INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or “target” for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is “Missing Page(s)”. If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of “sectioning” the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.
Angelica Kauffman's *Ariadne Abandoned by Theseus on Nazos*

Wadstrom, Sarah Morian, M.A.
Rice University, 1987

Copyright ©1987 by Wadstrom, Sarah Morian. All rights reserved.
PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark ✓.

1. Glossy photographs or pages ✓
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print ✓
3. Photographs with dark background ✓
4. Illustrations are poor copy ✓
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy ✓
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ✓
8. Print exceeds margin requirements
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print
11. Page(s) _______ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _______ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _______. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages ✓
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received
16. Other ____________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

University
Microfilms
International
RICE UNIVERSITY

ANGELICA KAUFFMAN'S
ARIADNE ABANDONED BY THESEUS ON NAXOS

by

SARAH MORIAN WADSTROM

A THESIS SUBMITTED
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

MASTER OF ARTS

APPROVED, THESIS COMMITTEE:

[Signatures and names]

Marion Grayson, Asst. Professor,
Art & Art History, Director

Roger Ulrich, Asst. Professor,
Art & Art History

Katherine Brown, Professor,
Art & Art History, Chairman

Houston, Texas

May, 1987
ABSTRACT

Angelica Kauffman's
Ariadne Abandoned by Theseus on Naxos

Sarah M. Wadstrom

Ariadne Abandoned by Theseus on Naxos was painted by the Swiss-born artist Angelica Kauffman in 1774, while she was living in England. Her work was an important factor in the development of the early Neoclassical style in England, and this painting embodies the ideas of noble simplicity and sedate grandeur put forth by her friend Johann Winckelmann as appropriate for such history paintings. One of her few single-figure, non-portrait history paintings, it is typical of the careful composition and rich Venetian coloring for which she was well-known. Angelica was a well-educated woman, and therefore she was able to draw on a wide variety of literary and visual sources when she chose the subject. The theme of abandoned and mourning women was often used by artists in the late eighteenth century, and Angelica may have had a particular identification with it, due to her unusual position as an artist and a single woman.
Frontispiece: *Ariadne Abandoned by Theseus on Naxos*. Oil on canvas, 63.8 x 91.0. Signed and dated lower left: Angelica Kauffman Pinx. 1774. Houston, Museum of Fine Arts, gift of Mr. and Mrs. Harris Masterson, III, in memory of Neil Turner Masterson, Jr.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Ariadne Abandoned by Theseus on Naxos\(^4\) (Frontis.), in the permanent collection of the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, Texas, was painted by the Swiss-born artist Angelica Kauffman in 1774, midway during the fifteen-year period that she lived in England. This work, which belongs in the category of history or "subject" painting, is meticulously planned around the single figure of Ariadne and embodies the noble simplicity and sedate gravéur advocated in art by her close friend and the leader of the Neoclassical movement, Johann Winckelmann (see infra., p.14). Angelica, who had absorbed the new philosophy and pictorial elements of the classical style in Rome as a young woman, was an important figure and artistic force early in the movement, especially in England.

This thesis, which grew out of my attraction to the jewel-like beauty of the Houston painting, provides a historical and biographical context for Ariadne Abandoned, as well as an analysis of its style, place and possible meaning within the artist’s total œuvre. Without cloying sweetness, the painting demonstrates a quality of gentle femininity so prized in her time and, for better or worse, disparaged in our own. Special emphasis is given to the work as an example of Kauffman’s relatively rare single-figure, non-portrait history paintings and to the problems posed by this type of composition.

Maria Anna Angelica Catherine Kauffman\(^2\) was born October 30, 1741, in the Swiss town of Chur (Côre), near the Liechtenstein border. The only child of Johann Joseph Kauffman, a church muralist, and his wife Cleopha Luz, Angelica was soon recognized as a prodigy. Her artistic training began as a young child under her father, who encouraged her interest by giving her engravings after the Old Masters and plaster casts of classical sculpture from which to copy. She also studied French, German, history and literature, as well as music, in which she was also talented. Her father saw to it that she continued her
studies of Old Masters in private and public collections available in the areas where he pursued commissions throughout northern Italy.

When she was twenty-one, she and her then-widowed father arrived in Rome where her artistic career began in earnest. There, she met the leading artists and intellectuals of her day, who introduced her to the Neoclassical ideas that were then becoming a major influence on art. She also began to meet the English visitors and expatriates in Italy, who would be so helpful when she was persuaded to try her fortune in England. Her professional status was affirmed by her election to the Rome Accademia di San Luca in June, 1765.

Angelica was only twenty-five years old when she arrived in London in 1766, but her reputation had preceded her through the many English portraits she had done in Italy, especially her portrait of the actor David Garrick that had been exhibited in London at the Free Society of Painters the previous year. The newspapers lavished praise on her, comparing her to Holbein, Van Dyck, Rubens and Lely. Lady Wentworth, the influential English aristocrat with whom she had come to England, particularly enjoyed the role of patroness. With her help and that of other old friends in London, such as Garrick and the artists Benjamin West and Nathaniel Dance, Angelica’s career quickly flourished. The English aristocrats who had met her in Italy continued their patronage, and her introduction by Lord Exeter to the painter Joshua Reynolds provided the seal of approval, assuring success in the London art world. Reynolds was the most influential person in the English arts at that time, and his suggestion that they paint each others’ portraits (Figs. 1, 2), in the tradition of Rosalba Carrera and Watteau in France fifty years earlier, was tantamount to public approval of this young Swiss artist’s talent. She had a constant stream of visitors to her studio, many of the highest rank in the royal family, including the Queen Mother.

Angelica’s appearance and personality undoubtedly had a great deal to do with her
success. She was well-liked by people from a wide variety of backgrounds and maintained many friendships in spite of long separations of distance and time. As a young woman in Rome, her facility in languages had allowed her to move easily among the fragmented social groups of Germans, English, Scots and Italians, which gave her unusual access to the different artists and intellectual leaders there. Accounts vary as to whether she was beautiful or merely attractive, but all agree that she was "engaging." Her self-portraits, and portraits by others such as Reynolds and Dance, exhibit the sweetness and sensitivity so admired in the eighteenth century, along with an enchanting smile and long seductive eyes and mouth. Tall and graceful, she had a quick intelligence, charming manner and ready sympathy for others that won her loyalty throughout her life. But, while her youth and beauty may have contributed to her early popularity, Angelica nonetheless maintained her position in the professional art world for over forty years. Reynolds and the Scottish Neoclassicist Gavin Hamilton, as well as the art patron Frederick Hervey and the German author Goethe, were among the major figures who were steadfast in their life-long admiration of her work, and her influence on her contemporaries such as Fuseli and Flaxman is well-documented.5 Her German admirers called her die Seelein Mahlerin, "the paintress of the soul."6

That she was one of the twenty-two founder members of the Royal Academy in 1768, when she had been in England only two years, is another mark of her professional acceptance in her new milieu.7 The establishment of the Academy had a profound effect on English art and the way the English looked at their own artists. As in the academies of Italy and France, it removed artists from the old apprentice system and allowed a regularized course of study to be followed by all students, thus ensuring that each received solid grounding in all phases of art. In addition, the institution of the academy system conferred a legitimacy on native English artists and their training that they had lacked previously. Reynolds was elected the first president, and, under his leadership, the
Academy allowed room for a wide variety of tastes and styles in art. Many paintings exhibited there in the early years were by non-members, and even the membership itself was broad enough to prevent stuffiness, including, as it did, foreigners and two women.⁸

Angelica Kauffmann was among the first to exhibit history paintings in the Neoclassical style in England, and one of the few to do so consistently for more than thirty years following the establishment of the Royal Academy. History painting was the most prestigious category in the hierarchy of genres that had been established by the French academy a century earlier, since it took its subject matter from the great deeds of man in history, mythology or literature and treated them in a pictorial manner that elevated them above everyday life. English art patrons, however, preferred portraits, vedute or copies of Old Masters to history paintings by contemporary artists. Thus, the fact that Angelica exhibited and sold an average of three history paintings a year to English patrons, and that she continued to receive commissions and have them exhibited even after she left England, demonstrates the high regard in which her work was held there.

A commission executed by Angelica near the end of her London stay in 1779-80, that of the large ceiling roundels for the Royal Academy quarters at Somerset House, was another demonstration of the regard of her peers. She, Benjamin West and the Italian artist Biagio Rebecca were asked to provide an elaborate program of decoration for the Lecture Room, to which Angelica contributed a set of four large allegorical paintings, Color, Design, Composition and Genius. These paintings, and those contributed by West, are now installed on the ceiling of the vestibule of Burlington House, the present home of the Royal Academy.⁹

Nonetheless her work did draw criticism from certain areas during her lifetime, much of it justified but perhaps unimportant in the overall assessment of her artistic achievements. Leslie, the biographer of Reynolds and her contemporary, called her large mythological canvases "wishy-washy" and went on to say that her heroes looked like girls
dressed up as men. He described her figures as full of indecision, with feet that never
seemed to take a firm grasp of the ground. And yet, he said that her entries in the 1771
Royal Academy exhibit were among the best to be seen there. As a woman, she had not
been allowed to study anatomy or draw from the nude model, but in English art of her
time there was no great interest in anatomical realism. She gave her heads, especially
those in historical paintings, Greek profiles, but this, too, was a convention used by others
in an age when everything Greek was much admired. Any artist as prolific as Angelica
would naturally have turned out many canvases that were less than masterpieces. Goethe
defended her on this count, saying: "For a woman she has extraordinary talent. One
must look at what she does, not at what she fails to do. How many artists would stand
the test if judged by their failings?"

In 1781 Angelica left England to return to Italy, where she suffered no loss of
artistic prestige. Among her new patrons were the Grand Duke Paul of Russia and his
wife, whom she met in Venice, and for a time she was court painter to the Queen of
Naples, who was Austrian by birth. During the last twenty years of her life, she was
considered the foremost artist in Rome. Even in her declining years, the artist had a
positive effect on those around her. Writing in 1803, Catherine Wilmot, an Irish woman
then on the Grand Tour, complained of being turned to stone by so many ancient ruins, a
condition remedied by her encounter with the sixty-three-year-old Angelica:

Indeed I suspect that this metamorphosis did take place, and but
for a visit I paid to Angelica Kauffman, I might have remain'd so
till Doomsday, but her promethean influence which animates
everything she touches, tingled me into existence once again, nor
can I think of her without a flash of admiration such as her nature
is calculated to inspire, independent of the talent which had
rendered her name so celebrated. ...Her delightful mildness of
voice soothes one like the effect of plaintive musick, and the pale
transparency of her complexion, one attributes less to her
declining health, than to the idea that no other light has ever
shown on her, but the silver beams of the moon. ...She continues
painting, tho' but slowly, and she seems highly consider'd amongst
modern artists.
Even though, at her death in 1807, she was accorded the same honors at her funeral as those given to the great Renaissance artist Raphael, the popularity of her work immediately began to decline, primarily because of changing tastes. Angelica had been in the forefront of the Neoclassical movement, but by the turn of the century, the critics and the art-buying public began to admire different aspects of antiquity, and her work and that of others such as Batoni quickly became passé. In England, the association of the Neoclassical with the politics of Jacques-Louis David and the French Revolution brought a reaction against the style, and landscape painting began to be significant there, as elsewhere. For example, in 1799 only one painting out of the 681 exhibited at the Royal Academy had a classical and historical source, with the majority of the rest being portraits and landscapes.

Much of the later criticism of Angelica’s oeuvre was due to these changes in artistic taste. The German critic Förster, writing in the nineteenth century, accused her of sentimental sweetness, but sentiment was precisely what was highly regarded in a culture that produced literary best sellers such as Samuel Richardson’s Pamela and Laurence Sterne’s The Sentimental Traveler and that considered lack of sensitivity to be vulgar. Another German, Sternberg, criticized her for her frivolous subject matter, apparently ignoring such works as Hector Taking Leave of Andromache and the Death of Leonardo.

Her name remained known to the general public, however, through less serious, decorative work on walls, ceilings and furniture, very little of which was actually done by the artist herself. So popular was her style of art that it was emulated by copyists, and her engravings were used as the basis for decorations on dinner services, porcelain figurines, fans, etc. Perhaps this later "reputation" was responsible for some of the twentieth-century criticism of Angelica that exhibits personal, vituperative qualities. For example, none of her work was included in an exhibition in 1951 covering the first one hundred years of the Royal Academy. In the foreword to the catalogue of a one-woman
exhibition of her paintings held at Kenwood in 1955, Edwin Bayliss, Chairman of the Parks Committee of the London County Council, provided this less-than-complimentary evaluation:

Angelica Kauffmann is a painter whose name, at least, is known to most people. It is not easy to understand why her fame should have been so great in her lifetime and why it should have been so great to this day, when a competent artist such as Battoni [sic], who portrayed just as many traveling Englishmen, has only recently emerged from obscurity as far as the general body of amateurs of art is concerned. Her sex can have little to do with it. There have been women painters both before and after her who are almost unknown and her fellow academician Mary Moser is remembered, if at all, only as a founder member of the Royal Academy.¹⁹

Bayliss attributed the appeal of her work in her own time partially to an aspect described by Angelica’s contemporary Count Bernsdorff, the Danish Prime Minister, -- the "quiet dignity of the Greeks" and the "womanly, modest and loving" qualities of her females, which showed the proper relation between the sexes, with the weaker dependent on the stronger. Bayliss believed that this would have explained her appeal to the "masculine critics of the eighteenth century."²⁰ As late as 1981, Ellis Waterhouse called Angelica "one of the odder artistic phenomena of her time, as she was admired far beyond her artistic desserts and seems to have charmed, at different times, Winckelmann, Reynolds, Goethe and Canova."²¹

Another factor that may have contributed to the dismissal of her work by some twentieth-century critics is that, during the nineteenth century, several popular romanticized novels loosely based on the artist’s life were published. These may have prompted some critics to appraise her work less seriously than they might have otherwise, and to attribute her popularity to her tragic life story rather than the quality of her art.²² Manners and Williamson also attribute part of the negative criticism in later years to the fact that so many of her works suffered from overzealous cleaning. The light touch and thin glazes of color, which were Angelica’s hallmarks, made cleaning very difficult, and
some of her best pictures were indeed ruined in the restoration process.²³

There are other twentieth-century critics, however, who have made a fairer
judgment of her work and of the period as a whole, which has helped to restore the luster
to her reputation. Anthony Clark, in his essay for the catalogue of the 1968 exhibition held
in Bregenz, has this to say about her choice of subject matter:

Intellectual forces and deeply serious purpose are not present.
Such qualities would have been out of place in a young eighteenth-
century woman of artistic and musical gifts whose grace and
sprightlyness were obvious, and whose abilities could fully express
themselves with the same kind of natural brilliance and force that
the better music of the period possessed.²⁴

He also said in her praise:

I strongly believe that Angelica was a first-rate painter, and
indeed, occupied a position of the first rank. Her quality and
position have nothing to do with her sex. Her Age thought she far
out-distanced normal possibilities as a woman, but was
particularly fascinated by the fact that she WAS a woman as well
as a great artist. The understanding of greatness in her Age was
different from ours, but I believe that Angelica Kauffmann’s best
paintings are of a lasting greatness and value.²⁵

And Peter Walch, in his dissertation of 1968, gives a high opinion of her place in the
history of art:

Her early pictures are truly milestones in the development of
Neoclassicism: Her later pictures -- in which she demonstrates a
remarkable capacity to work in several different modes all at once
-- sometimes anticipate, sometimes reflect the enormous stylistic
and iconographical diversity of that moment in history.²⁶

In spite of the fact that her popularity with the critics suffered a decline over the
first 150 years after her death, we can now look back at her work more objectively,
reassess her inventiveness and artistic merit, and see more clearly her sizeable
contribution to the development of the artistic style of the period.
CHAPTER I: NOTES

1 Museum of Fine Arts, Houston (Acc. no. 69.23), oil on canvas, 25 1/8 x 35 13/16 inches (63.8 x 91.0 cm.), Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Harris Masterson, III, in memory of Neil Turner Masterson, Jr. The painting is signed and dated lower left: Angelica Kauffman Pinx 1774.

2 For most of her career, Angelica signed her last name with one "n", although she sometimes used the double "n", Kauffmann, in later years. I chose to use one "n" since that is how she signed the painting in the Museum of Fine Arts in Houston, though much of the literature on this artist in recent years uses the double "n."


5 Walch, Diss., p. 9.


III, pp. 300-301

9 Walch, Diss., p. 73. These paintings carried a great deal of prestige but little financial reward. For these four large works she received a total of only £100, compared to the forty guineas commanded for a half-length portrait and thirty guineas for the reproduction rights to a small subject picture to be engraved by a commercial printing house. A guinea was the pre-metric equivalent of twenty-one shillings, while the pound was equal to twenty shillings.


After studying her works, I believe that this criticism is generally unjustified.

11 Ibid., p. 133.

12 Mayer, p. 134.

13 Gerard believed her popularity was on the wane in England, which led to her departure (rev. ed. p. 171). Mayer said that Angelica's protégée, Maria Hadfield Cosway, had become the rage, and that the Gordon Riots may also have contributed to her decision to leave. (Kauffmann, pp. 95, 100). The Gordon Riots were in protest of the Catholic Relief Bill in Parliament, and Angelica was a devout Catholic. The rioters actually reached Golden Square, where she lived, and though she was unscathed it must have been a terrifying experience.
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CHAPTER 2: DEVELOPMENT OF ANGELICA KAUFFMAN'S STYLE, CAREER AND PATRONAGE

Angelica's early artistic education consisted of the training she received under her father, whose oeuvre was primarily religious paintings and portraits.\(^1\) All descriptions of his work make the point that he was an unpretentious painter, and when it soon became apparent that his daughter's artistic ability would far outstrip his he gave her every opportunity to study and was extremely proud of her accomplishments.

Her career as a portrait painter began at the age of eleven when, according to family tradition, she painted the portrait of the bishop, Monsignor Nevroni Cappuchino, in Como in 1752. In her *Self-Portrait* (Fig.3) done only two years later, one can see that she was capable well beyond her years. In Milan in 1754, she copied after the Old Masters, including Leonardo da Vinci, in private collections such as that of her patron, Rinaldo d'Este, the Duke of Modena. Gerard says that Angelica took the softness of expression and stately repose of features in her figures from Leonardo, but it seems more logical to suggest that the interest in "stately repose" came from her later association with Winckelmann.\(^2\) Although still a child, she received commissions for portraits at this time from the Duchess of Modena, the Bishop of Milan and Count Firmini.\(^3\)

After her mother's death in 1757, she and her father returned to his native village of Schwarzenburg, Switzerland. By this time, her father had begun to rely upon her financial contribution to the family, and she assisted in a commission he received from the local church by executing frescoes of the twelve apostles copied from engravings after G.B.V. Piazzetta (1683-1754). A Venetian, who had studied under Crespi in Bologna, Piazzetta's style was strongly Baroque and characterized by figures seen from a low viewpoint, with their eyes rolled up to heaven.\(^4\)
After two years the Kauffmans resumed their travels in Italy, and in Milan around 1760, she made the difficult decision to pursue a lifetime career as a painter, in spite of the strong encouragement she had received to become an opera singer. In 1762, during a brief stop in Parma, she was introduced to Correggio's chiaroscuro, sweetness and fluid forms, and in Bologna she studied the works of the Carracci, Guido Reni and Guercino. In Florence, that same year, she worked daily from sunrise until well after dark, in a room put aside for her use in the Uffizi Gallery, copying after works both for study and to sell.

Walch describes her painting style on her arrival in Florence as "wholly provincial if both competent and charming," based on her Self-Portrait in Bregenz Costume (Fig.4), which he dates c. 1760. In this picture, the young artist is posed stiffly, holding her palette and maul stick. Over the next three years spent in Florence, Rome and Naples, in direct contact with the leading intellectuals of her day, her style "was transformed almost out of recognition into a highly successful expression of the burgeoning Neoclassical style." An album of sketches by Angelica, preserved in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, offers clues to her development in these early years. It contains over one hundred drawings, which, although few are actually identified or dated by her, are all believed to have been done after her arrival in Florence in 1762 and before her departure for England in 1766. For the most part, these sketches were done for her own practice after work by other artists. For example, No. 59 is after Rembrandt's Self-Portrait in the Pitti Palace, Florence, No. 111 is after the Pesaro Madonna by Titian, and No. 32 is after Van Dyck's Portrait of Frans Franken. Her special interest in portraiture is reflected, as many of the drawings are copies of Roman and Old Master portraits or portrayals from life of friends. The remaining works are landscape and figure studies.

In Florence, Angelica became acquainted with two men who would be important to her developing artistic career. One was the German artist and connoisseur, Johann Friedrich Reiffenstein (Fig.7), from whom she learned etching and whose etched portrait
she did the following year (Fig.8), when both were in Naples. The other was the young American painter Benjamin West (Figs.5,6), who not only encouraged her but apparently referred patrons to her during this time. It is unlikely, however, that he "imparted her first knowledge of the principles of composition, the importance of outline, and likewise of the proper combinations and mixtures of colour," as an article published the year after after her death claimed.\(^9\) West at the time was no more advanced or experienced than she, considering the fact that she had been studying and painting since childhood.

In 1763 the Kauffmans spent six months in Rome, where Angelica’s arrival was of sufficient general interest to be mentioned in the correspondence of a Rome-based Englishman, Jonathan Skelton, writing to his friend Richard Haywood in England.\(^{10}\) In July, going on to Naples, she began to do portraits for English travelers on the Grand Tour, such as the actor David Garrick (Fig.12) and Lord Exeter both of whom would be staunch supporters during her stay in England. While in Naples she would have been interested by the discoveries being made at Pompeii and Herculaneum, especially the wall paintings. In the spring of 1764, she and her father returned to Rome where they stayed for more than a year, and she made much progress professionally.

Among the leaders of artistic and intellectual society in Rome who affected the development of the style she would soon take with her to England, the most influential was the German cleric and archaeologist Johann Winckelmann, the foremost proponent of Neoclassicism in his time. Just how they met is uncertain, but by July she had finished her portrait of him (Figs.9,10), which he mentions in a letter to his friend, Franck:

I have just been painted by a stranger, a young person of extraordinary merit. She excels in oils. Mine is a half-figure seated, and she herself engraved it (l’eau forte) as a present for me. This young girl is a Swiss; her father, who is likewise an artist, brought her to Italy when she was only a child, so she speaks Italian as well as she does German -- as for German, she speaks it as if she were born in Saxony. She expresses herself equally well in French and in English, and in consequence of the latter, she paints the portraits of all the English in Rome. She
sings so well that she stands comparison with our best virtuosi. Her name is Angelica Kauffmann.\textsuperscript{11}

Winckelmann published three major books and numerous articles on art, which were the wellsprings of the Neoclassical movement. His first book, \textit{Thoughts on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture}, was published in 1755, before he had been to Rome. The second, \textit{The History of Ancient Art} of 1764, the result of nine years of study of the Egyptian, Etruscan, Greek and Roman art in Rome, was the first attempt made to put this art into a systematic sequence of historical development. A third book, \textit{Monumenti antichi inediti}, published in 1767, was illustrated with engravings after his own drawings. Winckelmann had a passionate preference for all things Greek, and his belief in the superiority of Greek arts and learning would eventually affect the styles of sculpture, painting and architecture throughout Europe through translations of his writings. The German philosopher Hegel, in his \textit{Introduction to Aesthetics}, published in the 1820's, said of Winckelmann:

\begin{quote}
At an earlier date [he] was inspired by his insight into the ideals of the Greeks in a way whereby he opened up a new sense for considering art; he rescued it from ways of regarding it as serving common ends or merely imitating nature, and has powerfully encouraged the discovery of the Idea of art in works of art and the history of art. For Winckelmann is to be regarded as one of the men who, in the field of art, have opened up for the spirit a new organ and totally new modes of treatment.\textsuperscript{12}
\end{quote}

This new spirit, which permeated the second half of the eighteenth century and caused renewed interest in the Greco-Roman cultures, was enhanced by many archaeological discoveries in Rome, Herculaneum and Pompeii. For eighteenth century intellectuals, Classical works of art and literature provided paradigms of perfection that mankind must strive to reach again. The Greeks were thought to have achieved an ideal state of harmony in nature ennobled by reason, and the surviving sculpture and architecture produced in this utopia was there for the artists and philosophers to examine and attempt to equal. \textquotedblleft The antique in the eighteenth century was an idol on a pedestal
providing criteria of judgements for works of art."^{13}

The lines distinguishing early Neoclassicism from the preceding Rococo or subsequent Romanticism are often blurred. The term "Neoclassicism" itself did not come into use until the 1850's and, as with Gothic, Baroque and Rococo, the name originally carried a derogatory connotation comparable to "pseudo-classical."^{14} It was, first and foremost, a new "spirit" characterized by an altered attitude to the past and an ability to see distinct historical compartments of Classical, Medieval and Renaissance art styles. This new attitude resulted in the concepts of enriching the present by studying the past, of the power to choose between styles or to combine them, and of a modern style characteristic of the present.^{15}

"Romanticism," which followed Neoclassicism, is also inextricably linked with the new spirit. The two factions often chose the same subject matter: heroic deeds from history, classical or medieval; or from literature. The major differences were that while the Neoclassicists suppressed overt emotion and feeling, the Romantics emphasized it, and while the Neoclassicists preferred shallow stage settings parallel to the picture plane for their compositions, the Romantics often chose more dramatic diagonal spatial recessions. Also, in the handling of the paint surface, Neoclassicists tended toward a smoother, less painterly treatment, while Romanticists delighted in dash and bravura in their brushwork. These characteristics easily distinguish Angelica's essentially Neoclassical style as it was upon her departure for England in 1766.

During her second visit to Rome, from 1764 to 1765, Angelica made great strides in her stylistic development. She drew from antique sculpture, sometimes with Winckelmann, and continued to draw from engravings of Old Master paintings and sculpture.^{16} She studied perspective, in what may be the only formal study she undertook with anyone other than her father, and Clérisseau and Piranesi have both been suggested as her teachers.^{17} A portrait of Piranesi (Fig.11) in Angelica's sketchbook must date from this
time, since the folio on which he leans is done in accurate perspective. She may have undertaken perspective lessons after receiving criticism of a "subject" picture Penelope, done in 1764.\textsuperscript{18} While knowledge of perspective techniques was not necessary for her portrait work, it was vital to the genre of history painting to which she had begun to aspire.

She was familiar with the work of Winckelmann's much-praised protege Anton Raphael Mengs, since there is a copy after an infant Christ by him in her album of sketches.\textsuperscript{19} It does not seem likely, however, that she knew him personally.\textsuperscript{20} Reputed to be the foremost painter in Rome around 1760, the German-born Mengs had left the city for Madrid, where he had been appointed court painter, after completing his Parnassus (Fig.13) in 1761 for the villa of Cardinal Albani.\textsuperscript{21}

At this time, she also met the Scottish painter Gavin Hamilton, who was another early devotee of Neoclassicism whose works in the style slightly pre-date Mengs'. Hamilton sent a few Neoclassical-style history paintings to exhibitions in London in the 1760's, but little note was taken of them.\textsuperscript{22} Through the wide dissemination of engravings after his work, however, he influenced the course of Neoclassicism in Europe and England. Angelica appears to have admired his taste and attitudes toward the antique and adapted these to her already-developed, more painterly style based on the Old Masters.\textsuperscript{23}

After Mengs' departure, Pompeo Batoni was the undisputed leading artist in Rome. Angelica probably met him through his "junior partner," the English artist Nathaniel Dance, an early "romantic interest" for the young, attractive Swiss woman. Batoni was highly regarded as a history painter, but like so many others artists, he was financially dependent on portraiture. His style was more painterly than that of either Mengs or Hamilton and much more suited to Angelica's technique. She never adopted the severe outline style that Winckelmann felt was basic to the aims of the Greek artists. Portraits of both Batoni and Dance appear in her album of sketches but none of her drawings have
been identified as being after Batoni's work.\textsuperscript{24}

Later that June, she and her father left Rome, going first to Bologna where she again studied the works of the Carracci and Guido Reni. From there they went to Venice, where she copied after the central portion of Titian's \textit{Pesaro Madonna} and other unidentified sixteenth-century works in the style of Veronese, the drawings of which are in the Victoria and Albert album. It was in Venice that she was exposed to the rich, romantic coloring of the Renaissance masters that would be so much a part of the style she introduced when she arrived in London.\textsuperscript{25} This can be seen in a comparison of her later work with Venetian canvases such as those in the Houston Museum of Fine Arts: Lorenzo Lotto's \textit{Holy Family with St. Catherine} (1540-45) and Bartolommeo Veneto's \textit{Portrait of a Gentleman} (c. 1512).

Angelica painted her second history painting in 1764, an \textit{Ariadne and Bacchus} (Fig.14). No longer content to remain only a portraitist, she had raised her sights to the most ambitious category of painting. In this work she already shows the development of the style she would take to England, particularly the figures close to the picture plane, a compositional device derived perhaps from Batoni, as well as a somewhat painterly brushwork similar to his. By the time she arrived in London in June, 1766, she had developed a Neoclassical mode of painting of her own imbued with great charm by synthesizing elements both from the older works she had studied and copied during her travels around Italy, such as those of Guido Reni and Domenichino, and from prominent contemporaries.\textsuperscript{26} This early mature style was characterized by simplicity, directness and harmonious groupings in which the figures were carefully linked by look and gesture. Also, her female figures had the idealized oval heads with Grecian features and plump, boneless body forms that are distinctively characteristic of such figures depicted in the wall paintings uncovered at Herculaneum and Pompeii (see Fig.56).\textsuperscript{27}
CHAPTER 2: NOTES
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6 Walsh, "Sketchbook," p. 98.
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14 Hugh Honour, *The Age of Neo-Classicism* (London: The Arts Council of Great Britain, 1972), p. xxii. The artists in the last third of the eighteenth century referred to their own style as "true" or "correct."


16 Mayer, the caption under Plate 5.


18 Ibid., p. 105.

19 Ibid., p. 103.
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21 Ibid., p. 62.
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Of the Venetian paintings in the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, the only exception is the *Holy Family and St. John the Baptist* (1535) by Vicenza di Biagio Catena, which is
very linear and has little modulation in the color.

26 Walch, Diss. p. 35.

In the fall of 1765, while in Venice, Angelica met Lady Wentworth, the wife of His Majesty's English Resident and, leaving her father behind temporarily, went with her to London in the early summer of 1766. London was an exciting place to be in the last half of the eighteenth century and Angelica had no trouble establishing herself professionally. She had arrived at the right place at the right time and was fully equipped to take advantage of the circumstances. The arts were being actively encouraged by George III (George II had hated "bainting and boetry"); there was new wealth from the Indies, both East and West; and many books of criticism and theory were being published, including translations of foreign works. Word of the new style popular in Rome and the ideas of the Neoclassicist leader Johann Winckelmann were being carried back to England by English tourists and artists who had spent time in Italy. At this moment Angelica arrived in London, young, attractive, charming and with first-hand knowledge of all the latest trends. It is no wonder that she was immediately successful, but she also had the artistic talent to maintain her place when the novelty of her arrival had worn off.

Angelica was soon in great demand as a portrait painter, preceded as she had been by her reputation among the English in Italy. The portrait of David Garrick done in Naples in 1764, for example, had been shown at the Free Society of Artists the year before her arrival. Within the first year, she bought a house in the fashionable area of Golden Square and sent for her father, who was then in Switzerland. This was the only time they were separated until his death in 1781. Portrait painting was the bread and butter of most artists, and this was especially true in England, where portraits always enjoyed a very ready market. Angelica painted the portraits of an enormous number of royal and aristocratic patrons from of England, Scotland and Ireland, including the Queen Mother.
and the Duchess of Brunswick, sister of George III.

Her circle of friends and patrons included Lord Exeter of Burghley House, whom she had met on the Grand Tour, and whose portrait she had painted in Italy. John Parker of Saltram House was another major patron, purchasing Angelica’s paintings to complement the Neoclassical-style renovations Robert Adam had made to his residence. She was presented to Queen Charlotte and invited to Ireland by the Viceroy himself. The family of the Duke of Marlborough were important patrons, but perhaps her greatest devotee was George Bowles of The Grove, Wanstead, who would later purchase her *Ariadne Abandoned on Naxos*. Reynolds remained a constant friend and champion, which included seeing that all her paintings were exhibited at the Academy in 1775 when the reception committee felt eleven were too many. And, of course, she renewed her friendships with Nathaniel Dance, Benjamin West and the sculptor Joseph Nollekens, all of whom she had known in Italy.

Another circle in which Angelica moved was that of the theater, a result of her friendship with Garrick and his wife, and with whom she dined at their house in Twickenham in the company of other artists and actors. Other prominent people among her acquaintances were Dr. Johnson and Boswell, Dr. Burney, a composer and music historian, and the writers George Keate, Gibbon and Burke. She also socialized with several fellow Swiss, such as the artists Mary Moser, a flower painter, and her father George, both founder members with Angelica of the Royal Academy. Another Swiss friend, the ordained Protestant minister turned artist Henry Fuseli, had translated Winckelmann’s *Reflections on the Painting and Sculpture of the Greeks* into English in 1765, soon after his arrival in England, indicating his own strong interest in Neoclassical ideas. Most of her friends, including Reynolds, were known for the tables they kept and the good company of their guests, but unfortunately, there are few sources for the details of Angelica’s social relationships and activities. She not only destroyed her diaries when she
left England, but she also burned her correspondence at the end of her life, thus her personal opinions and daily records are sadly lacking.

The exhibition of Angelica's Neoclassical-style history paintings at the Free Society of Artists in 1768 brought her to the attention of the artists and major patrons who attended this exhibition held in honor of Christian VII of Denmark. Angelica was represented by three works, all subjects from Homer: *Venus Appearing to Aeneas* (Fig.15), *Penelope with the Bow of Ulysses* (Fig.16) and *Hector's Taking Leave of Andromache* (Fig.17). Benjamin West, the only other artist in England who consistently produced history paintings during his career, had exhibited *Pylades and Orestes before Iphigenia* at the Free Society exhibit in 1766, where it received a great deal of notice but was not purchased at the time. At the 1768 exhibit, West's *Farewell of Regulus* and *Venus Mourning the Death of Adonis* were the only other history paintings besides Angelica's, and these five works attracted the most attention from the viewers. Reynolds and Nathaniel Dance had submitted several portraits, and the rest of the entries were landscapes or views.

Angelica exhibited her same three works along with a fourth, *Achilles Discovered by Ulysses* (Fig.18), at the inaugural exhibition of the Royal Academy in 1769, which introduced her to the general public for the first time. Later critics of Angelica Kauffman's oeuvre consistently praise these four history paintings as examples of her best work. The compositions are simple, the colors reflect the sixteenth century Venetian richness for which she was well known, and the episodes chosen emphasize the feminine, rather than the overly dramatic or masculine, in their subject matter. All four were purchased out of the Academy exhibition by Reynolds' friend and patron, John Parker of Saltram House, who eventually owned eleven of her works. The fact that Angelica sold these four paintings was a turning point in her career, enabling her to continue in this difficult field. Benjamin West, for example, was able to continue his history painting career
only because he had the patronage of the King.

Over the next few years Angelica painted numerous portraits which took her to magnificent country homes such as Saltram and Lord Exeter’s Burghley House. In 1768, she even painted George III, a singular honor since he had not yet been portrayed by the major English painter Reynolds. She also went to Ireland at the invitation of Lord Townsend, the Viceroy, where she painted his portrait and those of many other Irish aristocrats. On this trip she must have also painted the allegorical figure *Hibernia*, which was used as the basis of the seal of the Bank of Ireland.⁹

In 1770, she once again submitted four history paintings at the Royal Academy exhibit, one of which, *Cleopatra at the Tomb of Marc Antony* (Fig.19), was the first of a type -- women mourning at a tomb -- that became very popular in Angelica’s œuvre.¹⁰ Another, *Vortigern* (Fig.53), was one of the earliest paintings to use an episode drawn from English medieval history. Her idea to do this may have come from an earlier work by Gavin Hamilton, *Mary Queen of Scots Resigning her Crown* (before 1765), which Angelica could have seen or heard about when she was in Rome.¹¹ A third painting, *Samma the Demonic Weeping over the Ashes of his Youngest Son Benoni* (Fig.20), was also from a new literary source, the poem *Der Messias* by the German writer Klopstock, who had become a friend by correspondence with Angelica. Her figure of Samma, which recalls the style of Michelangelo, inspired the critic Horace Walpole to note "not ill" [not bad] in the margin of his exhibition catalogue.¹²

At the 1771 Academy exhibition, she showed another work from English history, one from Ovid and one from the Odyssey; and the following year she submitted three history paintings with subjects from Homer, Milton and Tasso’s *Gerusalemme Liberata*. At the 1773 exhibition, she entered paintings based on the Odyssey and on Ossian, along with one of her rare religious works, a *Holy Family*. Angelica’s use of such a wide range of historical and literary sources influenced others among her contemporaries to broaden
their subject choices for history paintings, as well.

It should be pointed out here that her early Neoclassical style, exemplified in the first four paintings she exhibited in London (Figs. 15,16,17,18), was gradually modified during her stay in England. Her contact with Reynolds led to a strengthening of her use of rich color, about which her critics have expressed diverse opinions. A rumor that she had a secret formula from ancient Egypt that gave her paints extraordinary brilliance inspired an English friend, George Keate, to write a long poem on the subject.\textsuperscript{13} Her contemporary and first biographer, Rossi, made the broad statement that her color equalled that of the Old Masters. This bright color was criticized by others such as the mid-nineteenth century critic, Oppermann, who thought it too high and her backgrounds monotonous.\textsuperscript{14} She gradually softened her more austere early style to use more fluid poses, and lighter, looser, more agitated drapery. The \textit{Ariadne Abandoned}, done in 1774, falls between the two extremes. The composition is simple and direct, and Ariadne has the typically idealized Greek profile and plump, boneless arms, while the drapery, without superfluous swirls or motion, is gauzy and loose.

In 1774, she exhibited three works out of six that involved female subjects separated from their male lovers, a recurring theme in her work from this time on: \textit{Ariadne Abandoned by Theseus on Naxos; Calypso Assenting to the Departure of Ulysses;} and \textit{Penelope Invoking Minerva's Aid for the Safe Return of Telemachus}.\textsuperscript{15} This is an unusual concentration on mourning women, and one wonders if there were some event in her personal life that made this subject particularly attractive at this time. She did, after all, paint other personal dilemmas, such as \textit{A Female Figure Allured by Music and Painting} and \textit{The Artist Hesitating between Music and Painting} (Fig.21), done in several versions, on the subject of her fateful choice of art over music as a career in 1760.

Angelica continued on the same successful pattern, painting portraits and the occasional history painting, until 1781, when she left England and returned to Italy with
her new husband, Antonio Zucchi. Soon after her arrival in England, Angelica had fallen in love with and married a man named Brandt, who was passing himself in English social circles as the Swedish Count de Horn. His deception was soon revealed and a deed of separation obtained, but the event took a serious emotional toll on the sensitive young artist. It was not until 1781, after Brandt’s death, that she married again, this time to Zucchi, an Italian decorative painter fifteen years her senior, who had been living in England for some time. No doubt this was a marriage of convenience, but Angelica benefitted from Zucchi’s assistance in managing her career after she returned with him to Italy.
CHAPTER 3: NOTES

1 The Resident was similar to an ambassador. Lady Wentworth was then married to John Murray, but by courtesy she used the title of her late first husband.
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15 *Ariadne Abandoned by Theseus on Naxos* was No. 145 in the R. A. exhibit of 1774.
CHAPTER 4: VISUAL ANALYSIS OF AND SOURCES FOR

ARIOADNE ABANDONED BY THESEUS ON NAXOS

The composition of the painting Ariadne Abandoned by Theseus on Naxos closely follows the tenets of Neoclassicism as it is generally defined in current scholarship:

The main emphasis in neoclassical art is on man and his activities, ranging from tragic grief to gay dance; it is not concerned with the frivolous, and does not allow the setting to dominate. Neoclassicism is in marked contrast to the rococo in spirit and also in style, as it generally reduces compositions to a stark simplicity and clear-cut outline. The complex movement in space of baroque and rococo compositions, in both painting and sculpture, is almost eliminated in preference for a minimal illusion of depth and continuous surface movement in outline. The style slowly evolved from one in which the antique was studied through the eyes of Poussin, to one inspired more directly by classical works themselves. In the treatment of details, such as costume and architecture, great care was taken to be archaeologically accurate.¹

One sees this simplicity and emphasis on the human figure in Ariadne, who dominates the canvas, reclining full length in the foreground on a low cushion, or squab, with a large bolster supporting her back. She is the only figure in the painting and everything else is subordinate to her glowing image. She seems to emerge from the surrounding darkness of the monochromatic seascape background as if on a shallow stage. Her head is turned far away from the sea to the viewer’s right as though to avoid the sight of Theseus’ ship which is disappearing over the horizon at the left. Her right arm extends horizontally, parallel to the picture plane with the palm turned up and out as though to ward off the unwelcome and painful blow of his desertion. Her left elbow is bent and leans against the bolster, and her left hand repeats the turned-out gesture of the right one. Ariadne’s only adornments are three fine gold wire bracelets on each arm, which have gold knots or balls evenly spaced along the wires. The left leg, bare from the knee down, is extended full length with the toes just off the squab. The right knee is raised and that foot is hidden
under the other leg and drapery. The figure is clothed in diaphanous gauze, revealing and at the same time disguising the details of the body beneath. The white drapery wraps her body, crossing under her right breast and up over her left shoulder. Her pale arms and right breast are covered by a thinner, slightly off-white scarf striped with gold. There is also a narrow band of gold trim on the edge of the gauze under her left leg. Ariadne’s dark blond hair curls softly, held in check by a braid of the hair itself and a gold-trimmed fillet. The averted face is in shadow, as the light comes from the left to illuminate the palm of her right hand, then delicately trace the arm and bare white shoulder. It fully illuminates the drapery on the body, making the figure seem to glow from within.

The cushions on which Ariadne reposes are very elegant and luxurious, in contrast to the ruggedness of the surrounding coast and sea. The squab is quite thick and soft, echoing the sensuousness of the body. It is covered in a beige and yellow-ochre striped fabric, and the large bolster supporting Ariadne’s back is covered in a purple-brown fabric with the end tied off in sausage fashion with a red cord and a gold tassel. A deep ruby cloth with gold fringe thrown over both cushions acts to set off the flesh tones and white drapery. That Angelica studied the work of Titian is known from the drawings in her sketchbook, and since she was also strongly influenced by the Venetian coloring, it is not surprising to find the color scheme is similar to the Sleeping Venus (Fig.39), by Giorgione, now in the Dresden Gemäldegalerie. In both paintings the pale figures are on a deep red cloth and in a landscape that opens to deep space. In Giorgione’s work, the figure is also lying partially on a white sheet, while Angelica’s figure is wrapped in white drapery. The color scheme is reversed in Titian’s Venus of Urbino, of 1538 (Fig.40), in the Pitti Palace, Florence, in which there is little contrast between the nude and the sheet beneath her, while the mattress is deep red.

In Angelica’s painting the left half of the background is divided into three horizontal bands: the upper one-third is the dawn sky, a deep pinkish blue-gray which gradually
becomes lighter pink at the left and at the horizon; the middle is the calm sea which is a deeper blue-gray; and the lower third -- the widest vertically and narrowest horizontally because the figure and squab are superimposed over it -- is composed of the beach, rocks and a few sprigs of vegetation at the water's edge. Theseus' ship appears as a tiny shape, darker than the sea, which bridges the line between sea and sky, in the far left background. The sail is silhouetted against the sky and six oars pierce the water as the ship sails to the left, soon to be out of sight. The horizontal bands are cut off abruptly on the right by the rock outcrop that looms behind and above the figure, as well as by the dominating figure itself. The massive dark rock provides a foil for the curves of the body and the cushions, emphasizing Ariadne's position in the center foreground. In addition, the rib-like diagonal lines of the rock also reinforce the diagonal created by her forearm on the right. Another diagonal is created by the shallow crevice which runs from under the squab toward the lower right hand corner of the painting. The raised right knee is superimposed over the junction of sand and sea creating a triangular shape which is repeated in two groups of rocks to the left of the mattress. The brushwork varies from the very highly finished porcelain-like quality of the skin to the more painterly drapery where the brushstrokes themselves form the folds of cloth. The red throw is more highly finished than the gauze of the drapery. The artist has used the brush to evoke the textures of the objects painted, with no hard edges or outlines.

Angelica has composed this painting very carefully, so that all the parts work together to focus attention on the figure of Ariadne. The background is muted and secondary, complementing the whole. The composition is stable; horizontals parallel to the picture plane predominate and the figure creates a subtle wedge-shape that culminates at the elbow on the bolster. There is movement and contrast of straight lines and curves, combined with secondary diagonals to elevate the painting from the static and boring, but there is not so much movement that the overall composition loses its equilibrium.
The artist has incorporated one element that may have more than compositional significance. An open jewel casket, which stands on four ball feet in the foreground below the bolster, has a gold lining and edges bound in worked gold. A bluish tassel hangs over the right side. The end panel facing the viewer is black with a gold swag in the center, and the one visible side panel is similar but has two swags. (The swag was a dominant decorative motif in the Neoclassical period.) The casket displays only a few jewels, with pearls spilling over the end and right side onto the ground. A long thin rod looped with a cord that leans against the back corner of the box may be a fibula, or long pin, used by Greeks to hold their drapery in place. One can also make out part of a gold circle set with garnet-red stones that seems to be too large for a ring but too small for a bracelet. The jewels in the casket may be a reference to the jewelled crown which, in some versions of the myth, Ariadne gave to Theseus to light his way out of the labyrinth. Walch found no iconographical precedent for the jewels, but suggested that they must symbolize the contrast of Theseus' abuse of Ariadne's soul while leaving her with material wealth. Her sandals, with thin red ties, lie in shadow on the ground just beyond her bare feet. Adding to the drama of the color scheme and surrounding details is the theatrical gesture that Ariadne makes with her arms.

When Angelica chose to paint the subject of the abandonment of Ariadne by her lover Theseus on the island of Naxos, she drew on a wide variety of sources both literary and visual, antique and modern. As an unusually well-educated woman, who regularly took her inspiration from literature in choosing her subject matter, she would have known the legend of Ariadne (see Appendix B) from its inclusion in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Plutarch's *Lives*. Also, she was probably familiar with the long, dramatic, graphic exposition of Ariadne's trials and tribulations in the sixty-fourth poem, an *epithalamium* or nuptial song, by the Roman writer Catullus. References to Ariadne appear in a number of other Roman era writings such as *Cynthia Monobiblo* by Propertius, an Umbrian poet and
friend of Ovid. The third poem of this work begins: "She looked like Ariadne, being asleep
on her island / A picture of peace, blind to the parting sail."5

In England, Angelica may well have encountered a modern interpretation of the
mythological tale by Richard Flecknoe, *Ariadne Deserted by Theseus*, a musical recitative
originally published in London in 1654. The "awakening" scene from it could easily serve
as a description of Angelica’ *Ariadne Abandoned*:

The landscape, or prospect of a desart isle discover’d, with a ship
afar off sailing from thence; when ARIADNE, awakened out of
sleep, by sad (but delicate) musick, (supposed the harmony of the
celestial minds) and finding herself deserted by THESEUS, thus
expresses first, in recitative musick, the confusion of her thoughts,
and her distracted passions.

Ariadne:

Ay me! and is he gon!
And I left here alone!
Ah Theseus stay --
But see he sails away,
And never minds my moan --
Yet sure he do’s not fly me,
But only dos’t to try me;

Verse 2

And he’ll return again --
Oh no! that hope is vain,
Hee’s gon, Hee’s gon,
And I left here alone,
Poor wretch! the most forlorn,
as ever yet was born,
With killing doloors more than Tongue can speak,
O heart, why dos’t not break?6

In a necessarily limited search for literary models on the theme of Ariadne, I encountered
no other source that emphasized to this extent the specific scene in which Ariadne
awakens the see Theseus’ ship departing and reacts with strong emotion to her
abandonment.7 Owing to Angelica’s great interest in music, it seems possible that she
could have read Flecknoe’s work or witnessed a performance of it prior to 1774. Other
modern works based on the myth were available, such as those by the French playwrights Thomas Corneille (Ariane, orig. pub. in France 1762) and Pierre Perrin (Ariadne or [The Marriage of Bacchus] pub. in English in London, 1674), or by the English author Thomas D'Urfey who included Ariadne: or the Triumph of Bacchus in his book New Opera's, with comical Stories and Poems, on Several Occasions, Never before Printed, published in London in 1721, but these works deal with a different aspect of the legend.  

Apart from literary descriptions, there were numerous and diverse visual sources from which Angelica could have derived her particular representation of the subject. As a Neoclassical artist well-acquainted with Roman antiquities, she would have known several works in sculpture and painting illustrating the episode. One such example is a relief panel discovered in the sixteenth century and subsequently placed in the Belvedere Court of the Vatican (Fig.28). This work, now in the sculpture galleries of the Vatican Museum, shows Theseus with the sleeping Ariadne just prior to his departure. Ariadne asleep -- with Theseus, alone or with Bacchus -- is, in fact, a far more common depiction than that of Ariadne awake and mourning Theseus' departure. The legend is commonly portrayed in Greek vase painting (see Fig.35), and a relevant model, or engraving after one, may have been available to Angelica. Numerous Greek vases had been excavated from Etruscan tombs during this time and were a special antiquarian interest of Angelica's friend artist Gavin Hamilton. 

One of the earliest wall paintings to be uncovered in Herculaneum was Bacchus Discovering the Sleeping Ariadne (Figs.33a,b), dating from the first century. This painting was illustrated in Le Antichita di Ercolano published in Rome in 1757, and again in Pierre Sylvain Marechal's widely disseminated French edition, Antiquités d'Herculanum, published in Paris in 1770. A second wall painting, far more relevant as a visual source for Angelica's painting is Theseus Leaving Ariadne on Naxos, also from Herculaneum and now preserved in the British Museum (Fig.56). This composition depicts the awakened
Ariadne sitting up on her pallet with one arm extended toward Theseus' ship in the near
distance. Not only are the pose and figure treatment similar, but so are the large
foreground rock behind Ariadne and the seascape background.\textsuperscript{12} The major differences are
that the ship is just offshore and Ariadne sits straight-backed and emotionless in view of
her plight.

The semi-recumbent pose of Angelica's \textit{Ariadne} is obviously a close variant of one
commonly used in antique works to express "sleep, sensuous abandon and beauty taken
unawares."\textsuperscript{13} One of the most popular antique works in Rome was the sculpture of a
reclining female in this pose, installed as a fountain nymph in the Belvedere Court in 1512
(Fig.27). The general disposition of Ariadne's body in Angelica's painting resembles that of
the Vatican fountain figure. Both recline with the legs extended, the torsos twisted slightly
and the heads turned and tilted. The marble figure is shown fully asleep, however, with
one arm flung over the head, which rests on the other hand, and the legs are crossed. The
major change made by Angelica was to show the more emotionally dramatic moment when
Ariadne awakens to the discovery that Theseus is gone.

Identified in Angelica's time as the \textit{Sleeping Cleopatra} and, at a slightly later date
than her painting, as the \textit{Sleeping Ariadne}, the Vatican work is apparently a Hadrianic or
Augustan copy of a Hellenistic original at Pergamum.\textsuperscript{14} Figures in the identical pose of
the Vatican sculpture appear in the context of other antique works in Rome that could
have been known by Angelica. A sarcophagus panel representing Mars and Rhea Sylvia in
the Palazzo Mattei collection (Fig.29) included a sleeping figure in the pose, for example.\textsuperscript{15}
Also in the Palazzo Mattei was a bas relief panel depicting \textit{Thetis Conquered by the Love of
Peleus}, with Thetis in the pose (Fig.30). An engraving after this panel, from a drawing by
the author, appeared in Winckelmann's \textit{Monumenti antichi inediti}, published in 1767.\textsuperscript{16} A
figure in a similar pose appears on the Barberini Vase (Fig.34), now known as the
Portland Vase, first recorded in 1642 in the new palace of the Barberini pope, Urban
VIII. Made of glass, it was thought to be the funeral urn of the Emperor Alexander Severus (A.D. 222-225) and was engraved as such by De la Chausse (1690), Bartoli (1697) and Montfaucon (1722). The publications of these three men were so popular that few cultured Europeans would not have known of the vase. The subject of its relief decoration is the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, and Thetis reclines with one arm over her head. Though very languid, Thetis appears to be awake and therefore closer in spirit and appearance to Angelica’s figure of Ariadne.

The Vatican sculpture itself was the subject of many copies both in sculpted form and in prints. By the late sixteenth century, sculpture copies were recorded in Rome, Sicily and Naples, but of particular note is one installed in a grotto in the gardens of Stourhead in England in the 1740’s. Curiously, even though Angelica was in Naples near the excavation sites of Pompeii and Herculaneum in 1763-64, and her early interest in seated and reclining figure poses is recorded in numerous sketches preserved in the Victoria and Albert album (see Figs.22-26), none of her drawings can be related to any of the antique works or copies mentioned so far. It is perhaps indicative of her immediate visual sources for the Ariadne Abandoned, then, to find among the artist’s collection of prints and drawings, now in bound volumes at Saltram House and partially catalogued by Anthony Blunt, a print after the Vatican fountain figure by Maximilian Joseph Limpach, an engraver originally from Prague who worked for the Vatican in the eighteenth century.

While one or more of the above antique visual sources probably influenced Angelica’s pose for the figure of Ariadne, the dramatic gesture of the awakened Ariadne in her painting varies from all of them and seems to come from her own interpretation of the story itself. The gesture of arms outstretched with upturned hands can be found in antique works, and one example was noted in another relief illustrated in Winckelmann’s Monumenti antichi inediti, a sarcophagus front in the Palazzo Barberini depicting The Death
of Agamemnon (Fig.31). Here, a female figure at the left, identified by Winckelmann as the nurse of Orestes, reacts in horror at the sight of the massacre, in much the same way that Ariadne throws up her arms at the recognition of Theseus' "massacre" of her love in Angelica's painting. A modern source from which the artist could have taken her pictorial gesture, however, is an eighteenth-century illustrated edition of Cesare Ripa's Iconologia, which codified gestures appropriate to certain psychological states. "Despair" (Fig.36) shows a woman with her head twisted away and the opposite hand flung out in the same manner as Ariadne's.

The "Despair" or "Horror" gesture could also have come directly from the theater. In the work by Angelica, the sea and ship can easily be imagined as a canvas backdrop, and the whole composition could be a stage setting. There was a close correlation between the theater and art in the codification of body "language" to convey the various emotions. Eighteenth century acting called for a much broader and more dramatic style than is used today. The instructions of the Roman Quintillian concerning the declamatory style of orators were well known in theatrical circles of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and Betterton, a seventeenth century actor, advised "the study of paintings by Old Masters to gain insight into posture and gesture." Jonathan Richardson, an English portrait painter, theorist and essayist, described the theater in 1719 as "a sort of moving pictures". M. Engel and Henry Siddons, in their Practical Illustrations of Rhetorical Gesture and Action, depict a typical example of the use of prescribed gestures to evoke a specific emotion. In this book, the illustration for "Horror" (Fig.37) is close to the gesture used by Ariadne to ward off the devastating sight of Theseus' ship as it sailed away. Evidence that Angelica's gesture had its origin on the stage may be drawn from the fact that Henry Fuseli used the same gesture for Macbeth confronting Lady Macbeth in his Shakespeare illustration, Give Me the Daggers, from Act III, scene 2 (Fig.38), done in 1774, the same year as Angelica's Ariadne.
In creating her poignant portrayal of the moment when the heroine Ariadne realizes that Theseus has abandoned her, Angelica drew upon a variety of possible literary and visual sources, taking from each those elements most suitable for the idea she wished to express. Out of this combination, she achieved a masterful synthesis resulting in an original and imaginative work of art in which she maintained the Neoclassical aims of noble simplicity and sedate grandeur.
CHAPTER 4: NOTES
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7 A similar but brief description was found in a recent edition of Bullfinch's *Mythology*: "Ariadne, on awakening and finding herself deserted, abandoned herself to grief" (New York: Avenel Books, 1979, p. 165). Written by Thomas Bullfinch, a 19th century scholar, this may indicate an antique source with which I am unfamiliar.


Pierre Perrin, *Ariadne (or The Marriage of Bacchus)*, Microprint in *Three Centuries of Drama*.

Thomas D'Urfey, *Ariadne: or, the Triumph of Bacchus*. An opera from *New Opera's, with Comical Stories and Poems, on Several Occasions, Never before Printed*. (London: William Chetwood, 1721), p. 188-220. An original edition is in the Woodson Research Center, Rice University.

Another opera, *Die betrogene und nachmals vergotteret Ariadne (The Betrayal and
Subsequent Deification of Ariadne), with music by Reinhard Kaiser and libretto by Christian Henrich Postel, was produced in Hamburg in 1722, but I found no information as to whether it was performed outside Germany prior to 1774.
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10 Angelica had earlier illustrated this episode of the Ariadne legend in her Bacchus and Ariadne (1764). Compositionally, this is totally unrelated to the 1774 painting and therefore will not be discussed.


12 Having been given the reference to an illustration of the painting by Dr. Grayson, I was unable to trace specific information on its date of excavation or whether it had been engraved prior to 1774.
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There is an original edition of this book in the Woodson Research Center at Rice University, and Professor Marion Grayson very kindly translated the pertinent sections from the original Italian, for which I am grateful.
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19 MacDougall. p. 359, 365. The earliest known drawing is by Heemskerck done in the 1530's.


I have noted a closer, but more speculative, visual source for Ariadne's pose in the reclining goddess of the East Pediment of the Parthenon (Fig. 32). The earliest known illustrations available to the general public were published by James Stuart and Nicholas Revett in the third volume of *Antiquities of Athens* (London: John Haberkorn) which came out in 1816. The drawings of Stuart and Revett were done between 1751 and 1754, however.

The British Museum, *Elgin and Phigaleian Marbles* 2 vols. (London: M.A. Nattali, 1846). vol. 1, p. 233; vol. 2, p. 1-19. The drawings by Carrey done between 1674-1678 were in the collection of M. Begen in La Rochelle, France until 1770, when they were purchased for the Royal Library, then disappeared until 1797.
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25 Henry Siddons, *Practical Illustrations of Rhetorical Gesture and Action; Adapted to the English drama: from a work on the subject by M. Engel* (1822; rpt. Benjamin Blom, Inc.)
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CHAPTER 5: THE PLACE OF
ARIADNE ABANDONED BY THESEUS ON NAXOS
WITHIN ANGELICA KAUFFMAN’S OEUVRE AND POSSIBLE REASONS FOR HER
CHOICE OF THE SUBJECT

Ariadne Abandoned by Theseus on Naxos is one of only nine extant subject pictures
by Angelica, out of a total oeuvre of well over four hundred paintings, which depicts a
solitary figure, and one of four among these which have subjects taken from literature; the
other five are allegories. Of her forty-four original etchings, four of those based on literary
sources have single figures.¹

In composing a subject picture, or history painting, with a single figure the artist
faces problems different from those in creating a multi-figured work or even a single-figure
portrait. In a subject painting with only one figure, that figure must be complete in itself
and tell the story through gestures and accessories, a much more limiting mode of
representation that demands a distillation of the tale to its basic elements. In such a
painting, the background should also contribute both compositionally and iconographically
and help interpret the episode for the viewer, as it does in the Ariadne.

The four paintings with subjects taken from literary sources are united by the
theme of mourning and distress. These paintings are: the Ariadne Abandoned (1774), The
Tomb of Shakespeare (engraved in 1782), Penelope Weeping over the Bow of Ulysses (1777)
and Poor Maria (1777).² Mourning pictures usually called for a crowded death-bed scene in
which the deceased was surrounded by grieving family and friends, and Angelica treated
the subject in that manner, too, in other works, such as the Death of Pallas (Fig.60).
Scenes of private grief with only one figure, however, are exceptional in her oeuvre.³

These twin themes of death and mourning were strong elements in eighteenth
century art in general, and in Angelica's oeuvre in particular. Scenes of the death of Christ or martyrs had been common from the Middle Ages onward, but in the eighteenth century, scenes extolling the merits of public, patriotic sacrifice, such as Benjamin West's *Death of General Wolfe*, became frequent. Another popular type of funereal picture focused on the aspect of mourning by the gentle, melancholic women that were Angelica's most successful type of subject. These mourning pictures emphasized personal rather than public virtue. This parallel theme of despairing women was the result of the cult of sensibility given such strong impetus by the novels of Samuel Richardson and Laurence Sterne. Even the most apparently masculine of paintings -- for example, Hamilton's *Death of Lucretia* or David's *Oath of the Horatii* -- have this element of weeping, despairing women. Yet in Angelica's work the women rarely give way to unbridled emotion. Instead, they maintain their composure in the face of tragedy. Her painting of *Patience* is an unexcelled example of the genre which is reinforced by the verse below the image in the engraving after it: "Her meek hands folded on her modest breast/ In mute submission lifts th' adoring eye/ Ev'n to the storm that wrecks her."  

Angelica was the first to adapt such popular subjects as Cleopatra with the dying Marc Antony and Andromache with the body of Hector to a new focus on the female protagonist. In her *Cleopatra at the Tomb of Marc Antony* of 1770 (Fig.19) and *Andromache Weeping over the Ashes of Hector* of 1772, the bodies of the dead heroes are no longer in evidence, thus bringing the feminine sensibility into even greater importance. These women express their emotions in the manner advocated so strongly by Winckelmann, without overt anguish, but with melancholy stoicism. This suited both Angelica's temperament and abilities and the taste of her eighteenth-century patrons as well. Manners and Williamson say: "It has been suggested that one of the reasons for the popularity of Angelica's work was that she more completely represented the artistic spirit of her age than did any other artist at the time."  In her new interpretation of mourning
scenes, Angelica distilled the composition around the female figure and her personal, private suffering. While a despondent woman frequently appeared within the context of multi-figured history paintings of the time, Angelica made her the focus of each of these canvases, thereby elevating the female character to a much greater importance than she carried in the original literary source.6

In the *Ariadne Abandoned*, which exemplifies this philosophy, Angelica has combined her careful composition and spontaneous brushwork with this subject of an abandoned, despairing woman. The head is turned away in partial shadow, a characteristic symbol for Angelica’s damsels in distress. Because there is no other character to compete with the monumental figure of Ariadne, Theseus’ tiny ship assumes greater importance in identifying the heroine, as does the only other object in the painting that would give the viewer a clue, the coffer of jewels. As handled by Angelica, these are sufficient to tell the story of Ariadne and the perfidy of Theseus. Ariadne is noble and self-sacrificing, facing her bereavement bravely; she does not give way to hysteria.

*The Tomb of Shakespeare* (Fig.41), one of the many Kauffman works owned by George Bowles, belongs to a series by Angelica on the tombs of famous men. When it was engraved by Bartolozzi in 1782, a quote was appended from *The Tomb of Shakespeare, A Poetical Vision* by John Gilbert Cooper (London, 1755):

```plaintext
Here Fancy stood (her dewy fingers cold
Decking with flow’rets fresh th’ unsullied sod)
And bath’s with tears the sad sepulchral mold,
Her fav’rite offspring’s long and last abode.7
```

*The Tomb of Shakespeare* is in the oval format to which she and many others in the eighteenth century were partial, with the figure of the nymph and the tomb taking up most of the space. In the oval, the figure is standing on the left in profile, leaning over the tomb with flowers extended in her hands. This figure is the only one of the four to depict slow, graceful motion; even Ariadne’s gesture captures a still moment in time, and the
other two figures are motionless.

*Penelope Weeping over the Bow of Ulysses* (Fig.42), taken from Homer and commissioned by Lord Burghley, differs from the other three single-figure pictures in being an interior scene, with Penelope seated on an upholstered stool in front of a ledge bearing part of a large column. In the upper left corner is part of another wall with a shadow across it or perhaps it is a window opening to sky. The figure is leaning on her left arm with her head turned away in partial shadow in a manner similar to that in the *Ariadne*. The light on Penelope is more dramatic than that on Ariadne; Ariadne seems to be lighted from within, while a stronger light from the left strikes Penelope and consequently throws the right side of the painting into very deep shadow.

The fourth painting, *Poor Maria* (Fig.43), portrays a character in Laurence Sterne’s popular novels *Tristam Shandy* (1760) and *A Sentimental Journey* (1768) who was forbidden to marry her true love. Her grief unsettled her mind, and she roamed the countryside with her little dog, playing sad tunes on a pipe. The subject was popular with Angelica and she did several variations, but this is the only one with a single figure; the others include additional figures such as Sterne’s narrator, the "Sentimental Traveler." The story behind this painting is again a lover separated from the object of her desire. The figure exhibits the same patient, long-suffering grief as Ariadne and Penelope and turns her head away from the viewer at much the same angle, though the face is less shadowed than those of the other two. And yet, in spite of their apparent reserve, all these paintings aim to involve the viewer emotionally, an attitude that looked forward to the Romanticist ideas of the early nineteenth century.8

Angelica also painted five single-figure allegories, four of which are the ceiling roundels for the Royal Academy, *Genius* (Fig.44), *Painting, or color* (Fig.45), *Design* (Fig.46) and *Composition* (Fig.47). These were part of a larger program of decoration for the ceiling of the Royal Academy quarters at Somerset House in 1780 and are therefore
of a different nature than the single-figure works discussed above. Here the theme is a
traditional one of the three categories of a painter's labor, Invention, Design and Color,
which Angelica redefined by splitting Invention into its two parts: Genius, or the original
inspiration of the artist; and Composition, the physical arrangement of the elements in the
painting. These paintings share with the Ariadne the single figure and, except for
Painting, the shadowed face turned away from the viewer. The fifth single-figure allegory
is that of Hibernia (Fig.48) which depicts the figure in an oval, seated and surrounded by
her attributes. Her head is unusually frontal and unshadowed for a non-portrait painting
in Angelica's oeuvre. The more straightforward manner of this painting may be due to the
commercial purposes for which the bank intended it. Again, it shares with the Ariadne the
distinction of being one of this small number of paintings limited to one figure.

With regard to Angelica's original etchings featuring single-figure subjects, Juno
and the Peacock (Fig.49) and Hebe as Jupiter's Cupbearer (Fig.50), both from 1770, belong
to the group of works with literary subjects. Hebe's face, while not shadowed, is in full
profile and half hidden from the viewer. Compositionally, Juno has more in common with
the allegorical Hibernia than Ariadne, however. In 1779, she etched two single-figure
allegories, L'Allegra (Fig.51) and La Penserosa (Fig.52), based on poems by Milton but with
the gender changed to female. L'Allegra, holding a musical triangle and with a tambourine
at her feet, is seen full face but with her head tilted so that much of it is in shadow. La
Penserosa sits with her hands in her lap and her head turned more completely in profile
than Ariadne's.

These nine paintings and four etchings constitute a very small group within
Angelica's large production. History paintings with only one figure present more
difficulties than portraits or multi-figure groups, since the single-figure scenes offer fewer
opportunities to inject story-telling elements into the composition. New means must be
used to convey the episode succinctly and clearly, and Angelica has done this with her
simple, monumental figures of women. They take on heroic, ideal qualities by not sharing the focus of attention with another character.

The single female figure composition may well have provided Angelica with an opportunity to identify closely with her subject. It is worthwhile then to consider the conditions and events of her personal life that may have made her particularly receptive, in her early thirties, to motifs of the suffering and grief caused by abandonment or death of a lover. In spite of her natural endowment of intelligence, talent and beauty, the life of a professional artist was exceptionally difficult for a woman, especially one as ambitious as Angelica. Gerard says that her wish was to "fill posterity with wonder and admiration."

That this wish remained to a certain extent unfulfilled was in great measure owing to the circumstances which befell her in after life, and also to the hinderances which then -- far more than in the present time [1893] -- stood in the way of women who sought to make their mark, and rendered their best efforts somewhat incomplete.¹⁰

Having lost her mother at an early age and being depended on by her father to contribute to the family finances from her early teens, it is not surprising to learn that she became ill from overwork while in Florence in 1762-63. Adding to her problems were certain unpleasant realities related to her infringement on the male world. In her great desire to improve herself professionally, she was surely frustrated by the restrictions forbidding women to study life drawing, which was the firm basis for artistic advancement. Even her pursuit of knowledge through copying the Old Masters was sometimes hampered, an example being the fact that she was so harassed by male copyists in the Uffizi that the officials put her in a separate room where she could work undisturbed.

Before going to England, the pretty and personable young Swiss woman had been popular with men socially and had several flirtations, including one in Florence with Benjamin West. David Garrick wrote a flattering poem to her when she painted his portrait in Naples: "While thus you paint with ease and grace/ And spirit all your own/
Take if you please my mind and face/ But let my heart alone."\(^{11}\) The most serious of these romances was with Nathaniel Dance, with whom she was rumored to be engaged when she arrived in England. She broke off the romance in London, and some writers believe it was due to her hope for an offer from Joshua Reynolds, which, a newspaper article to the contrary, he probably never made.\(^{12}\) She was courted by Henry Fuseli, whom she rejected as a suitor.\(^{13}\) Her name was also linked romantically with Lord John Cavendish, a younger son of the Duke of Devonshire. As a result of this attention, she had every reason to believe that she would be able to make an advantageous marriage if she so desired, but this was not to happen due to a shocking mishap. In 1767, a year after her arrival in England, she made an uncharacteristic and tragic decision to marry, in secret, a man to whom she had been introduced in London society as the Swedish Count de Horn. Horn turned out to be an impostor named Brandt, who had a wife in Germany. Angelica and her father were devastated, and though she could have sued Brandt in the English courts, a guilty verdict would have meant his death. She could not bring herself to do this, and even as a Catholic, she refused to petition the Pope for an annulment, indicating that she had probably been very much in love with this man who had taken advantage of her. She paid Brandt £300 privately in exchange for a deed of separation, but this "marriage" became a public scandal anyway and ended any hopes she may have had of marrying and having children, the expected role for a woman in the eighteenth century.\(^{14}\) It was also the incident that inspired several of the nineteenth century novels based on her story.

As a woman alone in a professional career, she was always vulnerable to attacks on her reputation and had several vicious one aimed at her during her stay in England. In 1775, Nathaniel Hone submitted a painting called *The Conjuror* to the Royal Academy, which was a recognizable parody of Reynolds' habit of borrowing from Old Master compositions. Hone included several small nude figures, one being a seated woman with a trumpet whom gossips identified as Angelica. She wrote a cool, dignified letter demanding
the removal of the painting and threatening to withdraw her own work if this was not done immediately. In a sense, she was an easier target for gossips than Reynolds, and her act saved not only her own reputation but the loss of face by Reynolds, the real butt of Hone’s sarcastic work.\(^{15}\) Another recurrent accusation that threatened her social reputation was that of secretly drawing from the male nude. Smith, in gathering data for his *Life of Nollekens*, thought the matter important enough to question one of Angelica’s male models, who denied the accusations.\(^{16}\)

There were other events in Angelica’s life that would have reinforced her sensitivity to the issue of women in trouble. Undoubtedly she painted the series of single-figure mourning scenes in part because they were popular with her patrons, but she brought a particular sensitivity to the theme, having faced her own tragedies with the same stoic bravery as that admired in her subjects. She added her own aspect of a quiet personal grief to the theme of bereavement. That Angelica was able, ultimately, to rise above her setbacks, and that they did not hurt her career as a painter, is another measure of the admiration in which she and her art were held. Even as her personal life dissolved in the ruinous marriage to Brandt, for example, this was the moment that King George III chose to have her paint his portrait. Her other friends and patrons also rallied to her aid with commissions, since she had been hurt financially as well as emotionally. For most of her career, she was a single woman with the problems which that entailed, but she overcame these with the fortitude that the public so admired in the heroines of her paintings. As she painted her personal dilemma of the decision to become a painter rather than a singer, perhaps the accumulation of personal tragedies manifested themselves in her single-figure paintings and etchings of love-lorn, abandoned or widowed women.
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1 The works discussed are all paintings by Angelica of a single female figure, full-length, in a background and with a strong narrative element, or are her original prints. Bust-length compositions, historiated portraits and works done expressly to be engraved by others for book illustrations have not been included in this assessment.

The total number of paintings and original prints given here have been taken from Gerard’s biography of Kauffman (1st ed. 1892, pp. 337-59; rev. ed. 1893, pp. 433-37). There is no catalogue raisonné of Angelica Kauffman’s work.

2 Walch, Diss., p. 122.

3 The original painting was destroyed in 1945. It is known from the sketch that is now in the Tiroler Landesmuseum Ferdinandeum.

4 William Mason, Caractacus of 1759 (p. 15), cited by Graves (pp. 300-301).

5 Manners and Williamson, p. 2.
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8 Walch, Diss. p. 158.

9 Ibid., p. 106.

10 Gerard, p. 23.

11 Mayer, p. 32.


13 Mayer, p. 51.
14 Ibid., p. 57-63. Gerard says the German and French critics Wurzbach, Sternberg and Valer put forth the bizarre explanation that it was a plot by Reynolds to discredit a rival and by Fuseli, a rejected suitor, to force her into a disastrous marriage. There was never any mention of such a theory in London, and surely Boswell or Walpole wouldn't have let it go unnoticed (pp. 100-104). Reynolds remained Angelica's friend all his life. Whitley speculated on an involvement by Dance (p. 373) and Gerard included Nathaniel Hone (p. 104).

15 Mayer, pp. 81-88. Borrowing compositions was an accepted practice at the time.

Ariadne Abandoned by Theseus on Naxos belongs to a very small group of works within the oeuvre of Angelica Kauffmann that depicts historical subjects using a single female figure. Painted in England in 1774, it gives evidence of the artist’s fully developed Neoclassical style that synthesizes carefully chosen subject matter and classical compositional prototypes with a special ability to convey restrained emotional pathos. Intensive study and total absorption in her career since childhood brought Angelica Kauffmann to artistic maturity early, well before her thirtieth birthday. At the same time, psychological stresses and conflicts, inherent in such an abnormal lifestyle for a woman, worked to sensitize her to the plight of all women and led to a sizeable body of work on the subject of women left alone to mourn the departure of men due to wars, death or abandonment. It is significant, therefore, that Angelica chose to paint the stories and actions of women in reaction to fate and male dominance, of which the Ariadne is a prime example, in the same elevated manner used during this period to depict the heroic exploits of male protagonists.

Due to her study of classical antiquities in Rome and Naples, Angelica would have been familiar with many examples of reclining or abandoned females, including those of Ariadne herself. The Cleopatra fountain figure was widely known, but Angelica would have been acquainted with less common visual sources, such as the wall paintings at Herculaneum and the illustrations for Winckelmann’s book, Monumenti antichi inediti, and less eye-catching works such as the sarcophagus reliefs in the various palazzi. Angelica also knew the literary and dramatic sources of the story and most probably the English musical recitative version written in the seventeenth century that describes her painting so well. She synthesized her knowledge of these works into her painting of the tragic figure of
Ariadne.

Through investigation of the thematic, stylistic and historical aspects of one painting, *Ariadne Abandoned by Theseus on Naxos*, this thesis provides an evaluation of the broader contributions made by Angelica Kauffman to the development of Neoclassical history painting in England, from her arrival there in 1766 until her return to Italy in 1781, and even beyond. An important element in judging an artist’s place in history is the impact of his or her work on contemporaries and the younger generation of artists. Angelica’s individualistic Neoclassical approach to her art began to exert influence on British artists soon after she first exhibited her history paintings in 1768 and 1769. For example, elements from *Hector Taking Leave of Andromache* (Fig. 16) showed up in later works of her early mentor Gavin Hamilton. In his painting of the same subject done in 1775 (Fig.58), Hamilton closely followed Angelica’s prototype for the central characters, which contrasted Hector, stiff and stoical, with the weeping female collapsed on his shoulder, though he injected a number of secondary figures.¹

*Vortigern, King of Britain, Enamoured with Rowena* (Fig.53), exhibited by Angelica at the Academy in 1770, is one of the earliest known history paintings to draw upon medieval subject matter, and its effect can also be noted on her colleagues. Henry Fuseli used the same subject in a pen drawing with a similar composition (Fig.62) dating from about the time that she would have been painting *Vortigern*, which, as her close friend, he could have seen in her studio. According to Walch, John Mortimer’s *Vortigern and Rowena* of 1779 is also compositionally “strongly reminiscent” of Angelica’s painting.² Her *Cleopatra Mourning at Mark Antony’s Tomb* (Fig.19) of 1770, subsequently used by her for a series of works on the same theme but with different characters, became the standard for decades to come for representing a widow in mourning. As an example, Benjamin West reworked his *Agrippina with the Ashes of Germanicus*, originally done in 1766 (Fig.54), into a composition (Fig.55) closely resembling Angelica’s mourning scene.
An especially seminal work both as a new subject and for its new composition was Angelica’s *Lady Elizabeth Grey Imploring of Edward IV the Restitution of her Deceased Husband’s Lands, Forfeited in the Dispute between the Houses of York and Lancaster*, exhibited in 1776 (Fig.61). While her painting was based on a standard composition in common use for "Alexander at the Tent of Darius," she added the dogs in the lower left corner and the handmaidens in the right background, motifs that recur in the works of others such as those by William Hamilton, John Downman, John Opie and Robert Smirke.³

New subjects introduced by Angelica were widely influential: Vergil Reading the *Aeneid to Augustus and Octavia*, later used even by French painters including Ingres; Poor *Maria*, entered in the 1777 Academy exhibition, was picked up by R. Hurleston, J. Shelley, J. Shelldrake and Joseph Wright of Derby in later works; and Valentine, Proteus, Sylvia and Giulia in the Forest (Fig. 59), painted in 1789 for Boydell’s Shakespeare Gallery, appeared later in the oeuvre of Thomas Stothard, Francis Wheatley and Henry Pierce.⁴

In summation, Angelica Kauffman enjoyed an especially successful career in which she was honored as a prominent artist from her early twenties until her death in 1807 at the age of sixty-six. In any discussion of English art after 1766, she demands full consideration for her effect in that arena. She was as highly regarded personally as she was professionally, in spite of her natural vulnerability as a woman to vicious gossip and scandal. She came well-equipped to flourish in the dual worlds of art and society due to the strong academic education insisted on by her parents, her artistic talent, and her attractive personality.
CHAPTER 6: NOTES

1 Walch, Diss., pp. 245-53.
2 Ibid., pp. 278-80.
3 Ibid., p. 256. The works by Hamilton, Downman and Smirke are illustrated in Walch, Diss., Nos. 186-189.
APPENDIX A: PROVENANCE

Ariadne Abandoned by Theseus on Naxos is probably identical with the work titled Ariadne Abandoned by Theseus exhibited by Angelica at the Royal Academy in 1774 (catalogue No. 145).¹ The painting was purchased by her greatest patron, George Bowles, of The Grove, Wanstead, Essex, who eventually owned at least fifty of her works. During her years in England, he bought more than twenty-five canvases, including the Ariadne Abandoned, and another twenty-two after she had returned to Rome. While her second husband, Antonio Zucchi, kept careful records of her commissions after their return to the Continent, no such records exist for the work she did in England. It is unknown, therefore, whether Bowles commissioned the Ariadne or bought it after it was exhibited. Neither is it known when or how Angelica met Bowles; in fact, they may not have met until after the artist had left England and was in Venice, on her way to Rome.² This seems hard to believe, since Bowles was such an admirer of her work and already owned two dozen or so paintings, as well as an extensive collection of engravings after her work. They could easily have met socially at one of the many country homes she visited, or a friend might have brought him to her studio in London.

At Bowles death in 1784, his estate, including Ariadne Abandoned, was inherited by his sister Rebecca’s son, John Rushout, the second Baron Northwick, a great collector of art himself. At the death of Lord Northwick in 1859, the painting passed with his estate and title to his brother’s son, George Rushout Bowles, the third Lord Northwick, whose father had adopted the use of the Bowles family name. Elizabeth Augusta Bateman-Hanbury, widow of the third Lord Northwick, inherited his art collection and passed it on at her death in 1912 to her grandson, Edward George Spencer-Churchill, M.C., a captain in the Grenadier Guards (see Provenance Chart, p.60).
During the years after the first George Bowles' death, sales of art from the collection had been made, including some of the works by Angelica, but nine of her paintings, including the *Ariadne Abandoned*, descended by inheritance to Captain Spencer-Churchill. On October 29, 1965, when Spencer-Churchill's estate was sold at auction by Christie, Manson and Woods, Ltd., in London, Mr. and Mrs. Harris Masterson of Houston, Texas purchased the *Ariadne Abandoned*. In 1969, the Mastersons gave the painting to the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, in memory of Mr. Masterson's cousin, Neill Turner Masterson, Jr.
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1 The painting, under the title Ariadne Abandoned by Theseus, appears in the 1864 catalogue of the Northwick Park collection, No. 318. Another Kauffman painting of the same topic in the Dresden Gemäldegalerie, Ariadne (before 1781), shows Ariadne sitting upright in the company of a large crying putto.

2 Mayers, p. 106.

APPENDIX B: THE ARIADNE LEGEND

There are many versions of the legend of Ariadne and Theseus, with very little agreement among them as to details.¹ Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Plutarch's *Lives* were the major sources available to Angelica and her contemporaries and were part of a proper eighteenth century education, but there were other versions of the story, as well. According to most, Ariadne was the daughter of King Minos and Pasiphaë of Crete. There, confined in a labyrinth built by Daedalus, was a creature known as the Minotaur, the off-spring of Pasiphaë and a bull, to which the city of Athens was required to sacrifice a tribute of seven youths and maidens every nine years. Theseus, nominally the son of Aegeus, the king of Athens (for whom the Aegean Sea was named), but in reality the son of Poseidon, was one of the youths chosen and brought to Crete for the third offering. On his arrival, he fell in love with Ariadne, who gave him a sword and a ball of magic twine, or gold thread, to slay the dreadful Minotaur and find his was out of the maze. In some versions, she gave him her crown, the jewels of which lighted his pathway.

After Theseus emerged from the labyrinth, the only sacrificial youth ever to do so, he carried Ariadne off to the island of Naxos, one of the Cyclades, sometimes referred to as Dia. There he abandoned her, either immediately or after she gave birth to two sons. The legends also give different reasons for his desertion; it may have been faithlessness, or it may have been involuntarily at the command of Aphrodite or Bacchus. In the painting under discussion, Angelica chose to portray the emotion-filled moment when Ariadne awoke at dawn to see Theseus' ship under weigh, in the distance. The drama of the forsaken woman is common in mythology; Dido and Medea are two other examples. Ariadne's story had a happier ending, however, because Bacchus arrived to console her. She married Bacchus, and as a result she was granted immortality by Zeus. Her crown
(either a bridal crown given to her by Bacchus or the one made for her by Vulcan while she still lived at Knossos and the one used by Theseus) was then set among the stars as the Corona Borealis.
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APPENDIX C: PRINTS AFTER ANGELICA'S WORKS

Reproductive etchings and engravings after Angelica's works comprise an important aspect of study regarding her career. Through the enormous number of prints thus created, her work was disseminated widely and her artistic reputation and influence broadened. To have one's work engraved by others was lucrative (Angelica usually received thirty guineas for the reproduction rights to a small subject picture), and it gave an artist's work a much wider audience. The prints were sold far and wide to collectors, tourists and those with art interests who were not able to afford the originals.¹ Usually only the wealthy were able to travel and see paintings in other places, and few galleries in England were open to the public. Indeed, the German critic Sternberg (who didn't like the English anyway) accused the English of covering their treasures with cold egotism like Pompeii with ashes.² Public exhibitions of contemporary paintings did not begin in England until the foundation of the Royal Academy in 1769.

Angelica had learned the etching technique from her friend Reiffenstein, whom she knew as a young artist in Florence and Naples. In all, she did only forty-four original etched plates, including portraits of Reiffenstein and Winckelmann, but this first-hand knowledge assisted her in selecting printmakers to copy after her works. The relationship between a good engraver's interpretation of an artist's work has been compared to that of a musician's interpretation of a piece of music. There were several fine professional reproductive printmakers in England who copied Angelica's works during her lifetime, of whom three in particular are noteworthy: Thomas Burke, a popular and prolific copyist; the innovative William Wynne Ryland, who claimed the epithet "engraver to the king"; and Francesco Bartolozzi, an Italian brought to England by the king in 1764 to make print reproductions of the drawings in the royal collection.³
Ryland and Bartolozzi excelled in stipple technique, a combination of etched line and drypoint dotting, that imitated in appearance the look of chalk drawings, especially when printed in sepia or sanguine (red) ink. Ryland, who had learned the technique as a young student in Paris, did at least thirty-three stipple prints after Angelica's work. The sale of the Bowles-Rushout collection from Northwick Park in 1878 included a portfolio of 250 Bartolozzi prints after works by Angelica, many of which were early proofs before the addition of text. Gerard describes these proofs, especially the ones in color, as most beautiful and rare. So many of his works were printed in sanguine ink that the color became known as "Bartolozzi red." Burke, another well-known, well-thought-of engraver, was Angelica's personal favorite, whom, she felt, was "unexcelled for vigour, boldness and brilliancy of effect in the stipple manner." He executed such gems as *Rinaldo and Armida* and *Angelica Kauffman as Design Listening to the Inspiration of Poetry*.

While these three were the most notable of her engravers, it was the French printmaker working in London, J. M. Delatre, who reproduced in print the *Ariadne Abandoned by Theseus on Naxos* in 1785. Poetry, either by well-known authors, by the artist or by the engraver, was often included under the image, and the poem below the illustration of *Ariadne Abandoned* reads:

```
Fair Ariadne wander'd on the shore
Forsaken now, and Theseus loved no more
Torn was her gown, disheveled was her hair
Her bosom naked, and her feet were bare
She beat her breast, the traitor's gone said she
What shall become of poor forsaken me.
```
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1 Walch, Diss., p. 73.


6 Salaman, p. 11.

7 Nash, p. 262.

8 Salaman, pp. 16, 17.


I was able to transcribe the text with the use of a magnifying glass.
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