

# PRINTED ARGUMENTS: THE WINTERTHUR MEZZOTINT OF CHARLES LENNOX, DUKE OF RICHMOND

## Joseph Litts

Almost Arcadia—or the English countryside at a particularly wild moment—a tapestry of trees and flowering vines and smaller shrubs surges forward and retreats. A young boy in robes stands defiantly, pushing nature back with his baton while his cloak merges with the forested ground. Another boy in a metal collar is arrested mid-genuflect, handing the other a hat. The boy in robes is white; his name is Charles Lennox, the first duke of Richmond and Lennox, among several other English and French titles.<sup>1</sup> The boy in the collar is black; his identity is currently unknown. Charles was less than 10 years old when this image was made.

This mezzotint (Fig. 1) is one of over 20 images made of Charles, who lived from 1672 to 1723. At least 18 paintings and 5 prints of Charles were executed during his lifetime, including portraits by Godfrey Kneller, Willem Wissing, John Verelst, and Peter Lely. Taken as a group, the images argue for Charles's power, his wealth, his station in life, and above all, his conformance with the practice of nobility-as-lived-experience. This print in Winterthur's collections (acc. no. 1965.2602) is unique, however, among images of Charles, although part of a broader tradition of visually exploiting people of color in western European portraiture. None of other known portraits of Charles include enslaved servants or other non-European objects for visual consumption. For contemporary viewers, the print's message of Charles's race-based superiority is perhaps the chief argument. The late seventeenth-century date for the print enables us to complicate this interpretation, as the image was made in an era when race, both as a theoretical construct and as a lived experience, was more fluid than is usually understood. A more nuanced analysis examining difference and otherness more broadly enables us to see how this image and this object constructs Charles as a legitimate wielder of power and the owner of the print as a connoisseur of both art and political history.



Fig. 1, After Henri Gascar. *Charles Duke of Richmond and Lennox*. Intaglio (mezzotint and engraving) print on laid paper. ca. 1685. Sheet: 15 3/8 x 12 inches. Plate: 13 9/16 x 10 inches. Winterthur Museum, Gardens, & Library, Gift of Mrs. Waldron Phoenix Belknap. Acc. no. 1965.2602. Image courtesy Winterthur.

It is easy to assume in our contemporary world of phone selfies that the person depicted in a portrait controlled the image. Many actors, however, had explicit roles in producing this portrait and object. These include the original aims of Charles's parents and regents in having his portrait made, a fraught act in even the simplest of contexts. The images were made during a period of complex change and negotiation in British society. The political upheavals that marked British history during the second half of the seventeenth century are perhaps surpassed only by the simultaneous changes in the British

art market and the British community of image makers. Printed portraits, given the technical processes of print-making, also added layers of complexity as the original sitter, the painter, the printmaker (the person who made and prepared the metal plate used to make the printed image), and the publisher or seller interacted and imposed their agency on the image. Further, this print has been involved with the art market and cannon for over three and a half centuries; each time it changed hands, various actors (re)assigned value, in monetary, aesthetic, and historical senses. Finally, there is the contradiction inherent to all images made in multiples (mechanical or otherwise) and most famously summarized by Walter Benjamin: can an object which is a copy (i.e. mezzotints) have the same impact and value as a one-off work of art (i.e. a painting).<sup>2</sup>

I begin my analysis by theorizing how viewers in the British Atlantic World would have perceived the sitters and landscape of the printed image and two other early portraits of young Charles.<sup>3</sup> My analysis then examines the history of the mezzotint process and the growth of mezzotint as a patriotically British form of art making. Later, I use the print's materiality in context with the scholarship on print culture and the history of the image trade to speculate on a possible long history of this print.

### THE MANY FACES OF CHARLES LENNOX

Charles Lennox was born in July 1672 as one of the illegitimate sons of King Charles II of England and Louise de K rouaille. He was named Duke of Richmond in August 1675 and Duke of Lennox a month later.<sup>4</sup> He was an English Protestant by birth, was naturalized as a French Catholic in 1685 (a choice perhaps made in response to James II's ascent to the throne), and became an English Protestant again by choice in 1688. These shifts in denomination were likely a response to political unrest during the years between his father's death and the Glorious Revolution, discussed in greater detail later. Biographers would describe Charles as

Fill[ing] various more or less public offices, yet his unfortunate propensity for being everything by turns and nothing [for particularly] long effectually militated against any chance of his name being emblazoned upon the scroll of fame.<sup>5</sup>

In other words, what we as contemporary audiences read as a traditional, ne'er-do-well aristocrat.

 migr  French artist Henri Gascar painted the portrait of Charles on which this print is likely based (Fig. 2). Gascar was in England between 1674 and 1680, where he painted court portraits for Charles II. Most of Gascar's portraits were reproduced as mezzotints, almost all of which are uniformly signed as "H Gascar Pinx." The traditional interpretation is that Gascar was the printmaker, though there is currently no evidence either way.<sup>6</sup> Such

elisions between painter and printmaker were not unknown in the late seventeenth century, though they were unusual, given the different technical skills involved. They would become much more common later in the eighteenth century, especially in France.<sup>7</sup> Instead, printmakers worked closely with portrait artists to produce the plates and resulting images.

Winterthur's portrait is rare; the British Museum has the only other recorded copy known at the time of writing.<sup>8</sup> Scholar John Ingamells argues the print is after another painted portrait of Charles, also by Gascar, but never recorded and untraced.<sup>9</sup> The likelier scenario would be that strategic additions were made between the painting in figure 2 and the mezzotint.<sup>10</sup> In the painting, Charles is oriented toward the viewer's right and stands before a column with a parterre garden in the background. His baton is similarly cropped in both images. The printed image reverses the horizontal orientation of Charles, which is not uncommon with these sorts of prints after portraits. The easiest way to make an intaglio print from a painting is to copy the image directly into the plate, though this



Fig. 2, Henri Gascar. *Portrait of Charles Lennox*. Oil on canvas. ca. 1676. 40 x 31 inches. Collection of John, Earl of Belmore, on loan to Castle Coole, County Fermanagh, National Trust. Acc. no. NT 227687. Image used under CAA guidelines for fair use.

results in a horizontal reversal of the image during the printing process. Furthermore, and perhaps more





Fig. 3, Isaac Beckett, after Willem Wissing. *Charles Lennox, 1<sup>st</sup> Duke of Richmond and Lennox*. Intaglio (mezzotint) print. Late 17<sup>th</sup> century. Sheet: 9 5/8 x 7 1/4 inches. National Portrait Gallery, given by the daughter of compiler William Fleming, MD, Mary Elizabeth Stopford (née Fleming). Acc. no. D29467. Image courtesy National Portrait Gallery.

importantly, the horizontal reversal ensures that Charles comes before the black enslaved servant in the traditional left to right western reading, ensuring the white boy's supremacy is clearly articulated to the viewer. The addition of the enslaved servant and the change in background are visual arguments for Charles's legitimacy.

The clothing worn by both sitters marked them as different from most viewers; Charles's classical costume and the enslaved servant's exotic one distinguished them from contemporary fashion.<sup>11</sup> In the portraits discussed here, the artist depicted Charles's in vaguely classical robes with cloaks and Roman-style sandals. The forms of dress invoke a timeless quality and suggest not only that Charles is drawing on classical knowledge and ideas, but also that he and his power will endure. This power is potentially ironic; as an illegitimate child, Charles's power was based on his father's favor. On a practical level, Charles's dress ensured that he would not look out of date in twenty years. The costume also alludes to a noble ancestry that Charles did not technically possess. Drawing heavily on baroque conventions, the robes allude to antiquity and the classical, "perfect" body, in contrast to the enslaved servant's.<sup>12</sup> However, his curly, flowing hair (possibly a wig) is a concession to then-current tastes, referencing a period of sartorial extravagance after the austerity of the Cromwellian era.<sup>13</sup> The hairstyle is a demonstration of

power intelligible as such to viewers in the seventeenth century.<sup>14</sup>

His classical dress and aristocratic demeanor contrasts starkly with the enslaved servant in the print. The exotic servant is dressed in babouches, a silver collar, and a mandarin-collared coat in ikat fabric (possibly from Bukhara in Central Asia<sup>15</sup>); his orientalist livery renders his person an object for consumption. *Turquerie*, or the fashion for all things Turkish and "Persian" would come into full force slightly later in the eighteenth century, especially after the 1721 publication of Montesquieu's *Lettres Persans* and the 1726 portrait of Lady Mary Wortley Montague by Jonathan Richardson. The works of art and literature speak to an interest in the clothing and culture of Turkey, which had recently been "opened" to western tourists. Contemporaries would have read the outfit worn by the enslaved person in the print (and also in the painting of Lady Mary) as Turkish, and therefore as fashionable.<sup>16</sup>

The fashionable Turkish dress reminds scholars that the line between free and enslaved servant for people of color was unclear in this period in England. The general convention among art historians suggests that those who wore metal collars (as the figure in this image does) were enslaved.<sup>17</sup> However, in many portraits the metal collars are frequently obscured by liveries, thereby naturalizing signifiers of enslaved status.<sup>18</sup> That the collar is so clearly visible in this print speaks to a desire to render the black man as property and symbols of one's wealth and power.<sup>19</sup> These servants represented the intersection of baroque fantasies of the New World and the reality of the physical Other.<sup>20</sup> This man may be a stock figure, inserted by the printmaker, rather than an actual enslaved servant owned by Charles; the possibility suggests a prescriptive formula for courtliness.<sup>21</sup> His depiction in near-profile view supports this potential interpretation, as it is a generalized pose that speaks of fungible property rather than individuality.

The use of a person of color may have additional significance. Scholar David Bindman argues for an "innocent savage" trope, in which a person of color is inherently scandalized by the vices supposedly civilized Europeans enjoy.<sup>22</sup> Black servants were usually not depicted with children until much later in the eighteenth century, as their exoticness was associated with "innuendoes of sexuality or moral laxity."<sup>23</sup> Given Charles's illegitimacy, the enslaved servant may be a subtle commentary on the loose morals of Charles II's court. Of course, given the "dynastic disarray" of Charles II's court, with a palace full of illegitimate offspring and no legitimate heir of any gender after several decades, Charles's presence may not have required moralizing commentary.<sup>24</sup> Additionally, Charles Lennox was one of many illegitimate offspring in seventeenth-century European courts who maintained positions of power later in life. The more likely reading is that Charles is a master who has "tamed" the

“savage,” playing up Charles’s maturing authority rather than his inauspicious beginnings—though both readings have currency and speak to the tragic commodification of people of color to expand the British Empire.

Social commentators argued consumption of such imported luxury goods as enslaved servants, tea, silk, pearls, lacquer, etc., undermined the rural values that had been a hallmark of the English character.<sup>25</sup> The print partially responds to this cultural criticism, and signifiers of a country aesthetic are present in the mezzotint of Charles. He emerges from the forest, linking the young Duke closely with nature. His baton held in his right hand aggressively pushes back the foliage climbing around the tree, emphasizing his dominance over the natural world.

This is further suggested by two later mezzotints (Figs. 3 and 4) of Charles, which positioned him firmly in nature. All of these prints also feature Charles in vaguely classical draperies or robes and engaging with dogs. His contrapposto poses are informal, though classically informed, positioning him in the idealized middle ground between nature and culture.<sup>26</sup> The images depict him as someone comfortable with the accoutrements of hunting and familiar with the countryside: traditional shibboleths of the English gentry.<sup>27</sup> The dogs function as allegories of hunting and land, locating the source of Charles’s power in an English, rather than Colonial, context.<sup>28</sup> A Mastiff is depicted in figure 3, and a Cocker Spaniel in figure 4.<sup>29</sup> Englishmen associated both breeds with the traditional hunt and country lifestyle. The prints with the dog are slightly later than the print with the servant and represent a shift in the tactics deployed on behalf of Charles.<sup>30</sup> These images together showed a young boy comfortable in and with nature. They also alluded to country houses and land-based incomes rather than Royal patronage. Such sources of financial independence would presumably become more important during the multi-year turmoil of Charles II’s death, James II’s brief rule, and the Glorious Revolution.

Although it may seem inherently domestic, the dominance of the English landscape was also important in situating England’s position in international debates about style and content. The distinctly English local environment was a source of pride and inspiration that artists on the Continent could not sincerely employ.<sup>31</sup> The artist’s depiction of dogs and foliage in the environment, while admittedly vague, implied to viewers that the scene is English and associated Charles with England rather than the Continent, a decision he was likely grateful for during his 1688 return to England as a Protestant.

These images also visually asserted Charles’s power amidst the religious and political climate of the times. As a boy, Charles Lennox, and his mother, Louise, were Catholic in a predominately Protestant country, and they lived with others who remembered Charles I’s beheading, the Interregnum, Cromwell’s governance, and



Fig. 4, Edward Cooper after Bernard Lens. *Charles Lennox, 1<sup>st</sup> Duke of Richmond and Lennox*. Intaglio (mezzotint) print. ca. 1680. Sheet: 10  $\frac{3}{4}$  x 7  $\frac{1}{8}$  inches. National Portrait Gallery, given by Sir Herbert Henry Raphael. Acc. no. D19811. Image courtesy National Portrait Gallery.

general dissatisfaction with the monarchy. Charles II was clearly working to restore the primacy of the monarchy in the eyes of the public through a strategic visual campaign of paintings and prints, along with enforcing a state church and other cultural acts outside the scope of this paper. The paintings, and the prints by literal and physical extension, however, were commissioned in advance of the Glorious Revolution (1688), when the Catholic-leaning Stuarts would be deposed and replaced with the Protestant and Dutch rulers William and Mary. Historian Lisa Jardine argues this transition was not as immediate nor as peaceful as is usually imagined. It was the product of many decades of successful cultural exchange and several years of anxiety over Charles II’s successor. Against a backdrop of the Dutch-led occupation of London (1688–90), various groups waged strategic print culture battles.<sup>32</sup> The origins of this cultural and political change began earlier in the seventeenth century, with Charles II’s inability to produce a legitimate heir. The images of Charles Lennox were produced in this cultural climate of uncertainty and flux, and their arguments for power responded to this anxiety.

#### ENGLISH ART FROM THE CONTINENT

The mezzotint and the visual culture around Charles Lennox were part of a broader evolution in British Art. Charles II revived the royal patronage system of artistic production after many years of Puritanical-based



image-shunning in the Interregnum England. The late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries saw a rapid progression of English aesthetics. Both the Restoration era and the Glorious Revolution coincided with influx of Continental artists, and Continental art (both modern and antique), to Britain.<sup>33</sup> These artists performed not only as image-makers for the new court/government, but also as conduits for communicating the artistic ideals and theories of the mannerist and baroque styles that had been popular in Europe for many decades. This influx of artisans also brought technological innovation, including the mezzotint process.<sup>34</sup>

The mezzotint process became popular for the (re)production of portraits due to the subtle tonal shifts possible in this then-new medium. The process involves texturizing a metal plate, and then rubbing the surface to flatten the texture. The ultimate quality of the print depends on this texturizing of the plate. The flat areas print as highlights and the textured areas as shadows. This is the first printmaking process to enable the artist to have continuous tonal shifts, a significant advancement from the scratchy quality of cross-hatching required by other, earlier techniques. However, the mezzotint plates are



Fig. 5, Detail of Fig. 1, area of engraving photographed at 10x magnification and with backlighting. Photograph by author, 28 August 2018.

fragile, capable only of limited print runs before the plate wears down and print quality deteriorates.

Although the process was invented on the Continent, English printmakers, without an established academy to regulate the development of the print-making process, refined it.<sup>35</sup> Critic John Evelyn wrote in 1662 that “The Italians do well interpret by *Basso* and *Mezzo Relievo*” or mezzotint.<sup>36</sup> By the 1780s, the mezzotint process had become a patriotic symbol for the English. James Chelsum would wrongly claim that Sir Christopher Wren had likely invented the process; while he conceded German Prince Rupert might have contributed to technical refinements, he declared the process was wholly English. And although there were early practitioners in the Low Countries, it was

In England ... [where mezzotint] has been chiefly cultivated, in this county it has indisputably received it's [sic.] highest improvements, and it is therefore that a late foreign writer has given to it the name of “the English manner,” by way of eminence.<sup>37</sup>

The mezzotint process was actually the result of a series of refinements and innovations, largely the result of the seventeenth-century's climate of artistic itinerancy in Europe. The first English mezzotint was not published until 1662. Several German and Flemish friends of the English Charles I were instrumental in refining and disseminating the mezzotint process, so the print-making method was closely linked with royalist prerogatives.<sup>38</sup> By the mid-eighteenth century, the materiality of the print of Charles Lennox would have been positively associated with English history and culture.

The print in Winterthur's collection is rare, perhaps speaking to an aborted production process and



Fig. 6, Detail of Fig. 1, area of engraving photographed at 10x magnification and with backlighting. Photograph by author, 28 August 2018.

therefore a change of tactics deployed in visual representations. There are several areas where engraving was selectively used to darken the shadows, particularly in the hat held by the enslaved servant and an area near Charles's foot (Figs. 5 & 6, respectively).<sup>39</sup> Such additions were reasonably common; they usually signify that that the plate was used for a large print run that destroyed the plate. Given the scarcity of this image, the additional engraving is likely the result of mixing methods to achieve the desired image, which is common. The printmaker left the base and waist lines (guiding lines used to ensure even height of letters) around the title, and some of the letters do not appear fully formed. Either the plate was rushed (particularly compared with the high quality of lettering used in the other mezzotint portraits after paintings by Henri Gascar), or the project was abandoned early. The latter possibility certainly fits with the low number of extant copies of this image, especially when compared to the other mezzotints of Charles referenced earlier. Perhaps the image was deemed too luxurious or morally lax in the political climate of the era.

## TOWARD A USE HISTORY

Prints, given their status as copies, have always been more widely owned than paintings or drawings, but within prints there were (and are) numerous subtle

including landscapes, a scene from Christ's life, and scenes of military conquest. The prints are organized and hung abutting, maximizing the wares on view. Interestingly, there does not seem to be much adherence to traditional academic hierarchies in the arrangement of the images



Fig. 7, Abraham Bosse. *The Engraver and Etcher*. Intaglio (etching and engraving) print on ivory laid paper. 1642. Sheet: 11 x 13  $\frac{3}{4}$  inches. Plate: 10 x 12  $\frac{3}{4}$  inches. Art Institute Chicago, The John H. Wrenn Endowment. Acc. no. 1950.1452. Image courtesy Art Institute Chicago.

distinctions of quality, and therefore price.<sup>40</sup> Mezzotints, with their fragile grounds, were not particularly suited for the large runs inherent to book illustration, the primary use of prints in seventeenth-century England. The popularization of the medium for reproducing paintings with continuous tones lead to the emergence of a print market more independent from the book trade, a significant development for the English art world, although the two remained intertwined.<sup>41</sup>

The seventeenth-century workshop depicted was almost certainly French, but Abraham Bosse's view helps readers conceptualize print shops of the period (Fig. 7). The English title, *The Engraver and Etcher*, links the process of manufacturing prints and selling them closely in an integration of craft and sales that marked early modern shopping. Two artists prepare intaglio plates in the foreground, while would-be buyers peruse the wares offered in the background. Large images hang prominently at the top of the arrangement. Their medium is unclear; are they paintings or close-framed prints? Their ambiguity speaks to the high status held by good-quality reproductive prints. Below are unframed prints of various subjects,

based on their content, suggesting a sort of equivalency between these printed images. Presumably, a buyer would examine the prints on the wall, and request a fresh copy.

The sale and distribution of prints in London provides cues to the social movement of such images. The very act of collecting prints was one of social mobility in the period, and print collecting, as an activity, appears to have occurred on "an unusually level playing field."<sup>42</sup> Henry Playford, of Fleet Street, London, sold song books, and also "the best Prints and Paintings."<sup>43</sup> Leonard Knyff's *Britannia Illustrata* (1707) had numerous printed appeals for subscribers, who would each receive "two Prints of each impression" for the upfront cost of £10. The advertisement concluded with "an extraordinarily good collection of Pictures to be disposed of" at Knyff's house, without describing the objects offered.<sup>44</sup>

Collections of prints were also sold by book sellers and at auction, though rarely with any descriptive cataloging or information on the process of collecting. Many sales evidently occurred at coffee houses, linking the process of collecting art with sociability.<sup>45</sup> Prints were also



routinely sold by chapmen who travelled city and country selling miscellaneous wares. There was a substantial market; 86% of inventories from the London Orphan's Court between 1701–15 include pictures in some form.<sup>46</sup> The prints of Charles Lennox would have probably been affordable for many people (though not everyone), and their iconography would have appealed to a wide swath of collectors, ranging from ardent Royalists to the armchair historian or aesthete. It is likely, however, that the print of Charles Lennox was owned by a well-educated Royalist, with means.

Advertisements from print sellers provide some clues about the various marketable aspects of prints:

On *Monday* next will be published, The Effigies of *Philip V.* King of *Spain*, Duke of *Anjou*, Engraved from the Original sent from Paris. Printed on Royal Paper. Sold by *J. Savage*, Engraver, near [illeg.] Commons, and by the Print-sellers of London and Westminster. Price 1 s.<sup>47</sup>

The advertisement emphasized the quality of paper, the illustrious connections of the sitter, and the fidelity to the original. The latter claim addressed a problem of verisimilitude as many publishers were criticized for unethically altering their plates to make images more marketable.<sup>48</sup>

The mezzotints of Charles could have been marketed similarly in an English context. The paper used in the Winterthur print is a high-quality laid paper from France. It has the so-called Strasbourg Lily watermark, which places the manufacture of the paper in Strasbourg, France.<sup>49</sup> French paper was widely preferred for printmaking in the seventeenth century, as it had a finer texture, more even sizing, and a stronger tensile strength. All of these were characteristics required for intaglio printmaking processes. English papers were then considered suitable only for low-quality relief printmaking, letter writing, or journaling. Dutch paper was also esteemed, but for writing important documents or drawing rather than printmaking.<sup>50</sup> The comparatively low quality of paper available in England during the early seventeenth century active suppressed the development of intaglio printing processes, which meant English artists were more receptive to the arrival of mezzotint with the later growth in the international paper trade.<sup>51</sup>

Additionally, the print of Charles Lennox (see Fig. 1) had status as both a portrait and for its association with a noble person, elevating it within manuals on decorating. For wealthier collectors, significant numbers of decorating manuals exist, giving us ideas of display. “Pictures of the King and Queen . . . [and/or] two or three of the chief Nobility, as attendants of their Royal Persons” were suitable for the dining room, while “other draughts of the life of persons of Honour” belonged in “the *inward*

*or with-drawing Chambers*.”<sup>52</sup> Art in general, but especially portraits, was part of the perambulatory process of moving through all spaces, not just galleries.<sup>53</sup> The order and arrangement mattered, and these decisions were consciously made. The placement of the print within this hierarchy is complicated by Charles's biography. He was a direct descendant of the King, although illegitimate and therefore arguably an example of sinful relationships. The extent to which his illegitimacy impacted the print's marketability remains unclear.

Prints and other pictures were hung over all wall surfaces, as part of the perambulatory process of rooms. However, they were usually framed close (i.e. without French mats), and glazing in our contemporary sense was optional, given the cost of glass.<sup>54</sup> Given the wide margins and intact plate marks of the image of Charles Lennox held at Winterthur, it is more likely that it was kept loose, as part of a portfolio or book of heads. Most portfolios were made simply of hardboard, leather, and ribbon, but some were more elaborate.<sup>55</sup> The portfolio was a space-efficient way to protect a growing collection of images while maintaining access to them. Prints functioned as not only decoration, but also as didactic tools, both in the history and connoisseurship of art, but also in politics.

John Hamilton Mortimer's *Portrait of a Man and a Boy Looking at Prints* (Fig. 8) celebrates this practice. The elder man holds the print in one hand, and gazes at it intently. The open portfolio leaning against the chair and



Fig. 8, John Hamilton Mortimer, *Portrait of a Man and a Boy Looking at Prints*. Oil on canvas. 1765–1770. 30 x 25 inches. Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection. Acc. no. B1981.25.460. Image courtesy Yale Center for British Art.

the stack of loose papers on the floor indicate an extended viewing session; the pair are comparing and contrasting prints in a pedagogy that was uniquely possible through this medium. Light streams through the window at the upper left, implying enlightenment from the objects of study. The setting is a broader, scholarly space, and adds weight to the argument that prints had educational value beyond aesthetics. Mortimer thus engages with various modes of learning from prints including politics, culture, and history.<sup>56</sup>

Learning through prints transitioned into constructing history and identity through prints, and printed portraiture specifically. Collectors made “books of heads” by mounting individual printed portraits into bound volumes, occasionally with written biography. These works were the product of the eighteenth century’s interest in “ordering . . . the national past by collecting and mounting engraved portraits,” frequently with textual histories, in a process that would become known as “grangerization.”<sup>57</sup> This was part of parallel desires to assert England’s new-found aesthetic prowess in portraiture (of which the mezzotint was a critical part) and to literally objectify history, rendering it more comprehensible.<sup>58</sup> This interest would reach a satirical height in *Chalcographimania* (1814), a memoir in verse by an anonymous author who was “very closely connected with all the most celebrated personages who have figured in the Drama of *Collecting*” portrait prints.<sup>59</sup> Prints had many functions beyond ornamenting walls, and the materiality of Winterthur’s print suggests its early function was educational, likely in a portfolio.

## CODA

Seventeenth- and eighteenth-century artistic debates discussed the legitimacy of printed images.<sup>60</sup> The sudden multiplication of copies of an image diminished the monetary and intellectual value of each copy, but they enabled artists to circulate their ideas more broadly, cultivating their reputations.<sup>61</sup> Many artists employed this duality strategically. For the sitter of the portrait in

question, the choice to have prints of the portrait made may not have been entirely within their or their counsel’s purview, but the sitter also reaped the benefits (and potentially the drawbacks, for satirical prints) of having multiple copies of their likeness circulating.

Prints, though, were more than the “exactly repeatable statements” William Ivins famously argued. They had weight as published documents, certainly, but the intaglio print was also imbued with a “peculiar authority” in the early modern period. Intaglio prints, such as the image of Charles Lennox, were engaged in a sort of recursive dialogue with metaphors of knowledge and knowledge making itself. To look at a print, to make a print, was to physically replicate the process of learning. What one could learn from prints was thus doubly important as it was supposedly learned naturally.<sup>62</sup>

The materiality of the printed image was essential. Producing painted images of Charles as a powerful individual was a tactic that surely had some degree of success and followed the long tradition of court portraiture. However, these printed portraits were arguably more important. Given their multiplicity, they would be more widely seen, but they were also viewed (consciously or otherwise) as didactic tools that, in this case, naturalized Charles, his power, and his position in a way other forms of propaganda could not.

The print thus legitimizes Charles Lennox as a very young duke through a series of strategic allusions and choices. As part of a broader visual campaign, Charles is depicted as someone in charge, capable of drawing on colonial wealth and enjoying luxury goods, but not to excess. He is also a peer comfortable with the lifestyle of the English countryside, whose power is based as much on his estates as courtly favor. And though the enslaved servant is unidentified, his story unknown, his presence is still powerful, for the many subaltern stories and humans he represents. The print functioned, at varying levels, to assign power to Charles, to teach history, and to engage with culture in its time and place.

<sup>1</sup> *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, s.v. “Charles Lennox, 1<sup>st</sup> Duke of Richmond,” last updated 25 July 2018.

<sup>2</sup> Walter Benjamin, *Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit*, Trans., Harry Zohn, (Los Angeles: UCLA, 2005). <https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/ge/benjamin.htm>; Charles perhaps had some role in posing for the print, but given his young age, he may have simply posed as his advisors directed.

<sup>3</sup> This analytical framework owes much to Nicolas Bourriaud’s *Relational Aesthetics*.

<sup>4</sup> *Oxford National Dictionary of Biography*, s.v. “Lennox, Charles, first duke of Richmond, first duke of Lennox, and duke of Aubigny in the French nobility” by Timothy J. McCann, last modified 24 May 2008, <https://doi-org.udel.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/16449>

<sup>5</sup> The Earl of March, quoted in John Ingamells, *Later Stuart Portraits: 1685–1714*, (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2010), 236.

<sup>6</sup> *Grove Art Online*, s.v. “Gascar (Gascard; Gascars), Henri,” by D. Brême, accessed 24 August 2018.

<sup>7</sup> See Katie Scott, “Reproduction and Reputation: ‘François Boucher’ and the Formation of Artistic Identities,” in *Rebinking Boucher*. Eds. Melissa Hyde and Mark Ledbury, (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2006), 91–122.

<sup>8</sup> British Museum Acc. no. 1902,1011.2231.

<sup>9</sup> Ingamells, *Later Stuart Portraits*, 236–7.

<sup>10</sup> Conversation with Stephanie Delamaire, 8 August 2018.

<sup>11</sup> Indeed, portraits were routinely re-painted to change garments to bring them in line with then-contemporary taste. Marcia Pointon, *Hanging the Head*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 111–14.

<sup>12</sup> This line of argument would be further refined and articulated later in the eighteenth century, particularly by Winkelmann, but I feel it is applicable in this image, if for no other reason than anticipating later



strategies. See David Bindman, *Ape to Apollo* (London: Reaktion, 2002).

<sup>13</sup> David Piper, *The English Face*, (London: Thames & Hudson, 1957), 129–35.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Pointon, *Hanging the Head*, 107–140.

<sup>15</sup> See Katharine Fitz Gibbon and Andrew Hale, *Ikat*, (London: Lawrence King, 1997).

<sup>16</sup> See Haydn Williams, *Turquerie: An Eighteenth-Century European Fantasy*, (London: Thames and Hudson, 2014).

<sup>17</sup> The materiality of these collars is also poorly understood and is an avenue for further research.

<sup>18</sup> See David Bindman, “Am I Not a Man and a Brother? British Art and Slavery in the Eighteenth Century,” *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics*, no. 26 (Autumn 1994), 70–71.

<sup>19</sup> Giles Waterfield, Anne French, and Matthew Craske, *Below Stairs: 400 Years of Servants’ Portraits*, exhibition catalog, (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2003), 139–46.

<sup>20</sup> David Bindman, Bruce Boucher, and Helen Weston, “The Theater of Court and Church: Blacks as Figures of Fantasy,” in *The Image of the Black in Western Art*, vol. 3, pt. 3 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), 17–76.

<sup>21</sup> See Chadwick, *Figures of Empire*, 25–7.

<sup>22</sup> Bindman, *Ape to Apollo*, 38–42.

<sup>23</sup> Beth Fowkes Tobin, *Picturing Imperial Power*, (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1999), quote 28; 27–55.

<sup>24</sup> Lisa Jardine, *Going Dutch*, (New York: Harper, 2008), 54.

<sup>25</sup> i.e. Oliver Goldsmith, *The Deserted Village* (London: W. Griffin, 1770) and other works. Goldsmith is well known, but he was hardly the first such commentator.

<sup>26</sup> Ann Bermingham, *Landscape and Ideology: The English Rustic Tradition*, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1986), 9–54.

<sup>27</sup> Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978), 215–18.

<sup>28</sup> Dog collars have traditionally been seen as analogous to slave collars in the secondary literature, but there is no substantiating evidence for this. Indeed, most dog collars from the period are more elaborate than the slave collar as it is usually painted. Cf. Chadwick, *Figures of Empire*, 8. Leeds Castle Foundation, *Four Centuries of Dog Collars at Leeds Castle*, (London: Phillip Wilson, 1979).

<sup>29</sup> I am grateful to Erin Anderson for her help identifying the breeds.

<sup>30</sup> Though obviously much later, similar arguments are made in Johan Zoffany’s *Queen Charlotte with Her Two Eldest Sons*, oil on canvas, 1765. British Royal Collection, RCIN 400146.

<sup>31</sup> Bermingham, *Landscape and Ideology*, 9–54.

<sup>32</sup> Jardine, *Going Dutch*, 27–54.

<sup>33</sup> Piper, *The English Face*, 129ff.

<sup>34</sup> Carolyn Wax, *The Mezzotint: History and Technique*, (New York: Abrams, 1990), 13–17.

<sup>35</sup> Bamber Gascoigne, *How to Identify Prints*, (New York: Thames & Hudson, 1986), section 16b, and Frank Short, *British Mezzotints: Being*

*a Lecture Delivered to The Print Collector’s Club on November 7<sup>th</sup>, 1924*, Publication 4, (London: Print Collector’s Club, 1924).

<sup>36</sup> John Evelyn, *Sculptura . . .*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (London: J Payne, 1755), 3.

<sup>37</sup> James Chelsum, *A History of the Art of Engraving in Mezzotinto, from Its Origin to the Present Times*, (Winchester: printed by J. Robbins and Sold by Egerton, 1786), quote p. 2; 4–8, 15–16, 21, & 94.

<sup>38</sup> Wax, *The Mezzotint*, 21–3.

<sup>39</sup> These areas appear in both Winterthur’s and the British Museum’s prints. The copy held in the British Museum is identified as the second state of the print, suggesting these areas are not damage, as wear to mezzotint plates usually occurs first in the lighter portions before the darker portions; the evidence indicates the engraved areas were an attempt to increase the tonal range of the print. Gascoigne, *How to Identify Prints*, section 16b.

<sup>40</sup> A. Hyatt Manor, *Prints & People: A Social History of Printed Pictures*, (New York: NYGS for Met Museum, 1971), 373–76.

<sup>41</sup> Wax, *The Mezzotint*, 23.

<sup>42</sup> William MacGregor, “The Authority of Prints,” *Art History*, vol. 22, no. 3, (September 1999): 395–97.

<sup>43</sup> *The Post Man and The Historical Account*, 6 December 1701, page 2.

<sup>44</sup> *The Post Man and The Historical Account*, 26 June 1701, page 2.

<sup>45</sup> *The Post Man and The Historical Account*, 8 December 1701, page 2 and *Ibid.*, 11 March 1701, page 2.

<sup>46</sup> Charles Saumarez Smith, *Eighteenth-Century Decoration*, (New York: Abrams, 1993), 43–4.

<sup>47</sup> *The Post Man and The Historical Account*, 27 February 1701, page 2.

<sup>48</sup> Scott, “Reproduction and Reputation,” 91–122.

<sup>49</sup> *The Viola da Gamba Society Index of Manuscripts Containing Consort Music*, compiled by Andrew Ashbee, Robert Thompson, and Jonathan Wainwright, 2 vols, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed (2014), 268–73.

<sup>50</sup> W. A. Churchill, *Watermarks in Paper*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., (Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger & Co., 1967), 58 & 83–4.

<sup>51</sup> Wax, *The Mezzotint*, 27–31.

<sup>52</sup> Italics original. William Salmon, *Polygraphice: or The arts of drawing, engraving, etching . . .*, (London: Andrew Clark for John Crumpe, 1675) 159–60.

<sup>53</sup> Pointon, *Hanging the Head*, 17.

<sup>54</sup> Peter Thornton, *Authentic Décor: The Domestic Interior 1620–1920*, (New York: Viking, 1984), 26, 32–3, & 60.

<sup>55</sup> A luxury example is housed at the Cooper Hewitt. Portfolio, France, Leather, paper, gilt brass, and silk, 18<sup>th</sup> century. Acc. no. 1949-149-1.

<sup>56</sup> MacGregor, “The Authority of Prints,” 389–90.

<sup>57</sup> The term possibly originating with James Granger, who published the first type-set book of heads (his *Biographical History of England*) in 1769.

<sup>58</sup> Pointon, *Hanging the Head*, quote 54 & 54–68.

<sup>59</sup> Italics original. Anon, *Chalcographimania . . .*, (London: R. S. Kirby, 1814), vi.

<sup>60</sup> Or the “aura,” to use Walter Benjamin’s framing.

<sup>61</sup> Scott, “Reproduction and Reputation,” 102.

<sup>62</sup> MacGregor, “The Authority of Prints,” 411-15.