE SCULPTURE COLLECTION AT RUSSBOROUGH

RUSSBOROUGH HOUSE HAS LONG BEEN ADMIRER AS, AMONG OTHER THINGS, AN ELEGANTLY designed repository for the display of sculpture. It is reasonable to assume that Joseph Leeson would have discussed his intention of forming a sculpture collection with his architect Richard Castle (d.1751) prior to his departure for Italy in 1744. As a result, Castle provided niches for thirty-three statues in total – twenty-six externally and seven internally. Indeed, the building of the house between 1741 and 1751 coincided with Leeson's Grand Tours of 1744-45 and 1750-51, during which time most of his sculpture was acquired, and the niches, both inside and out, suggest that he did not intend to return from Italy empty-handed. On the entrance front there are twelve niches, six in each of the colonnades flanking the central block. At the rear of the house there are a further fourteen niches, seven on either side of the garden front. Internally, the entrance hall was reserved exclusively for the display of sculpture.

The sculptures in the colonnades survive intact in the niches for which they were intended. According to the research of the late Chris Caffrey, there is no documentary evidence to prove that they were commissioned by Leeson, although the bulk of the circumstantial evidence points in that direction.<sup>9</sup> Leeson had, according to Horace Mann (noted above), already acquired and dispatched a large shipment of statues and pictures by 1745. This poses the question: how many other undocumented shipments did Joseph Lesson get through in the 1740s and early 1750s? Had the records survived the question might be answerable. Either way, it is beyond doubt that Leeson was actively collecting sculpture while Russborough House was being built.

Despite Leeson's great wealth, the acquisition of high-quality Roman antiquities was no easy matter in mid-eighteenth-century Rome. The opening decades of the eighteenth century saw the dispersal of several of the collections of the more impoverished Roman patrician families. The departure of the Odescalchi Collection of sculpture to Madrid in 1724 and the Chigi Collection to Dresden in 1728 prompted the Papal authorities to take stringent action. Restrictions were placed on the export of antiquities and a licensing system was introduced, entitling the Papal authorities to one-third of any antiquities excavated within their territories. Equally, they could prevent the export of any individual work deemed to be of particular quality. Hence, Leeson, like Ralph Howard, the Earl of Charlemont and others, had to content himself with modern copies after the antique. This, however, did not prevent him from attempting to acquire the two Furietti centaurs from Hadrian's Villa (1751), now held in the Capitoline Museum in Rome. Their distinguished provenance, and the fact that they bore genuine inscriptions by Aristeeas and Papias of Aphrodisias, made them highly desirable. Unfortunately for Leeson, his offer of £2,000 was met with indignation, and there the matter ended.<sup>10</sup> However, this incident clearly indicates Leeson's pursuit of first-rate classical antiquities.

Back at Russborough, Richard Castle probably conceived the entrance hall as a repository for choice examples from Leeson's sculpture collection. The hall contains five niches and four oculi, with an additional two niches in the west quadrant corridor. While the sculptural programme of the external colonnades has apparently remained unaltered since its earliest recorded description in G.N. Wright's *A Tour in Ireland*, published in 1823, the indoor sculpture has been the source of much speculation and controversy, principally due to the lack of family papers, the cursory nature in which the National Gallery of Ireland originally inventoried the Milltown bequest, and the absence of photographs of the interior prior to its removal in 1906.<sup>11</sup> The schedule or inventory attached to the deed of gift merely lists the sculpture in the entrance hall in 1902, but is of little use in visualising the arrangement of the individual pieces. The items listed were marble busts of Portia, Brutus, Seneca and Cicero. There were also life-size statues of the youthful Bacchus and Diana, the latter being almost certainly a statue of the *Venus Genetrix*.<sup>12</sup> Two statuettes were listed of Hercules in marble and plaster.<sup>13</sup> To confuse matters, there is also an undated typescript list of sculpture in the Milltown Papers in the National Gallery from which the following 'modern sculpture' can be added: casts of Mercury, *The Musical Faun* and the *Venus de Medici*. There was also a bust of Marcus Aurelius as a boy and four casts of the heads of Roman empresses. The latter were certainly those which occupied the oculi above the doors at the angles of the room, and which were still *in situ* when the hall was photographed by *Country Life* in 1937.<sup>14</sup> It would appear that there was an element of duplication between the internal and external sculpture, as the figures of Mercury, Hercules and the faun appear more than once. It is fortunate, therefore, that in the course of research, a photograph of the entrance hall has come to light. Soundly dated to the mid or late 1860s, it was created a generation before the deed of gift inventory was made and shortly before the 6th Earl and Countess inherited the house. When the inventory is cross-

referenced with the photograph, it becomes clear that much had been rearranged in the entrance hall in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. However, for the sake of clarity, this article will concentrate on the earlier photographic evidence.

The 1902 inventory attached to the deed of gift merely lists the sculpture in the entrance hall. According to recent research by the conservator Richard Ireland, the sculpture in the entrance hall would have been originally displayed against a stone-coloured background of pale grey and matt white.<sup>15</sup> Such colour schemes were common in entrance halls in the eighteenth century, and those at Russborough have recently been reinstated on the basis of scientific evidence. Such a neutral choice of colours would not have distracted attention from the white marble and plaster sculptures which were intended to be the primary source of interest.

It is necessary, at this point, to take stock of the indoor sculpture as listed in the 1902 inventory. Excluding small sculptural groups, busts and bronzes, it consisted of nine statues, comprising four casts and five marbles. The casts were of *Mercury*, *Hercules*, the *Venus de Medici* and *The Dancing Faun*. It is worth noting that Joseph Leeson was content to settle for casts of these antiquities while his less affluent peers, Ralph Howard and Lord Charlemont, commissioned marble copies of such works.<sup>16</sup> The *Mercury* was much admired in the eighteenth century. The statue was first recorded in the sculpture court of the Belvedere in the Vatican palace in 1536 and was later removed to Florence. Although frequently reproduced, it is unclear whether the copyists looked to the Uffizi version or a bronze copy in the Farnese Collection. Indeed, there are many copies in Britain and Ireland, such as that made for Houghton Hall in Norfolk.<sup>17</sup> The *Venus de Medici* was first recorded in the Villa Medici in Rome in 1638. It has been in the Tribuna of the Uffizi since 1688, where it would have been seen by most Grand Tourists, including Joseph Leeson. It was considered one of the best statues to have survived from antiquity, though in fact it is a copy of a lost bronze and dates from about the first century BC.<sup>18</sup> *The Dancing Faun* is a third-century copy of a bronze original, first recorded in 1665. It was in the collection of the Grand Duke of Tuscany by 1673 and in the Tribuna by 1688. It was often paired with the *Venus de Medici* and was frequently copied.<sup>19</sup> According to Lynda Mulvin, the remaining works, five in number, comprised 'one of the few collections of antique sculpture brought to Ireland in the mid eighteenth century'.<sup>20</sup> It is possible, therefore, that Leeson was advised on these purchases by the Robert Wood who had acted as his secretary in Rome in 1744-45. Wood is known to have commissioned four landscapes from the French painter Claude Joseph Vernet (1714-1789) on Leeson's behalf in December 1749, and may have continued working for him until he left Italy in May 1750.<sup>21</sup> Interestingly, the author of *A Guide to the County of Wicklow*, published in 1827, noted the presence at Russborough of 'a few figures, in small life found in the subterranean cities of Pompeii, and Herculaneum'.<sup>22</sup> Mulvin may well be correct in her assertion that Leeson built his sculpture collection around this core group of antiquities. However, both Caffrey and Mulvin are almost certainly incorrect in thinking that such valuable works were intended for the garden front, and it seems more likely

that such prized works were displayed indoors. These consisted of statues of Bacchus, Diana, Hercules, *Venus Genetrix* and Dionysos/Apollino. The works, which appear to have been of high quality, are thought to have been of Parian marble and are believed to date from the late first to the second century AD, being Roman copies of Greek originals.

As was standard practice in the eighteenth century, these Roman antiquities were probably repaired – with new heads and limbs added – by Bartolomeo Cavaceppi (c.1716-1791), who was then the most prominent restorer in Rome. By the time of Leeson's second visit to Rome in 1750-51, Cavaceppi was a well-established dealer and antiquarian working from his own studio on the via Gesu e Maria, close to S Maria del Popolo. His principal patron was Cardinal Albani, by whom he was employed on the restoration of sculpture. Cavaceppi produced copies of antiquities in various sizes and media for the Grand Tour market. Joseph Leeson possessed two, *Faun with A Kid* and *Faun with a Goat*, both of which are signed and dated 1751.<sup>23</sup> It would make sense, therefore, that Leeson would have acquired his antiquities from Cavaceppi, with Wood acting as agent; foreign collectors such as Leeson generally preferred to deal with agents of their own nationality.

#### A TOUR OF THE HOUSE IN THE 1860S: THE ENTRANCE HALL

BASED ON THE PHOTOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE, AND WORKING IN A CLOCKWISE DIRECTION, it is possible to reconstruct the arrangement of the sculpture around the entrance hall (Plate 3). Mercury, Roman god of commerce and prosperity, stood to the left of the saloon door; to the right of this door was a cast of the *Venus de Medici*, one of the most revered of all Roman antiquities. The statue of Venus, in turn, was followed by the youthful Bacchus, god of wine (both Bacchus and Mercury were lovers of the goddess). The statue of Bacchus is thought to have been made from finely carved Parian marble dating from the second century AD, and wears a tunic trimmed with goat or faun skin known as a nebris. Depictions of this costume are rare and are normally associated with pastoralism and hunting.<sup>24</sup> This is appropriate, as the statue of Bacchus was originally paired, on the other side of the chimneypiece, with one of Diana the Huntress. This was not a copy of the well-known *Diana of Ephesus*, now in the Louvre, but was closer to a related work in the Vatican Museum. As with the statue of Bacchus, the Diana appears to have been a work of high quality in Parian marble. It is likely that the heads of both the Diana and Bacchus were part of Cavaceppi's eighteenth-century restorations.

Out of range of the camera, the west wall contains only one niche opposite the chimney piece. It is slightly larger than all the others and is pedimented. Of the thirty-three sculpture niches at Russborough, both indoor and out, it is by far the most conspicuous and was presumably intended to hold the most important of Joseph Leeson's antiquities. So far, four of the indoor statues have been accounted for; by a process of elimination the occupant of the most important niche in the house must be drawn from one of the remain-





3 – Russborough House, entrance hall, c.1864-70

ing sculptures listed in the 1902 inventory. These consisted of a cast of *The Dancing Faun*, a rather slight and insubstantial antique marble of a youthful Dionysus/Apollino, and a *Venus Genetrix*. Of these, the *Venus Genetrix* is, according to Mulvin, the finest piece of antique sculpture in the Milltown Collection.<sup>25</sup> It is believed that this work is one of many Roman copies after a Greek original, dated, on stylistic grounds, to around 410 BC. Leeson's Roman copy has been dated to the late first or early second century AD.<sup>26</sup> Therefore, as the centrepiece of his collection, it seems reasonable to assume that it would have been given pride of place in the most prominent niche in the house. The pedimented niche in question was flanked by a pair of marble urns on mahogany pedestals, beyond which stood a pair of tables surmounted by sculptures. These were copies of *The Wrestlers* and *The Arrotino*, also known as *The Knife Sharpener* or *Listening Slave*. It was common practice for eighteenth- and nineteenth-century collectors to pair these works of similar size and fame. Like the *Venus de Medici*, these were works that no self-respecting eighteenth-century connoisseur would have been without. *The Wrestlers*, according to Tobias Smollet, delighted dilettanti such as Leeson, who enjoyed gauging the groups' qualities against those of other famous antique statues in the Tribune at the Uffizi in Florence.<sup>27</sup> There was much controversy among the connoisseurs of Leeson's day as regards the title of *The Arrotino* or *Listening Slave*, and it is unknown which of the many titles Leeson himself used. The Uffizi work is now thought to be a Pergamene original of high quality.<sup>28</sup> Leeson's *Wrestlers* and *Arrotino* were executed by Giovanni Battista Piamontini (fl.1725-1762), who was thought by Dr James Tyrrell, Leeson's agent in Florence, to be the finest copyist in that city.<sup>29</sup> Piamontini was the lesser-known son of the

eminent Florentine sculptor Giuseppi Piamontini (1664-1742). Unfortunately, little is known of his activities to date, except that he copied busts of Tully and Seneca for another Irish Grand Tourist, Ralph Howard, in 1752.

The formal sculptural arrangement of the entrance hall was completed by three cinerary urns, now held in the National Gallery of Ireland. Although their authenticity and provenance have been questioned in the past, they are clearly visible in the 1860s photograph. They stood on black marble bases beneath the niches flanking the chimney piece and under the pediment niche directly opposite. All three are listed in the 1902 inventory. According to Sergio Benedetti, two of the three are genuine antiquities, while the third is an eighteenth-century Roman copy.<sup>30</sup>

Having thus far accounted for the arrangement of most of the indoor sculptures, the remaining two – a cast of *The Dancing Faun* and an antique marble of Dionysius/Apollino – must have stood in the niches in the west quadrant corridor. There is evidence that the west corridor, unlike that in the east wing which led to the kitchen, served as a repository of tapestry and sculpture until the removal of the Milltown Collection to the National Gallery in 1906.<sup>31</sup> This corridor, which led from the private (or bachelor) quarters in the west wing to the large drawing room in the central block, was admirably suited to such a purpose. While it is possible that it may have been an early nineteenth-century development, prompted by the 4th Earl's Grand Tour in 1820, the presence of two niches would suggest that it could have been designed with the display of sculpture in mind. However, two niches do not make a sculpture gallery, and therefore it is fortunate that Lady Milltown had the foresight to record that it was the principal repository of the family collection of bronzes.<sup>32</sup>

## THE MILLTOWN BRONZES

THE MILLTOWN BRONZES HAVE, TO DATE, RECEIVED RELATIVELY LITTLE ATTENTION, despite the fact that such works were a characteristic feature of most Grand Tour collections.<sup>33</sup> Those who could not acquire the most expensive and sought-after classical antiquities often contented themselves with miniature copies in bronze or less expensive materials. Joseph Leeson, in all likelihood, was no exception. By the middle of the eighteenth century, small bronzes had begun to emerge from the cabinets of the cognoscenti to take their place on top of chimney pieces in drawing rooms and libraries. The most famous contemporary illustration of this trend is Johann Zoffany's painting of Sir Laurence Dundas in his London library of 1769 (private collection). Such *garniture de cheminée* may well have existed at Russborough during the eighteenth century. The *Illustrated Summary Catalogue of Prints and Sculpture* in the National Gallery of Ireland lists fourteen bronzes of Milltown provenance.<sup>34</sup> Of these, only five predate the nineteenth century and were probably bought by Joseph Leeson or his son, the 2nd Earl (1744-1801). Significantly, all of these works are either copies after the renowned Renaissance

sculptor Giambologna (1529-1608), or works by one of his students. For Leeson's generation, Giambologna had almost achieved the status of his antique predecessors.<sup>35</sup> Lord Charlemont, for example, used a copy of his *Mercury* as the focal point of the long corridor leading to the library wing at Charlemont House (since demolished). Of the five bronzes, one depicts *The Executioner with the head of John the Baptist* (NGI 8122). This is a variant of a statuette of Mars by Giambologna dating from the 1570s. It was executed by the Florentine sculptor Massimilno Soldani (1656-1740), who catered almost exclusively for the tastes of northern European clients such as Joseph Leeson.<sup>36</sup> Soldani specialised in the production of small-scale replicas after the antique. Leeson, with his large collection of life-size copies, would have had no reason to duplicate them in miniature, opting instead for these works in the style of Giambologna.

The remaining four bronzes represent *The Labours of Hercules*. They were executed in the workshop of the Florentine sculptor Ferdinando Tacca (1619-1686). Tacca cast statuettes after Giambologna using the original models, his father having inherited the master's studio. Two of the four Milltown bronzes, *Hercules with the Hydra* (NGI 8121) and *Hercules with the Erymanthian Boar* (NGI 8123), are thought to have been cast from the original models. The other two, *Hercules slaying the Nemean Lion* (NGI 8124) and *Hercules with the Pillars* (NGI 8125), are attributed to a follower of Giambologna.<sup>37</sup> The remaining nine Milltown bronzes, now also held in the National Gallery of Ireland, were added to the collection in the early nineteenth century. J.P. Neale, in his account of Russborough published in 1826, noted that the then earl had 'brought from Italy some very fine Bronzes'.<sup>38</sup>

The earl in question was Joseph, 4th Earl of Milltown (1799-1866). Following his father's premature death in 1800, his mother, Emily Douglas, married one of the great Irish art collectors of the early nineteenth century, Valentine Lawless, 2nd Baron Cloncurry (1773-1853). The 4th Earl would therefore have spent his formative years at Lyons, county Kildare, under the influence of his stepfather Lord Cloncurry. He reached the age of majority in 1820, and sometime between that date and the publication of Neale's work in 1826 he visited Italy. He was certainly there in 1824, for in that year he fathered the eldest of three illegitimate children known as the Fitz Leasons.<sup>39</sup> As a collector of sculpture, his activities are naturally overshadowed by those of his great grandfather, the 1st Earl. However, he did, at least in terms of bronzes, make a valuable contribution to the ancestral collection and one that complemented the activities of his predecessors.

There is a series of seven early nineteenth-century bronzes of the Roman School in the National Gallery of Ireland collection. These are reduced copies after the antique, and consist of *The Dying Gaul* (NGI 8112), *The Borghese Gladiator* (NGI 8117), *Laocoon* (NGI 8127), the *Apollo Belvedere* (NGI 8144) and the *Venus de Medici* (NGI 8226), as well as copies of the *Apoxyomenos* (NGI 8126) and the *Cinnatus* or *Sandal Binder* (NGI 8286).<sup>40</sup> The production of faithful replicas after such famous antiquities became the norm in the late seventeenth century, but was beginning to wane by the early nineteenth century. This was due to the fame of the Venetian sculptor Antonio Canova (1757-1822) and

the demand for bronze copies after his works.<sup>41</sup> It would appear that the 4th Earl acquired a bronze of *The Dancing Girls* after Canova, and there is also a reduced marble copy of his *Sleeping Nymph* (NGI 8103) in the National Gallery of Ireland.<sup>43</sup> Leeson did, however, also possess two bronzes after Thorvaldsen: one, *A Shepherd Boy* (NGI 8227), is a reduced copy after a marble of 1817; the other, *Venus with an Apple* (NGI 8110), is a copy of a marble of about 1813–16.<sup>43</sup>

It is probable that these works were acquired, like the others, in the 1820s. However, a few are unaccounted for, such as Canova's *Dancing Girls*, *Apollino* and *Mercury*; busts of Nero, Napoleon and the King of Rome; and replicas of Trajan's Column and another unidentified column. Another two bronzes that do not appear to match any in the National Gallery of Ireland collection are visible in early photographs of Russborough of the 1860s and in 1912.<sup>44</sup> It is likely that any statuettes from the Milltown Collection which are not now held in the National Gallery of Ireland were sold by auction at Russborough in 1932.<sup>45</sup>

#### THE SOUTH ROOMS:

#### THE LARGE DRAWING ROOM, OLD DINING ROOM AND STUDY

IT HAS BEEN ARGUED BY JOHN CORNFORTH, ON STYLISTIC GROUNDS, THAT THE DECORATION of the large drawing room and dining room which flank the entrance hall on the south side of the house was completed after 1751.<sup>46</sup> This is based on the baroque character of the stuccowork in these rooms as opposed to the lighter rococo ornament found in the north-facing room, which must have been executed at a slightly later date. There is no question as to the nature of the picture-hang in these rooms, as the walls of both apartments were decorated with stucco frames. The Kentian-style rectangular frames in the dining room were removed by Sir Alfred Beit in the 1950s, but originally contained a series of nine landscapes by the Irish painter George Barret (c.1730-1784). This substantial commission would have come as a major boost to Barret, who was scarcely more than twenty years old at the time. It was also a forerunner to the much more ambitious series of landscapes Barret painted for Richard Wingfield, 3rd Viscount Powerscourt, in the early 1760s. However, unlike Powerscourt's commission, which consisted of views of his estates, Leeson opted for idealised Italianate landscapes and views of Rome after Giovanni Battista Busiri (1698-1757).<sup>47</sup> It might be expected that Leeson would have preferred views of his own estate, but at the time Russborough was built, its surroundings were, for the most part, barren and treeless. It would have taken a considerable time for the newly planted demesne to reach maturity. This may well account for the general absence of such works in the Milltown Collection.<sup>48</sup> Given Leeson's great wealth and discernment as a collector and patron, it is surprising that three of Barret's paintings are actually enlarged copies after small gouaches by Busiri, recently described as an artist of 'very modest talent but considerable popularity'.<sup>49</sup> He was, in fact, one of the earliest



Roman artists to supply small, portable and well-painted souvenirs of Rome to Grand Tourists, and his work was much sought after between the 1730s and early 1750s. Noted for his excellent draughtsmanship, if rather restricted repertory, Busiri's views of Rome are very common, and are also to be found in both the Wicklow and Westport collections.<sup>50</sup> Joseph Leeson's discernment, or lack of it, in this regard is difficult to explain. Given that he had just completed two Grand Tours, it is surprising that he had not commissioned a series of paintings for the dining room as he had done for the large drawing room, or at the very least have enlargements made of the four fine Panini views in his possession. However, in the absence of documentary evidence, his motives must remain a matter for speculation.

The decoration of the large drawing room, like that of the old dining room, was believed by Cornforth to have been executed after 1751 (Plate 4). Here, the walls were decorated with vigorously modelled stucco frames, specifically designed to accommodate four oval seascapes by Claude Joseph Vernet.<sup>51</sup> According to Vernet's account book, Robert Wood, in his capacity as agent, commissioned four oval paintings on Leeson's behalf in December 1749. The order was placed shortly before Leeson's departure for Rome, where he is recorded as being resident by Easter of 1750. Vernet had undertaken to complete the commission by the middle of 1751 – in other words, before Leeson's departure for Ireland. According to Benedetti, Joseph Leeson prolonged his stay in Rome until later in the year. However, there is evidence that he attended Lord Orford's picture sale in Covent Garden, London, on 13th and 14th June 1751.<sup>52</sup> Leeson's second Roman sojourn was therefore, if anything, shorter than has been previously thought. Given that

*4 – Russborough House, large drawing room, c.1864-70*





Vernet was seriously overburdened with work in the early 1750s and had difficulty meeting the deadline for Ralph Howard's commission, among others, it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that Leeson may have left Rome empty-handed.<sup>53</sup>

On the basis of photographic evidence from the 1860s and 1912, it is clear that these stucco frames were, during the nineteenth-century at least, lavishly gilded, and that the paintings within them – four oval marines representing the times of the day – were not hung in chronological order. Francis Russell, in his work on picture-hanging and display, has noted that ‘the claims of symmetry, place a premium on sets and pairs’, and that individual works might be enlarged or reduced to serve as pendants.<sup>54</sup> This is certainly true of the Russborough drawing room, where Vernet's four seascapes were augmented by two copies of works which were executed for Benjamin Lethieullier in 1751.<sup>55</sup> These were *Morning: A Port in Mist – Fishermen hauling in their Boat* and *River Landscape with the Temple of Vista at Tivoli*. These must have been painted when Leeson was in Rome, and are the work of the French artist Charles François Lacroix (1700-1782), who worked in Vernet's studio. Both copies were carefully integrated into the overall baroque decorative scheme, and were suspended from fictive stucco chains on the east and west walls. Two important references to copies of works at Russborough executed for the Earl of Bective are the only known comments by Joseph Leeson regarding paintings in his collection, and date from December 1766:

...the six pictures I bespoke for your Lordship are now finished and ready to be sent, according to any directions you give. I expected they would have been done much sooner, but there is so much work in them, and the man took such pains to execute them, that they proved very tedious. When I have the pleasure of receiving your commands, directed to me in Dublin, I shall in consequence send them when you desire.<sup>56</sup>

The six paintings in question are most likely the four oval Vernets and the two copies by Lacroix in the large drawing room. Copies of the oval paintings in landscape format existed at Headfort, county Meath, as did duplicates of the Lacroixs from the Milltown Collection.<sup>57</sup> The unnamed copyist referred to was almost certainly the obscure Dublin artist William Woodburn (c.1735-1818). A further two copies sold in 1811 suggest that there were more Vernet copies in the Milltown Collection than previously thought.<sup>58</sup> On 14th December 1766, Lord Milltown again wrote to Bective from Russborough:

The bearer is the painter who takes up the pictures as your Lordship desires. I should have rather kept them another week till they dried more, but as they are carefully packed, I hope they will go safe, and prove agreeable to you. I think they are very [fine?] copies and well done, and as the subjects are pleasing, shall be glad to find they meet with your approbation.<sup>59</sup>

Given that both letters were addressed from Russborough, there is no doubt that the paintings being copied were hanging in the house at the time.<sup>60</sup>

The Vernet paintings in the large drawing room were never intended to be the centre of attention, but rather a foil to the most important picture in the room – a late seventeenth-century copy of *The Triumph of David* (NGI 1323) by Guercino (1591-1666), originally painted for Cardinal Colonna in Rome in 1636-37.<sup>61</sup> Leeson may have seen the original painting in the Galleria Colonna, and was evidently sufficiently impressed to display the copy as an overmantel in the large drawing room at Russborough. This Old Testament subject, hung like an altarpiece above the chimney piece, acted as ‘a kind of secular altar and a source of physical if not spiritual warmth’, according to Gervase Jackson-Stops.<sup>62</sup> The picture was mounted in a lavishly carved and gilt baroque frame similar to that in the saloon. Both frames have been attributed by the Knight of Glin to the Dublin carvers John Houghton and John Kelly, working under the influence of the engraved designs of Mathias Lock.<sup>63</sup>

The Guercino copy and the four Vernet seascapes were hung above eye level, the height being dictated by the high pedimented chimneypiece; the two Vernet copies by Lacroix were the only paintings in the room hung at eye level. The overall effect of the paintings in their giltwood and stucco frames must have been overpowering, the whole being more than the sum of its parts. Neale, writing in 1826, listed eight Vernet's in the large drawing room. This is incorrect, as the decorative scheme could only accommodate seven paintings in total, including the overmantel.<sup>64</sup> The Vernet paintings, like those of Barrett in the large drawing room, served a purely decorative purpose that set them apart from the bulk of the collection, which was hung in a suite of crimson velvet-clad rooms on the west and north sides of the house – the small drawing room, music room, saloon and small dining room (discussed below).

The small panelled study next to the large drawing room served as a cabinet or closet. In 1826 it contained just seven paintings. It was here that Reynolds' three oil studies for *The Parody of the School of Athens* (NGI 735, 736, 737) were hung. These were painted in the early months of 1751, shortly before Leeson's departure from Rome. Given that he never owned the finished work, the oil sketches served as a valuable reminder of the friends he made in Rome, and were therefore worthy of hanging in his private study. George Newenham Wright, writing in 1822, described them as works ‘of great excellence’.<sup>65</sup> Later generations of the Leeson family, though heavily indebted, seemed to have agreed. Barbara, widow of the 4th Earl of Milltown, took the opportunity to fill a gap in the collection by acquiring the finished work when it appeared at auction at Foster's in London on 25th May 1870 at a cost of £105. Her son Edward, 6th Earl of Milltown, was also, according to the Earl of Kildare, ‘very much interested in the caricatures’.<sup>66</sup> It should also be noted that Barbara, Countess of Milltown, was responsible for the acquisition of two *Views of Tivoli* (NGI 746, 747) by the Welsh painter Richard Wilson (1714-1782). Here, again, her purchases were entirely consistent with the character of the 1st Earl's collection. Indeed, despite their financial difficulties, Leeson's nineteenth-century descendants were conscious of the importance of the ancestral collection.

## THE SMALL DRAWING ROOM AS CABINET

THE ORIGIN OF PICTURE CABINETS CAN ULTIMATELY BE TRACED BACK TO THE KUNST und Wunder Kammer of the Renaissance, and in particular to Italian examples such as the Tribuna of the Uffizi. According to Alastair Laing, the term ‘cabinet’ is derived from the medieval Latin word *cabana* or *capana*, and has three distinct meanings: firstly, it refers to a small room which serves as a repository for an art collection; secondly, in French, to the collection itself; and thirdly, to a secure piece of furniture with many drawers.<sup>67</sup> The small drawing room at Russborough fulfilled all three criteria in that it was a relatively small room, mostly hung with cabinet-sized pictures and furnished with a large ebony cabinet containing numerous drawers for coins, medals and gems. The cabinet is referred to in an undated late nineteenth-century inventory, and the paintings are visible in an early photograph (Plate 5).<sup>68</sup> It is one of two surviving Florentine cabinets from the Milltown Collection in the National Gallery of Ireland. It is interesting to note that one of Reynolds’ oil sketches for *The Parody of the School of Athens* (NGI 735), depicts Leeson with his quizzing-glass examining a coin or medal.<sup>69</sup>

The small drawing room was a cabinet in all but name, though never referred to as such in nineteenth-century inventories. No example of an eighteenth-century Irish cabinet of paintings is known to survive.<sup>70</sup> Those rooms at Charlemont House, Moira House and Powerscourt House, among others, are lost with their contents. In Britain, with the exception of the cabinet at Corsham Court and the Landscape Room at Holkham Hall, very few eighteenth-century examples survive. The Landscape Room at Holkham, for

5 – Russborough House, small drawing room, c.1864-70



example, cannot be compared with the small drawing room at Russborough, as the arrangement differed greatly in terms of the density of the picture-hang and the variety of subject matter. According to Cornforth, the most remarkable surviving example from the Georgian period is the cabinet at Felbrigg Hall in Norfolk, which was created by William Windham. Its arrangement can be dated, like that of Joseph Leeson's collection, to the mid eighteenth century. As was often the case, the paintings were hung against a rich crimson background to highlight the gilt frames of the pictures and mirrors in the room.

The Felbrigg cabinet was hung with a red-flowered paper, which was replaced by crimson worsted damask in the early nineteenth century.<sup>71</sup> Likewise, Neale described a crimson cut-silk velvet in the four principal picture-hanging rooms at Russborough.<sup>72</sup> At Felbrigg, Windham's own diagrams for the arrangement of the picture-hang survive, and date from the early 1760s. His correspondence provides a valuable insight into the care with which collectors of Leeson's generation approached the arrangement of their cabinets. The following extract from a letter written by Windham in January 1752 is of particular interest:

...at Mr Hall's leisure I would have him make me elevations of the four sides of the cabinet & great parlour each on separate pieces of paper by a scale of one inch to a foot making to whole height of the dado & all ... He must mark the cornice, doors everything in general, not[e] ye parts and than on other pieces of past[e] board ... I would have the sizes of the best pictures cut out by the same scale to outside of the frames and inside marked by a line & what the picture is wrote on it, or that last part may be left till I come in this manner.<sup>73</sup>

There is nothing to suggest that Windham's manner of picture-hanging was unconventional and it is quite possible that Leeson may well have adopted the same method. Mrs Jameson, in her companion to the private galleries of London, published in 1844, noted that to select a cabinet of pictures was both a matter of time and taste, requiring both feeling and experience for their arrangement and selection:

A private collection confined to works of one particular class ... is less exciting and agreeable than one in which the schools of art are mingled ... in short, it is the highest criterion of an exact, as well as an educated taste in art, to select a small collection of pictures of various date, style, and feeling; to hang them in the same room; and so to hang them, that neither the eye shall be offended by inharmonious propinquity, nor the mind disturbed by unfit associations.<sup>74</sup>

Jameson's opinions may well reflect the conventional wisdom of collectors. There are, however, certain fundamental differences between the picture-hang of Windham's cabinet and that at Russborough. While Cornforth found the arrangement of the pictures in the cabinet at Felbrigg quite dense, he was unaware of the existence of the 1860s photograph of the small drawing room at Russborough, and of the fact that the rooms had being orig-

inally hung with smaller cabinet pictures. The density of the hang in the Russborough cabinet was, in fact, far greater than that at Felbrigg, resembling what Julius Bryant has described as the ‘frame to frame, dado to cornice displays favoured on the Continent’.<sup>75</sup> Indeed, this density of hanging looked back to the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century galleries and cabinets of Italy. Leeson would have seen many such arrangements of private collections in Florence and Rome, the most influential being the Tribuna of the Uffizi.

The position of the three doorcases in the room dictated the arrangement of the picture-hang. The wall space was divided up into several distinct groups or clusters of paintings tightly arranged in a carefully balanced and symmetrical manner around certain key works. These were *The Adoration of the Shepherds*, attributed to Girolamo Troppa (1637-1710), *Lot and his Daughters* and *St Mary Magdalene* by Felice Ficherelli (1605-1660), and a copy of Guercino’s *Aurora*. All are now in the National Gallery of Ireland. Once the position of those works had been determined, it became a matter of arranging clusters of smaller paintings around them. The crimson velvet backdrop to the paintings and the mostly uniform choice of picture frames gave a general cohesion to the overall arrangement. An *Adoration of the Magi* (NGI 1072) attributed to a follower of Bonifazio de’Pitati (1487-1553) took pride of place above the chimney piece as the focal point of the room. This was balanced on the opposite wall by a large painting of *Lot and his Daughters* (NGI 1746) by Ficherelli. *The Adoration of the Magi* was itself flanked by a group of smaller works by Busiri; the Felbrigg cabinet, in contrast to that at Russborough, was devoted exclusively to the works of that artist. Interestingly, Leeson’s set of paintings by Busiri were mounted in rococo frames identical to those in Windham’s cabinet at Felbrigg, and are thought to have been the work of the London carver René Duffour.<sup>76</sup> The Busiris, in turn, were carefully integrated with the sculpture which formed a garniture on the mantel.

Judging from the early photograph, Cavaceppi’s *Fauns with Kid and Goat* (NGI 8243, 8242), signed and dated 1751, flanked an eighteenth-century Roman bust of Portia (NGI 8295) above the chimney piece.<sup>77</sup> To the left of the chimney piece hung Batoni’s portrait of the 2nd Earl of Milltown, also dated 1751; to the right, another tightly knit group of paintings clustered around Ficherelli’s *St Mary Magdalen* (NGI 1707) of about 1640.<sup>78</sup> Smaller works and larger paintings deemed to be of particular interest were hung at eye level for closer study. To the left of the doorcase on the east wall hung another tightly knit group of pictures, the focus of which was a copy of *The Expulsion of Adam and Eve* (NGI 4006) after the baroque painter Domenichino (1581-1641). Leeson must have seen the original in the Palazzo Colonna while in Rome.<sup>79</sup> Beneath it hung a smaller painting, *An Angel leading Lot and his Daughters out of Sodom* (NGI 1653), attributed to Alessandro Turchi (1578-1649).<sup>80</sup> This erotic subject seems to have been particularly popular with Leeson for it appears no less than four times in the Milltown Collection. The Turchi, in turn, was flanked by two of the four Panini paintings – *A View of the Roman Forum* (NGI 726) and *St Paul preaching to the Romans with the Temple of Vesta and Pyramid of Cajus Cestius* (NGI 728). Based on Neale’s inventory of 1826, coupled with the 1860s photo-



graphic evidence presented here, it would appear that the four Paninis never hung together. In the 1820s, the remaining pair is recorded as hanging in the study at Russborough. This series of paintings was undoubtedly one of the highlights of Leeson's collection. They are signed and dated 1742, and, according to Benedetti, may have been acquired by Leeson through the Jacobite agent Dr John Clephane while in Rome in 1744.<sup>81</sup> There is, however, no solid evidence for this. Lord Milltown, writing to the 1st Earl of Bective on the 14th December 1766, made specific reference to the series of Panini's in his possession:

Should your Lordship choose anything here [to be copied], I hope you will believe I shall have a pleasure in obeying your commands, and as this man's cheif fort[e] lies in landskip and ruins, I think Paulo Powlini's [Ruins of Rome] will answer his genius best. The four I have are pretty fine, and I think he will copy them well. Mr Nevill, I find, as he tells me, has agreed to give him 5 Gns. apiece. Should you choose to have them, pray command me...<sup>82</sup>

It is not known whether Bective availed of Lord Milltown's suggestion to commission copies of the Paninis at Russborough, although the artist in question appears to have been William Woodburn of Dublin, who had already copied works at Russborough on Bective's behalf.

Evidence has recently come to light that the plans for the picture-hang of the Felbrigg cabinet were drawn by an assistant of the architect James Paine in 1764.<sup>83</sup> Given the precision with which the Russborough drawing room or cabinet was hung, professional help cannot be ruled out. Richard Castle may be eliminated by virtue of the fact that he died in 1751. Francis Bindon (d.1765), who completed the house, seems the most likely candidate as he was both architect and painter. As such, he would have been admirably suited to the task of devising a picture-hang. Detailed calculations would have been made of the spaces between the dado and the bottom of the frames and, likewise, between individual pictures.<sup>84</sup> The distance between the uppermost tier of paintings and the cornice was calculated in such a way as to allow a slender border of the background material to be visible. The same was done between the dado rail and lower tier of pictures. Despite the fact that the red cut-silk velvet hangings may have been renewed in the Victorian period, it is tempting to believe that the arrangement of the small drawing room had survived unaltered since the 1750s. As it corresponds in many ways with what is known of contemporary eighteenth-century practice in Britain, it seems not an unreasonable hypothesis. Unlike the Felbrigg cabinet, which was devoted exclusively to the works of one artist, that at Russborough was an eclectic *mélange* of works, many of them copies after Poussin, Salvator Rosa, Andrea del Sarto, Domenichino, Wouvermans and Holbein, among others.

## THE MUSIC ROOM AND SMALL DINING ROOM

**D**UE TO THE LACK OF PHOTOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE, NOTHING IS KNOWN OF THE PICTURE-HANG in the music room. Judging by Neale's inventory of 1826, the room contained thirty-eight paintings. Some were very large, like Sebastiano Galeotti's *Rebecca at the Well* (National Trust: Basildon Park) and Dandini's *Moses driving away the Shepherds* (NGI 1683), while the smaller works included Batoni's *Shepherdesses* (NGI 703). The picture-hang of the small dining room appears to have undergone a certain amount of alteration in the early nineteenth century, when a large full-length portrait of Napoleon after Jacques-Louis David (1748-1825) was hung on the east wall. This, no doubt, upset the original arrangement on that wall. Most of the works recorded by Neale in 1826, including a series of four female portraits by the Venetian pastellist Rosalba Carriera (1675-1757), and Batoni's portrait of the 1st Earl of Milltown, were still *in situ* when the room was photographed in the 1860s (Plate 6). Around the chimney piece the paintings were hung in a typically well-balanced and symmetrical eighteenth-century fashion. The focal point of the room was a copy of *A Bathing-Piece* (NGI 990) by Annibale Carracci (1560-1609) above the mantel; beneath it were two small works, *Music* and *Dancing* (NGI 721, 722), by Jean Lebel.

6 – Russborough House, small dining room, c.1864-70



## THE ARRANGEMENT OF THE SALOON

THE SALOON AT RUSSBOROUGH IS WIDELY REGARDED AS ONE OF THE FINEST MID-EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ROOMS OF ITS TYPE IN BRITAIN OR IRELAND, and took shape during the same decade (1741-51) that Joseph Leeson was assembling his art collection in Italy. Embellishing its walls would have been a priority for an art collector of Leeson's stature. At the planning stage, prior to his departure for Italy in 1744, he would, no doubt, have been aware of the immensely influential saloon designed by the renowned English architect William Kent (c.1685-1748) for Sir Robert Walpole at Houghton Hall in Norfolk. Leeson also possessed a copy of *Vitruvius Britannicus* (3 vols, 1715-25), and would have been familiar with other contemporary English examples. Walpole's saloon served primarily as a picture gallery for the display of his collection of Italian paintings, and was the template for other saloons of the following generations. As at Houghton Hall, the visitor approached the saloon at Russborough through a stone-coloured entrance hall, axially aligned with the front door and decorated with sculpture. Kent based the Houghton saloon on the *salone* he had seen in the palaces and villas of Rome, as well as his study of the works of the much-admired architects Andrea Palladio and Inigo Jones.<sup>85</sup> Paintings were arranged in a carefully balanced and strongly symmetrical manner, but not hung so high that they could not to be read, nor hung between windows where visibility would have been difficult due to the glare of sunlight. The spaces between windows were occupied by pier glasses, reflecting much-needed light into candle-lit interiors. Large mirrors, though both difficult and expensive to produce, were an essential component of any eighteenth-century saloon, as were the pier tables beneath them. The Knight of Glin has speculated on the arrangement of the pier glasses in the saloon at Russborough, referring to those in the Milltown Collection in the National Gallery of Ireland (NGI 12,003, 12,004). He suggests that a pair of large mirrors flanked the Corinthian pedimented doorcase leading into the entrance hall, and that a large landscape mirror surmounted the chimney piece, balanced by one on the opposite wall.<sup>86</sup> The idea of a large pair of pier glasses flanking the principal doorcase makes sense, as they would have helped balance the three bays of the window wall directly opposite. However, such an arrangement would be quite impractical as it would have greatly reduced the amount of wall space available for paintings. In fact, the glasses in question hung on the piers between the windows above a pair of matching pier tables with marble tops by the Italian scagliolist Don Pietro Belloni (1695-1771). These tabletops are not to be confused with the one surviving Belloni tabletop formerly in the music room at Russborough. Instead, these must have been the saloon pair – inlaid with landscapes and borders of shells, flowers and scrolls<sup>87</sup> – to which Sir Horace Mann referred in a letter to Horace Walpole dated 11th July 1747.<sup>88</sup> Indeed, this pair of tabletops would have been closer in scale to those commissioned in 1750 by Ralph Howard of Shelton Abbey than to the surviving one at Russborough, and there is no evidence that the existing tabletop, dated 1750, ever formed part of a pair. Further circumstantial evidence suggests a friendship between Leeson and Benjamin Lethieullier and Sir



7 – *Russborough House, saloon, c.1864-70*

Matthew Fetherstonhaugh of Uppark in West Sussex, both of who were in Rome at the same time.<sup>89</sup> Leeson owned copies of a painting by Vernet still at Uppark, and the chimney piece in the saloon at Russborough, by Thomas Carter of London, is virtually identical to those in the saloon at Uppark.<sup>90</sup> Unfortunately there is no documentary evidence to prove the link between the two collections, as most of the family papers at Uppark were destroyed by fire in 1989.<sup>91</sup>

There has been much speculation as to what occupied the space above the saloon chimney piece, which was, after all, the focal point of the principal interior at Russborough. The Knight of Glin was the first to suggest that one of the two elaborately carved gilt rococo frames now in the National Gallery of Ireland was hung there (NGI 12,158). Decorated with cherubs' heads, it echoed those to be found on both the pier glasses between the windows and in the Lafranchini stuccowork on the ceiling. All were elements in a coherent ensemble, of which the paintings formed an integral part.

The arrangement of the paintings in the saloon can be worked out with considerable accuracy by cross-referencing the earliest list of the pictures by Neale with the photographic evidence of the 1860s (Plate 7). Of the thirty paintings listed by Neale, all but four can be accounted for in the current National Gallery of Ireland catalogues, despite the fact that titles and attributions have, in many cases, changed. The photographic evidence illustrates two of the three walls on which pictures hung, and it is possible therefore to plot the position of two-thirds of the paintings in the room and account for the relatively few alterations that took place between the 1820s and the 1860s. Neale, when



listing the paintings, worked his way around the room in an anti-clockwise direction, beginning and ending with a pair of landscapes by George Barret. These decorative paintings hung above the doors to the music room and small dining room, and were matched by a pair of triangular-shaped landscapes designed to fit above the pedimented doorcase leading to the entrance hall. They formed part of a larger series of Italianate landscapes commissioned by Joseph Leeson from Barret in the late 1740s, sixteen of which survive in the National Gallery of Ireland (NGI 1091, 1092, 1627-1637, 1753-1754, 4003).<sup>92</sup> These four Barret landscapes were sold by auction at Russborough on 21st October 1952.<sup>93</sup>

According to Cornforth, the hanging of paintings above chimney pieces, as opposed to being inserted into overmantels, could be problematic, presumably due to the adverse affects of heat and smoke; hence the widespread use of copies in that position. However, he also noted a fashion in the late 1740s and 1750s for the hanging of decorative pictures in elaborate rococo frames, citing that from the Russborough saloon as an example.<sup>94</sup> According to his research, no example of this trend survives *in situ*. It is fortunate, therefore, that the 1860s photograph of the Russborough saloon provides evidence of this practice. It also predates the often-confusing late Victorian inventories which record that the frame in question contained a mirror; in fact, it contained a copy of Rubens' *Judgement of Paris* (NGI 1991). According to Neale's list of pictures, this painting was in the saloon in 1826, and there is no evidence to suggest that it had not occupied the same position since the 1750s.<sup>95</sup> Rubens had, in fact, painted two versions of this subject, both of which were frequently copied; that in the Milltown Collection is thought to be a late seventeenth-century copy of the version now in the Gemäldegalerie in Dresden.

This Rubens copy, in its lavishly carved gilt frame, effectively served as an overmantel, dominating the room despite its relatively small size. This is not an isolated instance of a copy being hung in such a prominent position. In the picture gallery at Corsham Court, for example, a studio copy of Rubens' *A Wolf and Fox Hunt* hangs above the mantel as the focal point of that room. As Jonathan Richardson noted in 1719, 'a copy of a very good picture is preferable to an indifferent original: for there the invention is seen almost entire, and [a] great deal of the expression, and ... good hints of the colouring, drawing and other qualities.'<sup>96</sup> It is this mindset, and the fact that copies were cheaper and easier to obtain, that may well account for the preponderance of replicas in the Milltown Collection. The saloon at Russborough, normally the repository of the best large-scale Italian works, contained numerous copies. This was also not unusual, as it was seldom possible to obtain permission for the export of first-rate works from Rome. It is also worth noting that suitable works of a sufficiently large scale for a saloon or picture gallery were often hard to come by in Britain and Ireland during the eighteenth century. Even the wealthiest of collectors, such as the Duke of Northumberland, commissioned copies of Raphael's works and that of other Old Masters for his picture gallery in the 1750s.<sup>97</sup>

On his first trip to Italy in 1745, Joseph Leeson visited the Palazzo Colonna, which at that time, like many other aristocratic residences in Rome, was open to the public.



Leeson must have been particularly taken with Salvator Rosa's *The Death of Atilius Regulus* (NGI 1045) – a work then considered to be of the first importance<sup>98</sup> – as he commissioned a copy from Vernet in March of that year. Indeed, the subject of Regulus was extremely popular with eighteenth-century British and Irish collectors, who regarded the Roman Consul as a fine example of Roman virtue. It is also worth noting that Leeson's contemporary, Ralph Howard, commissioned a related work, *The Departure of Regulus* (private collection), from the Welsh artist Richard Wilson in 1751-52. Leeson's copy of *The Death of Regulus* was a work ideally suited to the Russborough saloon, where it was first recorded by Neale in 1826.<sup>99</sup>

Directly opposite the chimney piece hung the largest painting in the room, a copy of an altarpiece by Correggio (1489-1534), then, as now, in the Dresden Gallery. Depicting *The Virgin and Child with Saints John the Baptist, Germinian, Peter Martyr, and George* (NGI 1042), this large work (231 x 175 cm) dominated the west wall and was an integral part of the structure of the picture-hang in the room. By positioning it directly opposite Ruben's *Judgement of Paris*, an interesting balance of the sacred and profane was achieved. On the south wall, flanking the principal door leading to the entrance hall, were two large canvases, *Prince Rupert, Count Palatine* and *Cain and Abel* (NGI 1667). The full-length portrait of Prince Rupert was a seventeenth-century copy of a lost original by Van Dyck, believed to have been painted in 1636-37.<sup>100</sup>

The painting of *Cain and Abel* (NGI 1667), now attributed to the circle of the Pisan artist Orazio Riminaldi (1586-1630/1), is thought to date from about 1620. A popular subject among Italian artists during the first half of the seventeenth century, in Leeson's lifetime it was thought to be the work of Guercino, and was described as such by Neale in 1826.<sup>101</sup> Both pictures share a very distinguished provenance having come from the collection of Sir Robert Walpole; Leeson acquired them at a sale of paintings from the Orford Collection held in London on 13th-15th June 1751.<sup>102</sup>

The portrait of Prince Rupert (NGI 1738), listed as lot 49, was acquired on the first day of the Walpole sale and was the most expensive of the four paintings Leeson purchased, costing £22 1s.<sup>103</sup> The painting of *Cain and Abel* (lot 93) was purchased the following day for a mere £7 15s.<sup>104</sup> Leeson also acquired two other works, both copies – an *Adoration of the Kings*, after Tintoretto (day 2, lot 17), and *Jupiter and Europa*, after Veronese (say 1, lot 53), costing £4 and £6 6s respectively. The former may correspond to a work listed by Neale in the small drawing room in 1826, and then attributed to Empoli.<sup>105</sup> This may perhaps be identified with a work of the same title by a follower of Bonifazio de' Pitati (NGI 1072). The latter hung in Sir Robert Walpole's parlour in Grosvenor Street and is listed as number 296 in the catalogue of 1736.<sup>106</sup> This picture is recorded as hanging on the west wall of the saloon at Russborough by 1826. It is worth noting that the whereabouts of these paintings is unrecorded in Dukelskaya and Moore's recent catalogue of the Walpole Collection.<sup>107</sup>

Given the prominent position of the two large canvases from the Walpole Collection, flanking the principal doorcase in the saloon at Russborough, it is reasonable

to assume that Leeson wished to show his strict adherence to the Whig establishment, the source of all political power and preferment in his time. These paintings, therefore, evidently carried great political significance, as did Russborough as a whole, signifying Leeson's transformation from wealthy brewer to Baron (in 1756) and later Earl of Milltown (in 1763). This process was well under way in the early 1750s, and his staunch support of government brought its own rewards.<sup>108</sup> Indeed, Robert Walpole's own building and collecting activities provided an exemplary model for an aspiring nouveau riche politician like Leeson.

During the course of research, an important lost work from the Milltown Collection was located. This picture, which formerly hung in the saloon after 1826, now forms part of the Iliffe Collection at Basildon Park in Berkshire. This painting, depicting *Rebecca at the Well* (Plates 1, 8), is dated 1709 and is the work of the obscure Florentine artist Sebastiano Galeotti (1675-1746). Galeotti, though now largely forgotten, was one of the foremost fresco painters in northern Italy during the first half of the eighteenth century.<sup>109</sup> It is clear that he was also an accomplished painter in oils, though relatively few of his works in that medium have thus far been identified. His *Rebecca at the Well*, formerly at Russborough, was first recorded in the collection of the Florentine nobleman Baron Andrea Franceschi in 1724.<sup>110</sup> It was later acquired by the painter, collector and dealer Ignazio Hugford, and is recorded as being in his possession in 1766.<sup>111</sup> The picture could not therefore have been acquired by Joseph Leeson on either of his Grand Tours in 1744-45 or 1750-51. The work was listed by Neale in 1826 as hanging in the music room, where it was attributed to the French artist Laurent de La Hyre (1606-1656). Given that it is very much in character with the collection assembled by the 1st Earl in the mid eighteenth century, the possibility of its having been acquired on a subsequent Grand Tour cannot be ruled out. In any event, it was the only major alteration to the picture-hang in the saloon at Russborough in the nineteenth century. It was also perhaps the last major painting from the Milltown Collection to leave the house, and remained on display in the saloon until it was sold with the remainder of the original contents in October 1952.<sup>112</sup>

## CONCLUSION

GIVEN THAT JOSEPH LEESON COMPLETED TWO GRAND TOURS WHILE RUSSBOROUGH was being built, and that the bulk of his Italian paintings predate 1750, there is good reason to believe that he, and not later members of the family, was the principal collector. Joseph Leeson's taste in picture-hanging, and his desire, like Walpole, to fill the empty ancestor-less walls at Russborough must inevitably have influenced the treatment and formation of the collection. Apart from copies of the major seventeenth-century Bolognese masters, such as Domenichino, Guercino, Reni and Carracci, Leeson acquired works by and after lesser masters, including Bassetti, Empoli, Giordano and Salvator Rosa among others. One of his most important purchases was a group of sev-



8 – *Sebastiano Galeotti, REBECCA AT THE WELL (also known as REBECCA AND ELIEZER)*  
1709, oil on canvas, 218.4 x 276.8 cm (courtesy National Trust: Iliffe Collection, Basildon Park)

enteenth-century paintings of the Florentine school. These works, by Casare Dandini, Ficherelli, Furini and others, was quite at variance with the taste of most British and Irish Grand Tourists. The late Michael Wynne doubted Leeson's connoisseurship in this regard and attributed their purchase to his Florentine agent Dr James Tyrrell.<sup>114</sup> This seems entirely plausible given that Tyrrell acted for other Grand Tourists. Leeson may also have relied heavily on the advice of Robert Wood and other individuals who acted as agents. In this respect, Leeson may have been typical in that he relied on professional advice. He may well have been among the richest of Irish Grand Tourists, but there were others such as Lord Charlemont, Ralph Howard and Joseph Henry who, with lesser means, were arguably more discerning. Joseph Leeson's reputation as a collector is, however, beyond reproach. The donation of the Milltown Collection to the National Gallery of Ireland in 1902 raised the stature of both the collection and the collector. As the only major Irish Grand Tour collection to have survived more or less intact, it continues to receive more attention than other Irish collections of the eighteenth century. However, in the absence of the Milltown family papers, Joseph Leeson himself is likely to remain something of an enigma for the foreseeable future.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was greatly improved by the advice and encouragement received from Dr Philip McEvansoneya, David Griffin and the Knight of Glin. Much of my research was conducted in the National Library of Ireland, and my thanks go to the staff of the manuscript reading room, in particular Tom Desmond, for all his help over many years. I wish to acknowledge the assistance of the various librarians at the National Gallery of Ireland. I would also like to thank Dr A.P.W. Malcolmson, formerly of the Public Record Office of Northern Ireland, who had the foresight to transcribe extracts from letters of Joseph Leeson now lost. I would like to thank also Dr Jane Conyningham of the Witt Library, University of London, for her assistance. I owe a great debt of gratitude to the following individuals who aided my research in many ways, in particular the owner of an early series of photographs of Russborough who wishes to remain anonymous. I would like to thank Margret Lacey, Lorraine Gallagher, Trish Ferguson and Patrick O'Keeffe for the long hours spent typing and correcting this article. Finally, my old friends, Dr Matthew Bent, Suzanne Pegley, Wulf Ludwicke, Ruth Ferguson, Liam Brady and Tom Harris, have endured my obsession with Russborough for many years. I would like to thank them all for their support and help in various ways in times of trouble.

## ENDNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> All artworks referred to, unless otherwise stated, are now in the National Gallery of Ireland.
- <sup>2</sup> H. Davis (ed.), *The prose works of Jonathan Swift*, 14 vols (Oxford, 1951) XII, 135.
- <sup>3</sup> Obituary of Joseph Leeson, 1st Earl of Milltown, *Gentleman's Magazine*, LIII, November 1783, 979.
- <sup>4</sup> Memorial of the will of Joseph Leeson, 1st Earl of Milltown, registered 7th November 1783 (Registry of Deeds, 355/154/238338).
- <sup>5</sup> E. M. Johnston-Liik, *History of the Irish Parliament 1692-1800*, 6 vols (Belfast, 2002) 74.
- <sup>6</sup> S. Benedetti (ed.), *The Milltowns: A family reunion* (Dublin, 1997) 20.
- <sup>7</sup> J. Ingamells, *A Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy 1701-1800* (New Haven and London, 1997) 1015-16.
- <sup>8</sup> W.S. Lewis (ed.), *The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence*, 48 vols (New Haven and London, 1955) XIX, 13.
- <sup>9</sup> Benedetti (ed.), *The Milltowns*, 67.
- <sup>10</sup> F. Haskell and N. Penny, *Taste and the Antique* (New Haven and London, 1984) 178-79.
- <sup>11</sup> For the external sculpture, see Christopher Caffrey, 'The Eighteenth Century Sculpture at Russborough House', unpublished MA thesis, UCD, 1997. See also Lynda Mulvin, 'The Roman Sculptures at Russborough House' in Michael McCarthy (ed.), *Lord Charlemont and His Circle* (Dublin, 2001).
- <sup>12</sup> This statue is now in the Getty Villa in Malibu, California.
- <sup>13</sup> NGI, Milltown Correspondence, Deed of Gift (1902): List of Sculpture, no. 265, 15.
- <sup>14</sup> S. O'Reilly, *Irish houses and gardens-from the archives of Country Life* (London, 1998) 89.
- <sup>15</sup> I am grateful to Richard Ireland for this information.
- <sup>16</sup> He also owned marble copies of the *Mercury* and *Dancing Faun* which were in the colonnades. It is difficult to explain why he required two more indoors, except perhaps to integrate the external and internal groups of sculpture.
- <sup>17</sup> Haskell and Penny, *Taste and the Antique*, 266-67.
- <sup>18</sup> *ibid.*, 325-28.
- <sup>19</sup> *ibid.*, 205-06.

- 20 Mulvin, 'The Roman Sculptures at Russborough House', 167.
- 21 Ingamells, *A Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy*, 1015-16.
- 22 G.N. Wright, *A Guide to the County of Wicklow* (Dublin, 1827) 159-60.
- 23 Benedetti (ed.), *The Milltowns*, 104-05.
- 24 Mulvin, 'The Roman Sculptures at Russborough House', 170-71.
- 25 *ibid.*, 173.
- 26 I am grateful to Dr Hazel Dodge of the Classics Department at Trinity College Dublin for her opinion on the Milltown antiquities.
- 27 Haskell and Penny, *Taste and the Antique*, 339.
- 28 *ibid.*, 156.
- 29 Benedetti (ed.), *The Milltowns*, 98. See also C. O'Connor, 'Dr James Tyrrell, Agent at Florence', *Studies*, 69, no. 274, Summer 1980, 137-44.
- 30 Benedetti (ed.), *The Milltowns*, 106.
- 31 NGI, Milltown Correspondence, List of the Contents of Russborough written by Geraldine Evelyn, Countess of Milltown.
- 32 *ibid.*
- 33 A. Le Harivel (ed.), *National Gallery of Ireland: Illustrated summary catalogue of prints and sculpture* (Dublin, 1988) 571, 588-89, 598, 600.
- 34 *ibid.*, 555, 588-89, 593, 598, 600. See also Benedetti (ed.), *The Milltowns*, 110-13.
- 35 H. Honour, 'After the Antique: some Italian bronzes of the eighteenth century', *Apollo*, LXXVII, March 1963, 195.
- 36 *ibid.*
- 37 Benedetti (ed.), *The Milltowns*, 110-12.
- 38 J.P. Neale, *Views of the Seats of Noblemen and Gentlemen in the United Kingdom*, 2nd series, 5 vols (London 1826) III, 17.
- 39 E. Grant, *The Highland Lady in Ireland, Journals 1840-1850* (Edinburgh, 1991) 173.
- 40 Le Harivel (ed.), *Illustrated summary catalogue of prints and sculpture*, 588-89.
- 41 Honour, 'After the Antique', 200.
- 42 Le Harivel (ed.), *Illustrated summary catalogue of prints and sculpture*, 555.
- 43 *ibid.*, 600.
- 44 *The Georgian Society Records*, 5 vols (Dublin 1909-13), V, pl.LVI.
- 45 James H. North & Co, Auctioneers, Russborough, 27th July 1932, advertised in *The Irish Times*, 23rd July 1932.
- 46 J. Cornforth, 'Russborough, Co Wicklow III,' *Country Life*, 19th December 1963, 1688.
- 47 M. Wynne, 'Continental European Sources for George Barret', *Irish Arts Review*, X, 1994, 136-39.
- 48 With the exception of one, *A View in Lord Milltown's Demesne*, at *Russboro* by Thomas Roberts, no other paintings of the demesne are known. This picture, which was sold in Dublin in 1820, must have been painted sometime between Robert's first exhibition in 1766 and the artist's death in 1778. I am grateful to Dr Brendan Rooney, for this information.
- 49 Nicola Figgis and Brendan Rooney, *Irish Paintings in the National Gallery of Ireland: vol. 1* (Dublin, 2001) 54.
- 50 E.P. Bowran and J.J. Rishel (eds), *Art in Rome in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 2000) 336.
- 51 Cornforth, 'Russborough Co Wicklow III,' 1626.
- 52 L. Dukelskaya and A. Moore, *A Capital Collection: Houghton Hall and the Heritage* (New Haven and London, 2002) 457-58.
- 53 National Library of Ireland (NLI), Wicklow Papers, MS 38,628/9, Tyrrell, J. Agent in Florence to



- Howard, R. (Dublin) 12th August 1753.
- <sup>54</sup> F. Russell, 'The Hanging and Display of Pictures 1700-1850', in G. Jackson Stops (ed.), *The Fashioning and Furnishing of the British Country House* (Washington D.C., 1989) 144.
- <sup>55</sup> Benjamin Lethieullier (1728-1797), brother-in-law of Sir Matthew Fetherstonhaugh (c.1714-1774) of Uppark. Both were included in Sir Joshua Reynolds, *Parody of the School of Athens* (1751). Both may have been friends of Joseph Leeson.
- <sup>56</sup> NLI, Headfort Papers, Special List, no. 238, 43. ref no. F/5/75, Lord Milltown, Russborough to Lord Bective, Kells, 7th of December 1766. This is a copy of an interim summary list compiled by Dr Anthony Malcolmson for the Public Record Office of Northern Ireland in 1975.
- <sup>57</sup> I am grateful to David Griffin for this information and also to the *Country Life* Picture Library.
- <sup>58</sup> B. Fredericksen Burton (ed.), *The Index of Paintings Sold in the British Isles during the Nineteenth Century, 1811-1815*, 3 vols (London, 1993), III, Part 2. The Provenance Index, of the Getty Art History Information Program (London, 1993), 1133.
- <sup>59</sup> See note 57.
- <sup>60</sup> From extracts transcribed by A.P.W. Malcolmson in 1975.
- <sup>61</sup> M. Wynne, *Later Italian Paintings in the National Gallery of Ireland* (Dublin, 1986), 48-49.
- <sup>62</sup> G. Jackson Stops and James Pipkin, *The Country House: A Grand Tour* (London, 1984) 99.
- <sup>63</sup> Knight of Glin, 'Russborough, Its Decoration and Furniture. Some Preliminary Thoughts' in Benedetti (ed.), *The Milltowns*, 121.
- <sup>64</sup> Neale, *Views of the Seats of Noblemen and Gentlemen in the United Kingdom*, 18.
- <sup>65</sup> Wright, *A Guide to the County of Wicklow*, 159-60.
- <sup>66</sup> NLI, Wicklow Papers, MS 38, 628/9, Earl of Kildare, Carton, to Lady Wicklow, 9th September 1883.
- <sup>67</sup> Alistair Lang, *In Trust for the Nation* (London, 1995) 155.
- <sup>68</sup> NGI, Milltown Correspondence, box number NGI/89, blue handwritten inventory (no date).
- <sup>69</sup> It is unclear whether Leeson's numismatic collection has survived.
- <sup>70</sup> C. O'Connor, 'The Charlemont House Medal Cabinet,' *Irish Arts Review*, I, 2, Summer 1984, 23-27.
- <sup>71</sup> Jackson Stops and Pipkin, *The Country House*, 189.
- <sup>72</sup> Neale, *Views of the Seats of Noblemen and Gentlemen in the United Kingdom*, 17.
- <sup>73</sup> J. Cornforth, *Early Georgian Interiors* (New Haven and London, 2004), 312.
- <sup>74</sup> A. Jameson, *Companion to the Most Celebrated Private Galleries of Art in London* (London, 1844) 383-86.
- <sup>75</sup> A. Lang (ed.), *Clerics and Connoisseurs* (London, 2001) 71.
- <sup>76</sup> Jackson Stops and Pipkin, *The Country House*, 189.
- <sup>77</sup> Le Harivel (ed.), *Illustrated summary catalogue of prints and sculpture*, 587.
- <sup>78</sup> Wynne, *Later Italian Paintings in the National Gallery of Ireland*, 33.
- <sup>79</sup> *ibid.*, 28-29.
- <sup>80</sup> *ibid.*, 126.
- <sup>81</sup> Benedetti (ed.), *The Milltowns*, 92-94.
- <sup>82</sup> See note 57 above.
- <sup>83</sup> Russell, 'The Hanging and Display of Pictures 1700-1850,' 159, n.15.
- <sup>84</sup> *ibid.*, p.138.
- <sup>85</sup> Jackson Stops and Pipkin, *The Country House*, 89.
- <sup>86</sup> Glin, 'Russborough, Its Decoration and Furniture', 120.
- <sup>87</sup> NGI, Milltown Correspondence, Inventory of Contents by Mary Kelly Housekeeper Russborough March/April 1906, 27.
- <sup>88</sup> M. Wynne, 'The Milltowns as Patrons,' *Apollo*, XCIX, 144, February 1974, 104-11.

- <sup>89</sup> Benedetti (ed.), *The Milltowns*, 79.
- <sup>90</sup> Cornforth, *Early Georgian Interiors*, 64.
- <sup>91</sup> Those that survive in the West Sussex Record Office contain nothing of relevance.
- <sup>92</sup> Figgis and Rooney, *Irish Paintings in the National Gallery of Ireland*, 47.
- <sup>93</sup> Hamilton & Hamilton, *Residue Sale of Fine Art*, Russborough, 21st October 1952, 10, lots 147, 148, 154).
- <sup>94</sup> J. Fowler and J. Cornforth, *English Decoration in the 18th Century* (London, 1974) 240.
- <sup>95</sup> Neale, *Views of the Seats of Noblemen and Gentlemen in the United Kingdom*, 17.
- <sup>96</sup> J. Richardson, *The Connoisseur, an Essay on the Whole Art of Criticism, as it Relates to Painting*, cited in Cornforth and Fowler, *English Decoration in the 18th Century*, 234-36.
- <sup>97</sup> J. Wood, *Raphael Copies and Exemplary Picture Galleries in Mid-Eighteenth Century London*, (Munich and Berlin, 1999).
- <sup>98</sup> Benedetti (ed.), *The Milltowns*, 96-97.
- <sup>99</sup> Neale, *Views of the Seats of Noblemen and Gentlemen in the United Kingdom*, 17.
- <sup>100</sup> Other versions of it are to be found in the National Gallery London and in Baltimore. The most accurate and detailed account of this painting is to be found in D. Oldfield, *Later Flemish Paintings in the National Gallery of Ireland* (Dublin, 1992), 42-44.
- <sup>101</sup> Wynne, *Later Italian Painting in the National Gallery of Ireland*, 109-110.
- <sup>102</sup> Dukelskaya and Moore (eds), *A Capital Collection*, 457-58.
- <sup>103</sup> This is a copy with slight variations of an original now in the Walters Art Museum in Baltimore.
- <sup>104</sup> Neither picture is listed in the manuscript catalogue of Sir Robert Walpole's collection of 1736, nor in the updated addition of the Aedes Walpolinae. Horace Walpole did not include the paintings in his father's three London houses in the latter publication. It would appear, therefore, that the pictures sold by auction in June 1751 came from one of Walpole's London residences in either Downing Street, Grosvenor Street or Chelsea. Dukelskaya and Moore (eds), *A Capital Collection*, 445-49, 355-417.
- <sup>105</sup> Neale, *Views of the Seats of Noblemen and Gentlemen in the United Kingdom*, 17-18.
- <sup>106</sup> Dukelskaya and Moore (eds), *A Capital Collection*, 448.
- <sup>107</sup> *ibid.*
- <sup>108</sup> Johnston-Liik, *History of the Irish Parliament 1692-1800*, V, 74.
- <sup>109</sup> R. Dugoni, *Sebastiano Galeotti* (Torino, 2001) 151.
- <sup>110</sup> Piero Matini Stamp, *Nota de' quadri e opere di scultura Che sono esposti per la Festa di S.Luca dagli Accademici del Disegno nella loro Cappella posta nel Chiostrro del Monastero de' Padri della SS.Nonziata di Firenze i Anno 1724* (Firenze, 1724) 16, cited in Dugoni, *Sebastiano Galeotti*, 151.
- <sup>111</sup> A. Pazzi and O. Marrini, *Serie di ritratti di celebri pittori dipinti di propria mano in seguito a quella gia pubblicata nel Museo Fiorentino esistente appresso l'Abate Antonio Pazzi con brevi notizie intorno a' medesimi compilate dall'Abate Orazio Marrini, Nella Stamperia Mouckiana* (Firenze, 1766) III, cited in Dugoni, *Sebastiano Galeotti*, 151.
- <sup>112</sup> Hamilton & Hamilton, *Residue Sale of Fine Art*, 10, lot 146. See also Wynne, *Later Italian Paintings in the National Gallery of Ireland*, xiii-xiv.