

Adolf Michaelis  
**Ancient marbles in Great Britain**

Antiquariat auf Datenträger





**Ancient marbles  
in Great Britain  
von  
Adolf Michaelis**

Digitalisierung  
Duehrkohp & Radicke

Edition Ruprecht 2007

Edition  Ruprecht



**Cambridge :**

PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A. & SON,  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

TO MY BELOVED FRIEND

GEORGE SCHARF, Esq., F.R.S.L., F.S.A.

MEMBER OF THE GERMAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE,  
DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY

THIS WORK IS INSCRIBED

IN GRATEFUL REMEMBRANCE OF MANY HAPPY DAYS

SPENT UNDER HIS HOSPITABLE ROOF

1861, 1873, 1877.

## THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

THE object of the present work is to supply archæologists and those interested in archæology with more complete and accurate information than has hitherto been provided concerning the treasures of ancient sculpture, stored up in the galleries of Great Britain, the abundance and excellence of which appear to be but little known in detail, notwithstanding that they are admitted in general terms.

In order to guard against erroneous expectations, it should be borne in mind that the title "Ancient Marbles" does not imply antique sculptures of every description, but only the relics of Greek and Roman origin which have been imported into Great Britain from classical soil. I have accordingly excluded Egyptian and Oriental art as well as the Anglo-Roman remains found in Great Britain. Whatever the book may contain not included within the limits of the above definition, must be looked at as an accessory which, I venture to hope, will at least not be troublesome to the reader.

For obvious reasons no catalogue is given of the Sculptures preserved in the British Museum. With the exception of the few Museums of a public character, such as those in Cambridge and Oxford, private galleries therefore have supplied the main part of

this catalogue. Everybody knows, how widely spread they are over the country, though perhaps few are aware how difficult it is to get information about them, much more to obtain such access to them as shall enable a visitor thoroughly to examine the works of art, without being at every moment disturbed by the impatient noise of the housekeeper's keys. But the greatest of all hindrances is the want of good catalogues or other literary means of general, as well as special, preparation and instruction. Up to the present day the Student had to depend chiefly on JAMES DALLAWAY'S *Anecdotes of the Arts in England* (1800), however superficial and antiquated the book may be. The French translation published under A. L. MILLIN'S authority, *Les Beaux-arts en Angleterre* (1807), added nothing of consequence, the editor not having himself visited the collections. Nor did Dallaway's own revised edition, which appeared in 1816 with the title *Of Statuary and Sculpture among the Ancients*, though it was enriched by useful additions, materially alter the unsatisfactory character of the book. A selection only of particularly remarkable monuments is contained in the splendid volumes published by the SOCIETY OF DILETTANTI, the *Specimens of Antient Sculpture, selected from several collections in Great Britain* (1809 and 1835). If we add a few special publications, some of them scarcely accessible to persons most interested in their contents, such as the works on the Oxford Marbles (1763), on the Museum Worsleyanum (1794), on the Ince collection (1809), on the Marbles of Woburn Abbey (1822), on the Museum Disneianum (1849), and, last not least, Prof. NEWTON'S valuable *Notes on the Sculptures at Wilton House* (1849), we should exhaust nearly all that has been done in England itself to-

wards our special knowledge of those treasures. The greater are the thanks due to the late Count CLARAC, who, after a personal inspection in 1833, employed Mr Brotherton to make drawings of the Statues in the most important private galleries, which he incorporated in his copious *Musée de Sculpture* (vols. III.—V., 1832—1841). Unsatisfactory as these sketches in outline may be with regard to style, they still suffice to give an approximate idea of the subjects represented. Hence CLARAC'S work is still one of the most important books to be consulted on English private collections, as far as Statues are concerned; Busts and Reliefs not being included within its scope.

Of more modest pretensions, though scarcely less meritorious, are the observations scattered through the writings of various travellers in Great Britain. Older works, like those by VOLKMANN<sup>1</sup>, GOEDE<sup>2</sup>, SPIKER<sup>3</sup>, may be left out of consideration, as they afford very little valuable information. The notes published from C. O. MÜLLER'S journals of 1822, in Böttiger's *Amalthea*, Vol. III. (1825), deal only with the collections in Lansdowne House and at Petworth. Richer in observations and notices is the well-known book of Dr WAAGEN, which was first published in German with the title *Kunstwerke und Künstler in England* (1837, 1838), and afterwards, in English, with the results of several subsequent visits incorporated, as *Treasures of Art in Great Britain* (3 vols., 1854), supplementary to

<sup>1</sup> *Neueste Reisen durch England. Aus den besten Nachrichten und neueren Schriften zusammengetragen von J. J. VOLKMANN.* 4 vols. Leipzig, 1781-1782. (Compiled chiefly from English sources.)

<sup>2</sup> *England, Wales, Irland und Schottland. Erinnerungen von einer Reise in den Jahren 1802 und 1803.* 2nd edition. 5 vols. Dresden, 1806.

<sup>3</sup> *Reise durch England, Wales, und Schottland im Jahre 1816.* 2 vols. Leipzig, 1818.

which is the volume styled *Galleries and Cabinets of Art in Great Britain* (1857). Waagen, however, was chiefly attracted by works of modern art, especially of painting; as to antique sculpture his eye was less sure, his studies less extensive and thorough. The chief value of his book, therefore, to classical archæologists, consists in pointing out a great number of dispersed marbles, which he had the opportunity of observing in the course of his various journeys. Still, it may easily be understood that his notes should have appeared sufficiently new and interesting to be extracted, for the use of the French public, by G. BRUNET in the *Revue archéologique*, vol. x. (1853). The first archæologist, however, after Count Clarac, who, with a full mastery of the different parts of archæological science, made private galleries of ancient art in England the object of a special examination, was ALEXANDER CONZE, then Professor of Archæology in the University of Halle. In the *Archäologischer Anzeiger* of 1864, a supplement of the *Archäologische Zeitung* of Berlin, he communicated, in the most concise form, many valuable notices extracted from his journals. More recently a supplement to them was contributed by the late Professor F. MATZ, to the *Archäologische Zeitung* of 1873, in which also some collections, hitherto unknown, were first presented to the notice of the learned public.

The author of this work first visited England in 1861. But the immense riches of the British Museum then left me little leisure to go in quest of private collections, with the exception of the gallery of Lansdowne House, a few notices of which I published in the *Archäologischer Anzeiger* of 1862. In the autumn of 1873, accompanied by my friend Professor Matz, I undertook a tour through different parts of England. My

attention was at that time mainly directed to Greek Sepulchral Reliefs, that of my companion to Roman Sarcophagi, the collection and publication of these classes of monuments having been undertaken by the Academy of Vienna, and by the German Archæological Institute, respectively; but whatever time could be spared was devoted to the examination of antique monuments of other descriptions. The results of these inquiries, together with such notices as were supplied by the books of reference then accessible to me, were published in an article "On the private collections of ancient art in England," in the *Archäologische Zeitung* of 1874, pp. 1—70. This rather detailed sketch forms the foundation of the present work, to undertake which I have been led, partly by my own interest in the subject, partly by the requests of friends and colleagues, especially in England. Favourable circumstances having enabled me to become acquainted with those galleries to a greater extent than perhaps any other living archæologist, I thought it my duty, putting aside for some years other tasks of a more inviting nature, to undertake the irksome, mosaic-like work of drawing up a descriptive catalogue of the marbles they contain. In doing this, I hoped also to pay a small tribute of affection and gratitude to a country in which I have seen and learnt much, and have formed many valuable and pleasant personal connexions, and experienced much kindness and hospitality. Another visit to England in 1877 helped me to complete my former inquiries.

With the exception of Castle Howard, which I was accidentally prevented from visiting, I have personally inspected nearly all the principal galleries. As to the minor collections, of which often scarcely

more than the name is known, it would not be reasonable to expect that a foreigner, without any other assistance than that afforded by his limited private means, should be able to discover and examine them. I must hope that the publication of this necessarily incomplete work will stimulate others to supply its deficiencies, and I shall be very thankful for any information which may be communicated to me. But even of the larger collections, it would have been impossible to give a full and satisfactory account from my individual unaided resources. To my friend Dr CONZE I am indebted for the free use of all his original notes. The papers left by the late Professor MATZ, now the property of the German Archæological Institute, supplied a considerable number of drawings and descriptions, particularly of Sarcophagi. Prof. BERNOULLI of Basel, liberally complying with my request, placed also at my command all the notes he had made during a visit to England in 1875, which, as they chiefly concerned busts and other portrait sculptures, formed a most valuable supplement to Conze's, Matz's and my own notes. In the case of articles which are not founded upon notices made by myself or by my friends (indicated by *B*, *C*, *M*, see p. 210), the notice is borrowed from the special catalogue or from one of the other books quoted at the top of each collection; in these instances, of course, I should not be made responsible for blunders which may occur. The measures are throughout given in metres and centimetres. Full accuracy, however, can be warranted only where either I or one of my friends have taken them, experience having more than once shewn that measures taken by others in English feet and afterwards converted into metres (a foot being equal to 0.305 m.) prove to be not quite exact.

The catalogue itself is naturally an unconnected series of articles, which can hardly be what is called "pleasant reading." General readers, however, will I hope be interested by the Introduction, in which I have attempted to give a synopsis of the whole subject, and to shew, from original sources and in connexion with other historical incidents, in what manner and to what extent Peacham's saying about the transplanting of old Greece into England has been realized.

It should be added that the manuscript of my book was finished in October 1878, and the delays incident to the processes of translation, printing, and revision will explain why in the later portions of the work books have been consulted and other additions made, which refer to the last year or two, and which could not find place in the former parts.

There remains the agreeable task of acknowledging the assistance I have experienced in the course of this work. My thanks are due, in the first place, to the possessors of many of the collections here described. Though nearly unprovided with introductions, and generally obliged to risk a bare personal application, I feel bound to state that with a very few exceptions my applications to visit galleries met with a courteous permission. I must deprive myself of the satisfaction of naming individuals who have shewn me special kindness, lest I might seem ungrateful towards others. For much aid and many hints I have to thank the officers of the British Museum, Prof. NEWTON, Mr FRANKS, Mr POOLE, and Mr MURRAY; and also Mr DOYNE C. BELL, in London, Mr HOLMES, at Windsor Castle, and Dr ACLAND, of Oxford. To the Rev. ALEXANDER NAPIER, of Holkham, I am indebted for his effective advocacy of the publication of this work

by the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press ; to Mr C. A. M. FENNELL for undertaking the heavy and irksome task of translating a volume of such a size and nature ; to Prof. SIDNEY COLVIN for the pains he has bestowed on the revision of the translated text and on the superintendence of the illustrations. In the revision of the text I have had the further advantage of the skilled assistance of Prof. NEWTON and Mr MURRAY. To all these gentlemen I gladly proffer my sincere thanks. Lastly I desire to express my cordial gratitude to my dear friend Mr GEORGE SCHARF, whose richly furnished library, extensive knowledge, unremitting goodness, and kind interest in my plans and pursuits, have been to me of invaluable assistance. It is my earnest desire that my friend may accept the dedication of this dry, but, I hope, not useless work, as a token of my true and sincere affection and a memorial of some of my most precious associations with England.

STRASSBURG, *June*, 1882.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE . . . . .	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS . . . . .	xv
LIST OF PLATES AND WOODCUTS . . . . .	xix
GEOGRAPHICAL DIRECTORY . . . . .	xx
ERRATA AND ADDENDA . . . . .	xxi

### INTRODUCTION, ON THE INFLUX OF ANTIQUE SCULPTURES INTO GREAT BRITAIN.

PRELIMINARY . . . . .	I
-----------------------	---

#### I. THE ARUNDEL MARBLES AND OTHER EARLY COLLECTIONS.

1. No antiques in England in the 16th century.—2. Henry, Prince of Wales.—3. Lord Arundel's tours in Italy.—4. His Italian marbles.—5. The country of Greece.—6. Sir Thomas Roe in Constantinople.—7. William Petty.—8. The Duke of Buckingham.—9. Roe's and Petty's joint plans.—10. Arundel and Buckingham.—11. Petty's activity.—12. Roe's efforts.—13. Buckingham's marbles. Other collectors at Court.—14. Peacham's *Compleat Gentleman*.—15. Lord Arundel's Greek sculptures.—16. Increase of the collection. Its rising fame.—17. General view of the Arundel collection.—18. King Charles I.'s collection of antiquities.—19. Vicissitudes of the royal collection after 1649.—20. The Arundel collection during the Revolution.—21. The neglect thereof. The inscriptions presented to Oxford.—22. Dispersion of the whole collection.—23. The coins and gems.—24. The Pomfret marbles.—25. Thomas, Lord Pembroke.—26. The Mazarin collection.—27. The antiques in Wilton House.—28. Sir P. Lely, Lord Winchelsea, Lord Carteret, J. Kemp.—29. Dr Mead.—30. Conyers Middleton. Collectors of coins. W. Courten. Hans Sloane.—31. The Duke of Devonshire . . . . . 5—54

#### II. THE GOLDEN AGE OF CLASSIC DILETTANTISM. ROME AND ENGLAND.

32. Travels to the South in the time of the Stuarts.—33. The fashion of the 'grand tour.' Sir A. Fountaine. Lord Burlington.—34. Th. Coke (Lord Leicester).—35. Lord Carlisle, Lord Bessborough, Duke of Beaufort.—36. Other travelling collectors. The Richardsons.—37. Foundation of the Society of Dilettanti.—38. Activity of its members.—39. State of things at Rome. Foundation of the Capitoline Museum.—40. Dealers and restorers. Cavaceppi.—41. Perry, the Walpoles, Hollis and Brand, and smaller collectors.—42. Lord Leicester.—43. Lord Egremont.—44. British artists in Rome. Gavin Hamilton.—45. Thomas Jenkins.—46. His practices.—47. His

purchases of antiques.—48. Hamilton's and Jenkins' new excavations.—49. Results. Restorations.—50. King George III. The Duke of Marlborough.—51. British travellers —52. Lyde Browne.—53. Lord Palmerston, Weddell, Gen. Walmoden.—54. Locke, Duke of Richmond, Duncombe, Jennings, Lord Exeter, Lord Yarborough, Lord Cawdor, &c.—55. Founding of the Vatican Museum.—56. Competitors from other quarters. Charles Townley.—57. Townley in London.—58. H. Blundell.—59. Smith-Barry, Mansel-Talbot, Sir Thomas Robinson, Duke of Dorset, Sir G. Strickland, Lord Temple, Duke of St Albans, &c.—60. Lord Shelburne (Lansdowne).—61. Thomas Hope.—62. The Revolution in Rome and its consequences. Earl of Bristol.—63. William Hamilton and his first collection.—64. Sir W. Hamilton's second collection.—65. Relations with Greece.—66. Sir Richard Worsley.—67. Morritt, Lord Aberd en, Clarke, Rob. Walpole, Hawkins.—68. Payne Knight as a collector. Lord Northwick.—69. Payne Knight as a litt rateur. The *Specimens of Antient Sculpture*.—70. J. Dallaway.—71. Sales. Increase of the British Museum 55—128

### III. THE BRITISH MUSEUM AND THE PRIVATE COLLECTIONS. GREECE AND ENGLAND.

72. Travellers in Greece : Dodwell, Gell, Leake.—73. Cockerell and other architects. Bassae.—74. Lord Elgin's undertakings.—75. The new Firman and its consequences.—76. Transport of the marbles to England.—77. Opposition to the Elgin marbles. Payne Knight.—78. Champions of the Elgin marbles. West, Fuseli, Haydon.—79. Attempts to sell the collection. Lord Byron.—80. Foreign aid. Visconti. Lord Elgin's renewed proposals.—81. The Phigalia marbles. Canova's visit. Select committee.—82. Deliberations of the committee. Literary warfare.—83. The purchase of the Elgin marbles for the British Museum.—84. The activity of the Society of Dilettanti.—85. Minor collectors. Westmacott, Rogers.—86. The Duke of Bedford.—87. Collectors at Rome. Duke of Buckingham, Lord Kinnaird, Disney, &c.—88. Sir William Temple. Collectors at Athens : Lord Guilford, Burgon, Lady Ruthven.—89. Other collectors in Greece : Lord Strangford, Borrell, Woodhouse.—90. Collectors in London : Edwards, Burke, Chinnery, Sir J. Coghill, Sir H. Englefield, Sir J. Soane, Slade, Gen. Fox.—91. Decline of classical dilettantism.—92. Additions to the British Museum. Fellows. Sir Stratford Canning.—93. Discoveries of Newton, Wood, Pullan.—94. Salzmann and Biliotti, Cesnola, Smith and Porcher, Dennis, Davis.—95. Purchases of Farnese, Pourtal s, Blacas, Castellani collections, &c.—96. Private collectors of marbles : Lord Lonsdale, Cook, &c.—97. Collectors of small antiques : Hertz, Mayer, Forman, Auldjo, &c.—98. Perils of private collection.—99. Evils of private collections.—100. Passing of private collections into public museums . . . . . 129—184
- APPENDIX (Letters of Sir Thomas Roe) . . . . . 185—205

	PAGE
CATALOGUE OF COLLECTIONS.	
Explanation of some abbreviations . . . . .	209
St Ann's Hill, Surrey (Lady Holland) . . . . .	211
Castle Ashby, Northamptonshire (Marquis of Northampton) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Battlesden, Bedfordshire (D. Bromilow, Esq.) . . . . .	212
Bignor Park, Sussex (C. H. T. Hawkins, Esq.) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Birmingham, Warwickshire (J. A. Crane, Esq.) . . . . .	213
Blenheim Palace, Oxfordshire (Duke of Marlborough) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Boynton, Yorkshire (Sir W. Strickland) . . . . .	216
BROADLANDS, Hampshire (Rt. Hon. W. Cowper Temple) . . . . .	217
BROCKLESBY PARK, Lincolnshire (Earl of Yarborough) . . . . .	226
Broom Hall, Scotland (Earl of Elgin) . . . . .	241
CAMBRIDGE—	
FITZWILLIAM MUSEUM . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Trinity College Library . . . . .	268
Rev. C. W. King . . . . .	271
St John's College . . . . .	272
Canterbury, Kent (Museum) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Chatsworth, Derbyshire (Duke of Devonshire) . . . . .	276
Chichester, Sussex (Museum) . . . . .	277
Clumber Park, Nottinghamshire (Duke of Newcastle) . . . . .	278
Colchester, Essex (Museum. Rev. J. H. Pollexfen) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Dalkeith Palace, Scotland (Duke of Buccleuch) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
DEEPDENE, Surrey (Mrs Hope) . . . . .	279
Denton Hall, Northumberland (Lord Rokeby) . . . . .	294
Ditchley, Oxfordshire (Viscount Dillon) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Duncombe Park, Yorkshire (Earl of Feversham) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Dunrobin Castle, Scotland (Duke of Sutherland) . . . . .	296
Easton Neston, Northamptonshire (Earl of Pomfret) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Edinburgh—	
Antiquarian Museum . . . . .	297
Architects' Institution . . . . .	299
Royal Institution . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Lord Murray . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Hamilton Palace, Scotland (Duke of Hamilton) . . . . .	300
Hillingdon Court, Middlesex (Lady Mills) . . . . .	301
HOLKHAM HALL, Norfolk (Earl of Leicester) . . . . .	302
Houghton Hall, Norfolk (Marquis of Cholmondeley) . . . . .	323
Hovingham, Yorkshire (Sir W. C. Worsley) . . . . .	324
CASTLE HOWARD, Yorkshire (Earl of Carlisle) . . . . .	325
The Hyde, Essex (J. Disney, Esq.) . . . . .	333
Ickworth, Suffolk (Earl of Bristol) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
INCE BLUNDELL HALL, Lancashire (Th. Weld Blundell, Esq.) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Ketteringham Hall, Norfolk (Sir J. Boileau) . . . . .	415
Kingston Lacy, Dorsetshire (W. R. Bankes, Esq.) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Knole, Kent (Lord Sackville) . . . . .	416
Liverpool (Public Museum) . . . . .	423

	PAGE
LONDON—	
Apsley House (Duke of Wellington) . . . . .	429
— Atkinson, Esq. . . . .	431
C. S. Bale, Esq. . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Burlington House (Society of Antiquaries) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Col. Maitland Crichton . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Devonshire House (Duke of Devonshire) . . . . .	432
Lord Elcho . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
R. Ford, Esq. . . . .	433
A. W. Franks, Esq. . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Guildhall . . . . .	434
W. R. Hamilton, Esq., The late . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Holland House . . . . .	435
LANSDOWNE HOUSE (Marquis of Lansdowne) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Lord Leicester . . . . .	472
Lord De Mauley . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Mr Mellhuish . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
SOANE MUSEUM . . . . .	473
South Kensington Museum . . . . .	481
Stafford House (Duke of Sutherland) . . . . .	485
Lord Wemyss . . . . .	486
Sir R. Westmacott, The late . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Lord Yarborough . . . . .	487
LOWTHER CASTLE, Westmoreland (Earl of Lonsdale) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
MARBURY HALL, Cheshire (A. H. Smith Barry, Esq.) . . . . .	500
Margam, Glamorganshire (C. R. Mansel Talbot, Esq.) . . . . .	516
Narford Hall, Norfolk (A. C. Fountaine, Esq.) . . . . .	522
NEWBY HALL, Yorkshire (Lady M. Vyner) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Osborne, Isle of Wight (Royal Palace) . . . . .	535
Osterley Park, Middlesex (Earl of Jersey) . . . . .	538
OXFORD—	<i>ib.</i>
UNIVERSITY GALLERIES . . . . .	540
THE SCHOOLS . . . . .	572
ASHMOLEAN MUSEUM . . . . .	580
All Souls' College . . . . .	592
Christ Church College . . . . .	593
Radcliffe Library . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Penrice Castle, Glamorganshire (C. R. Mansel Talbot, Esq.) . . . . .	595
Penshurst, Kent (Viscount De Lisle and Dudley) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
PETWORTH HOUSE, Sussex (Lord Leconfield) . . . . .	596
Pippbrook House, Surrey (Mrs Seymour Burt) . . . . .	618
Ramsgate, Kent (H. Curling, Esq.) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
RICHMOND, Surrey (Francis Cook, Esq.) . . . . .	619
Rokeby Hall, Yorkshire (Col. Morrilt) . . . . .	643
ROSSIE PRIORY, Scotland (Lord Kinnaid) . . . . .	648
Salisbury, Wiltshire (Blackmore Museum) . . . . .	658
Shobden, Herefordshire (Lord Bateman) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Stanmore Hill, Middlesex (C. D. E. Fortnum, Esq.) . . . . .	659

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xix

	PAGE
Stourhead House, Wiltshire (Sir R. Hoare) . . . . .	661
Stratfield Saye, Hampshire (Duke of Wellington) . . . . .	662
Trentham Hall, Staffordshire (Duke of Sutherland) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Tunbridge Wells, Kent (Admiral Spratt) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Warwick Castle, Warwickshire (Earl of Warwick) . . . . .	663
Wentworth Castle, Yorkshire (F. W. T. Vernon-Wentworth, Esq.) . . . . .	664
Wentworth House, Yorkshire (Earl Fitzwilliam) . . . . .	665
WILTON HOUSE, Wiltshire (Earl of Pembroke) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Wimbledon, Surrey (— Beaumont, Esq.) . . . . .	716
Windsor Castle, Berkshire (Royal Palace) . . . . .	717
Winton Castle, Scotland (Lady Ruthven) . . . . .	721
WOBURN ABBEY, Bedfordshire (Duke of Bedford) . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>

INDEXES—

I. Collectors, Collections, Sources, &c. . . . .	757
II. Drawings and Engravings . . . . .	773
III. Subjects represented . . . . .	789
IV. Epigraphical Index . . . . .	825

LIST OF PLATES AND WOODCUTS.

PLATE I.	Relief, girl with two doves (Brocklesby Park, no. 17) <i>to face</i> p. 229
PLATE II.	Fragment of a statue of a Kistophoros (Cambridge, no. 1) . . . . . <i>to face</i> p. 242
FIG. 1.	Right shoulder of the same statue . . . . . p. 242
FIG. 2.	Pattern decorating the cista of the same statue . . . . . p. 245
PLATE III.	Head of Aphrodite (Holkham Hall, no. 37) . . . . . <i>to face</i> p. 314
PLATE IV.	Front of a sarcophagus, "the Winds" (Ince Blundell Hall, no. 221) . . . . . <i>to face</i> p. 374
FIG. 3.	Relief, Zeus (Ince Blundell Hall, no. 259) . . . . . p. 385
FIG. 4.	Relief, a Centaur (Ince Blundell Hall, no. 267) . . . . . p. 389
PLATE V.	Statue of an Amazon (Lansdowne House, no. 83) <i>to face</i> p. 462
PLATE VI.	Statue of Hermes (Lansdowne House, no. 85) . . . . . <i>to face</i> p. 464
PLATE VII.	Bust of a heroine (Petworth House, no. 27) . . . . . <i>to face</i> p. 610
PLATE VIII.	Terra cotta figure of a maiden at her toilette (Richmond, no. 14) . . . . . <i>to face</i> p. 627
FIG. 5.	Votive Relief to Zeus (Wilton House, no. 48) . . . . . p. 681
PLATE IX.	Relief, a Greek maiden (Woburn Abbey, no. 100) <i>to face</i> p. 731
PLATE X.	Sarcophagus, Patroklos, Achilles and Hektor (Woburn Abbey, no. 219) . . . . . <i>to face</i> p. 749

## GEOGRAPHICAL DIRECTORY.

- BEDFORDSHIRE : Battlesden, Woburn Abbey.  
BERKSHIRE : Windsor Castle.  
CAMBRIDGESHIRE : Cambridge.  
CHESHIRE : Marbury Hall.  
DERBYSHIRE : Chatsworth.  
DORSETSHIRE : Kingston Lacy.  
ESSEX : Colchester, The Hyde.  
GLAMORGANSHIRE : Margam, Penrice Castle.  
HAMPSHIRE : Broadlands, Stratfield Saye.  
HEREFORDSHIRE : Shobden.  
KENT : Canterbury, Knole, Penshurst, Ramsgate, Tunbridge Wells.  
LANCASHIRE : Ince Blundell Hall, Liverpool.  
LINCOLNSHIRE : Brocklesby Park.  
MIDDLESEX : Hillingdon Court, London, Osterley Park, Stanmore Hill.  
NORFOLK : Holkham Hall, Houghton Hall, Ketteringham Hall, Narford Hall.  
NORTHAMPTONSHIRE : Castle Ashby, Easton Neston.  
NORTHUMBERLAND : Denton Hall.  
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE : Clumber Park.  
OXFORDSHIRE : Blenheim Palace, Ditchley, Oxford.  
SCOTLAND : Broom Hall, Dalkeith Palace, Dunrobin Castle, Edinburgh, Hamilton Palace, Rossie Priory, Winton Castle.  
STAFFORDSHIRE : Trentham Hall.  
SUFFOLK : Ickworth.  
SURREY : St Ann's Hill, Deepdene, Pippbrook House, Richmond, Wimbledon.  
SUSSEX : Bignor Park, Chichester, Petworth House.  
WARWICKSHIRE : Birmingham, Warwick Castle.  
WESTMORELAND : Lowther Castle.  
WIGHT, ISLE OF : Osborne.  
WILTSHIRE : Salisbury, Stourhead House, Wilton House.  
YORKSHIRE : Boynton, Duncombe Park, Hovingham, Castle Howard, Newby Hall, Rokeby Hall, Wentworth Castle, Wentworth House.

## ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA.

- P. 5. The earliest instance of an English collector of ancient sculpture at Rome is afforded by Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester, brother of King Stephen, who lived at Rome about A.D. 1150; see *Monum. Germ. Histor., Script.*, vol. xx., p. 542. Cf. R. Pauli in the *Academy* 1880, Nov. 6, p. 330.
- P. 34, l. 13 : discovered] *read*: copied
- P. 45, l. 25 : fifty-two] *read*: eighty-three
- P. 60, l. 8 *dele* : that
- P. 70, n. 177, l. 7 : 1783] *read*: 1753
- P. 75, l. 5 *dele* : Hon.
- P. 81, n. 205 *add*: *Academy*, 1878, p. 142, note †.
- P. 89, n. 229 : nos. 38, 66] *read*: nos. 40, 46
- P. 104, l. 1 : decade] *read*: decades
- P. 105, l. 4 : 1778] *read*: 1777
- P. 108, n. 275 *add*: Guattani, *Mon. Ined.*, 1805, p. LXXXVII.
- P. 118, l. 15 : Kistophors] *read*: Kistophoros
- P. 126, l. 16 : Mr Anson] *read*: Lord Anson
- P. 157, l. 420 at the end, *add*: *Arch. Zeit.*, 1880, pp. 83f.
- P. 180, n. 430 *add*: Edm. Oldfield, *Trans. R. Soc. Lit.*, vol. VI., *New Series*, pp. 130 ff.
- P. 161, l. 3 : 23] *read*: 24
- P. 162, n. 436 *add*: Vaux, *Trans. R. Soc. Lit.*, vol. VIII., *New Series*, p. 590.
- P. 166, l. 3 from end : found] *read*: founded
- P. 171. For the matters treated in §§ 94 and 95 cf. Vaux, *Trans. R. Soc. Lit.*, vol. VIII., *New Series*, pp. 559 ff.
- P. 176, l. 17. The seats of Lady Charlotte Glamis, widow of Thomas George Lord Glamis (*d.* 1834), are Strathmore, Glamis-Castle, Forfarshire, and Paul's Warden, Hertfordshire.
- P. 211. In ALNWICK CASTLE (Northumberland), the seat of the DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND, is preserved, besides some Roman cinerary urns of great beauty (Waagen, *Treas.*, IV., p. 473), the famous Beverley collection of gems.
- P. 211, St Ann's Hill, no. 5, *add*: Clarac, IV. 755, 1844.—In Piranesi's *Vasi*, I. Pl. 52 there is an engraving of a large marbled vase (*krater*), in the possession of Lord Holland, with reliefs said to represent the *suovetaurilia*. It is evident from the engraving that at least the upper part of the vase is entirely modern; but also the reliefs which show a scene of sacrifice (*camillus*, priest near tripod, flute player, *popa* slaying a hog, servant bringing a bull, etc.) convey a rather modern impression.
- P. 211. The vases preserved at Castle Ashby have lately been examined by Dr Furtwängler, see *Arch. Zeit.*, 1881, pp. 301 ff.
- P. 212, Battlesden, l. 3. The right spelling of the owner's name, as kindly communicated by him, is BROMILOW.

- P. 213, Bignor no. 2 *add*: Clarac, IV. 666 B, 1508 A.
- P. 215, no. 3, l. 9: surrounded] *read*: flanked.
- P. 216, Boynton, no. 2, *add*: Probably identical with Cavaceppi, *Racc.*, III. 52, cf. Bernoulli, *Röm. Ikonogr.*, I. p. 194.
- P. 220, no. 11, l. 8 after "*vannus*" *add*: on his head.—The altar seems to have come from the Barberini collection, cf. *Documenti ined. per serv. alla storia dei Musei d'Italia*, IV. p. 39 "*Una piccola base triangolare di ara con tre bassi rilievi, uno rappresentante una Sacerdotessa in atto di sacrificare, l'altro una Baccante, et il terzo un Sileno con canestro di frutti in testa e patera in mano.*"
- P. 225, no. 32 *add*: Piranesi, *Vasi*, I. Pl. 49.
- P. 226, no. 33 *add*: Piranesi, *Vasi*, I. Pl. 49. A third similar vase in the possession of Lord Palmerston is given in Piranesi, Pl. 28.
- P. 229, l. 19 *dele*: even
- P. 229, no. 17, l. 3: charm of] *read*: charm nor of
- P. 231, no. 26 *add*: Clarac, IV. 772, 1924.—In the verses, l. 5, *read*: Νεικηφορίδος
- P. 235, no. 62 *add*: Clarac, III. 476, 904.
- P. 236, no. 82 *add*: Clarac, V. 784, 1962.
- P. 238, no. 91. Apparently identical with Piranesi, *Vasi*, II. Pl. 105.
- P. 242, no. 1, l. 8: II. 892] *read*: II. 8, 92.
- P. 243, l. 27: πλημοχοή] *read*: πλημοχώη
- P. 246, no. 4, l. 1: Pan; τροπαιοφόρος figured] *read*: Pan; figured as τροπαιοφόρος
- P. 248, no. 15 *add*: *C. I. Gr.* 3635.
- P. 251, l. 9: Ἀπολλόδωρου] *read*: Ἀπολλοδώρου
- P. 251, l. 11: the style of] *read*: the style and
- P. 253, l. 2 *add*: Lacroix, *Iles de la Grèce*, Pl. 6.
- P. 262, no. 76 *add*: Benndorf, *Vorlegeblätter*, C, Pl. 9, 3. 4.
- P. 265, no. 88 *add*: Muratori 1327, 11 (in Ficoroni's possession).
- P. 266, no. 89 *add*: Muratori 1316, 11 (in Ficoroni's possession).
- P. 266, no. 93 *add*: Bernoulli, *Röm. Ikonogr.*, I. p. 163, and the quotations given there in note 4.
- P. 268, l. 5 *read*: aufgestützten Fusses
- P. 270, no. 111, l. 1: column] *read*: stelè
- P. 274, no. 45. On the representation of Seirens with fish tails, which is not antique, cf. the learned disquisition of J. Bolte, *de monumentis ad Odysseam pertinentibus*, Berlin 1882, pp. 33. 59 ff.
- P. 278 *dele*: CORFE CASTLE.
- P. 289, no. 35, l. 8: as a vase] *read*: it is a vase.
- P. 290, no. 39, l. 3: Pl. 59] *read*: Pl. 65.
- P. 306, no. 19, l. 1: Pl. 7] *read*: Pl. 27.—A replica of this fine statue is at Tersatto Castle, near Fiume, cf. Schneider in *Archaeologisch-epigraphische Mittheilungen aus Oesterreich*, V., p. 159, no. 2. In this statue Seilenos has a tail.
- P. 307, l. 6, p. 308, l. 16, and p. 313, no. 34, l. 17: Amadei] *read*: Amidei
- P. 308, no. 24 *add*: Clarac IV. 574, 1231 A.

- P. 310, no. 26. A short abstract of my memoir, accompanied by a poor woodcut, is given in *The Antiquary*, 1882, January, pp. 6—8. I need scarcely say that the attempt to ascribe the Holkham bust to Phidias or to Kresilas (p. 8) is exclusively due to the author of that article.
- P. 311, no. 29 *add*: Bernoulli, *Röm. Ikonogr.*, I. p. 92, where a slight sketch of the fine head is given.
- P. 313, no. 36 *add*: Montfaucon, *Ant. Expl.*, III. Pl. 6, 3.
- P. 316, no. 46: Meade] *read*: Mead, and *add*: [\*]
- P. 317, no. 48. Perhaps identical with F. Ursinus, *Imagines*, Pl. 75. *C. I. Gr.* 6079?
- P. 317, no. 49 *add*: Gruter 988, 4.
- P. 317, no. 50, l. 9: no. 110] *read*: no. 66
- P. 318, no. 52. The last passage refers not to no. 52, but to no. 51.
- P. 318, no. 53. The identity of the Holkham bust and the bust found at Tivoli has been doubted by Bernoulli, *Röm. Ikonogr.*, I. p. 290 (cf. pp. 70 ff.) on account of the latter being mentioned as still existing in the Capitol in the *Beschreibung der Stadt Rom*, III. 1, p. 124. In matter of fact, the Tivoli bust, in compliance with Ursinus' will, came into the Capitol, and is described as being there in Rossini's *Mercurio errante*, 1693 (p. 13 of the 6th edition, 1739), and in the *Descrizione delle statue...ne Palazzi di Campidoglio* (p. 139 of the 3rd edition, 1775). On the other hand, neither Ridolfino Venuti in his rather detailed account (*Roma moderna*, 1741, p. 9) mentions the bust, nor does E. Q. Visconti know that the bust ever was in the Capitol (*Iconogr. Rom.*, I. p. 130 Mil.), nor has it found a place in the careful Vasi's *Itinerario istruttivo di Roma*, I. p. 81 of the edition of 1804. The bust reappears on its old place first in Platner's *Beschreibung*, I. cit. (1837) as a head placed on a modern bust of coloured stucco, with a modern inscription "Lucius Cornelius Praetor"; short notices of it are also to be found in Nibby, *Roma nell' anno 1838*, *Parte moderna*, II. p. 627, and in Tofanelli, *Indicazione delle sculture... nel Museo Capitolino*, 1846, p. 139. Now, however, neither Dr Dressel nor Dr Schwartz, requested by Prof. Bernoulli and by myself respectively to make inquiry, is able to find any trace of that bust in the Capitol. To me it appears more than probable, that the Holkham bust, which is not a head but a complete bust, as is the engraving in Gallaeus, and which by the groove on the nape of the neck bears witness of its being the very bust found at Tivoli, was abstracted from the Capitol in some way at the beginning of the 18th century and found its way into the hands of Kent; that for more than a century its loss had been forgotten in Rome; that in our century the vacant place of the old inventories has been filled up by some head put on a modern bust of stucco and christened with the old name; and that finally this head has disappeared in the recent rearrangement of the Capitoline collections.

- P. 321, l. 10. Cf. especially the statue of Zeus in the eastern pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia (Overbeck, *Plastik*, 3. ed., I. p. 420, fig. 90, no. 1 H).
- P. 327, no. 16. Bernoulli, *Röm. Ikonogr.*, I. p. 119, note 1 says that the globe on the l. hand is possibly antique.
- P. 330, no. 50 *add*: Muratori 884, 8 (Mancini collection in Rome). The inscription runs thus: *D. M. | P. Aelius Aug. lib. | Taurus proc.*
- P. 331, no. 52 *add*: Muratori 1549, 8 (in Ficoroni's possession).
- P. 332, no. 66 *add*: Engelmann, *Beiträge zu Euripides*, I. *Alkmene*, Berlin 1882; a sketch of the vase is given on p. 5.
- P. 338, l. 1 *dele*: Cavaceppi, *Racc.*, II. 36.
- P. 338, no. 6, l. 3: no. 8] *read*: no. 9
- P. 343, no. 24 *add*: *Mon. Matth.*, I. 70 "Bacchans."
- P. 348, no. 34, l. 1: 1696 B] *read*: 1646 B.
- P. 364, no. 128, l. 2: Pl. 22] *read*: Pl. 2, 2.
- P. 369, no. 176. Cf. Bernoulli, *Röm. Ikonogr.*, I. p. 122.
- P. 373, no. 215, l. 4: kitchen] *read*: Temple
- P. 377, no. 226 *add*: Muratori 1539, 6 (in the Giustiniani Villa outside the Porta del Popolo).
- P. 378, no. 231 *add*: Muratori 1745, 15.
- P. 379, no. 233, l. 8: autumn] *read*: summer
- P. 379, no. 236, l. 1: *Engr.* 84, 3] *read*: *Engr.* 84, 4.
- P. 380, no. 239 *add*: Muratori 1224, 3 (Marchese Capponi).
- P. 380, no. 240 *add*: Muratori 996, 9; he gives *Claudio* and *hic situs est*.
- P. 391, no. 274: barrel] *read*: belly
- P. 403, no. 312 *add*: Muratori 1695, 3.
- P. 403, no. 313 *add*: Muratori 1476, 10.
- P. 404, no. 316 *add*: Muratori 1198, 10 (Villa Montalto).
- P. 404, no. 317 *add*: Muratori 1665, 4.
- P. 404, no. 318 *add*: Muratori 1524, 1 gives the inscription, then in the Cesarini Villa, as follows "*e schedis Ptolomeis*" (a good authority):  
*Dis Manibus sacrum | M. Burrio Felici patron. | benemerenti fecer. |*  
*M. Burrius Hermes | M. Burrius Pulpus | et Burria Philumene |*  
*M. Burrius Puncilus | M. Burrius Atticus | M. Burrius Abascantus.*
- P. 404, no. 319 *add*: Muratori 1545, 9.
- P. 404, no. 320 *add*: Muratori 1698, 9.
- P. 405, no. 322 *add*: Muratori 1273, 11.
- P. 406, no. 330 *add*: Muratori 1252, 10.
- P. 407, no. 341. The same inscription is to be found on a different cippus in Piranesi, *Vasi*, I. Pl. 52.
- P. 408, no. 350 *add*: Cf. Muratori 1598, 11 = 1738, 9.
- P. 409, no. 354 *add*: Muratori 1634, 10.
- P. 409, no. 356 *add*: Muratori 1153, 5.
- P. 409, no. 362 *add*: Muratori 1164, 8 (Villa Montalto).
- P. 410, no. 364 *add*: Cf. Muratori 1705, 11 (Villa Giustiniani).
- P. 410, no. 373. Identical with Piranesi, *Vasi*, II. 112?
- P. 413, no. 399, l. 3: *Engr.* 110, 3] *read*: *Engr.* 110, 1.

- P. 426, no. 11 *add*: Muratori 1206, 7 (in the vigna of Seb. Lazzarini, near Rome).
- P. 428, no. 28. A vase of similar shape is engraved in Piranesi, *Vasi*, I. Pl. 9, F.
- P. 429, no. 1 *add*: Bernoulli, *Röm. Ikonogr.*, I. p. 136, and the authorities quoted by him. Henzen (*C. I. L.*, VI. I, 1326) doubts the genuineness of the inscription.
- P. 430, no. 3 *add*: Bernoulli, *Röm. Ikonogr.*, I. pp. 280ff.
- P. 434, no. 2. Helbig's interpretation has become uncertain since the discovery of the monument of Manius Cordius Thalamus (*Bullet. comun.*, IX. Pl. 19, 20), on which an indisputable head of Minerva is covered with the mask of Medusa.
- P. 441, no. 16 *add*: Gruter 613, 9 (in the church of SS. Cosma e Damiano, at Rome), who gives *Antoniniano*.
- P. 442, l. 6: as it seems] *read*: as it were
- P. 442, no. 24 *add*: Gruter 675, 1 (in the possession of the Mattei family, in Trastevere, near the Ponte S. Bartolommeo).
- P. 444, no. 29. Cf. Bernoulli, *Röm. Ikonogr.*, I. p. 91.
- P. 445, no. 33, l. 11: in drapery carving] *read*: of drapery
- P. 455, no. 67. As to the epoch of the original of this statue, cf. K. Lange, *Arch. Zeit.*, 1881, p. 197 note 2.
- P. 457, no. 71 *add*: Gruter 676, 13 (Cardinal Cesi).
- P. 462, no. 81, l. 1: Terminal bust] *read*: Terminal figure
- P. 464, l. 9. "Mr Grenville" is no doubt a member of the family of the Marquis of Buckingham, who was at that time in Italy collecting marbles for Stowe, cf. Piranesi, *Vasi*, I. Pl. 15.
- P. 473, no. 1, l. 2: statues] *read*: statue
- P. 499, no. 94. This is probably the fragment of marble discovered in the Casali Villa, on the alleged site of the *campus Martialis* (Ovid, *Fast.* 3, 521. Paulus Festi epit. p. 131), which was thought to be a *meta*, though its shape showed very little similarity to a real *meta*. It was for some time preserved in the garden of the said villa, and afterwards bought by an Englishman for a large sum. Cf. *Beschr. d. Stadt Rom*, III. 1, pp. 477. 502.
- P. 502, no. 3 *add*: Clarac, III. 476 C, 906 E.
- P. 504, no. 8, l. 24. In the Berlin group certain details are such as to leave it uncertain whether Dionysos or Priapos is meant.
- P. 517, no. 3, l. 19. It is probably the "*statua alta pal. 6, rappresentante un Fauno colla siringa e bastone*," described in the inventory of the Barberini collection made in 1738 (*Docum. ined.* etc., IV. p. 50).
- P. 544, no. 10, l. 17: freely] *read*: fully
- P. 552, no. 42, l. 2: 970] *read*: 970 D
- P. 566, no. 111 *add*: Benndorf, *Vorlegeblätter*, C, Pl. 11, 3.
- P. 576, l. 2. The principal name may be Νικησιος.
- P. 600, no. 6 *add*: *C. I. Gr.* 6138.
- P. 624, l. 6: statue identical] *read*: statue is identical
- P. 635, l. 20: version] *read*: copy
- P. 642, l. 13: over] *read*: beyond

- P. 642, no. 80. Cf. Muratori 1319, 8.  
 P. 655, no. 91 *add*: Muratori 999, 6 (Ang. Borioni).  
 P. 669, l. 30 *dele*: 46, this bust being not modern.  
 P. 684, no. 55, l. 4 *add*: [\*]  
 P. 684, no. 60, l. 1: *Collib.*] *read*: *Monum. lib.*  
 P. 712, no. 198 *add*: Muratori 1296, 10 (Montalto Villa).  
 P. 721. Two drawings by Miss Agnes C. Imlach communicated to Mr Conze enable me to give a more detailed description of the two stelae at Winton Castle.

1. **Attic sepulchral stelê**, very tall, flanked by two pilasters, and crowned with a rounded top, on which a graceful anthemion is developing itself. In the field stands a maiden, facing l., in slight movement. She is draped with a chiton and a wide cloak which entirely envelops her l. arm. The hair which falls down on to the nape of the neck shews a simple arrangement. The head is bent, looking at a small doll which she holds in her raised r. hand. Beautiful Attic style of the 4th century. On the architrave is the name Ἀριστομάχη, written in the characters of that period. H. 1.63. L. 0.45.

2. **Attic sepulchral stelê**. Between two pilasters is a female figure, seated on a chair, facing l. She is draped and wears a high head-dress. She shakes hands with another female, draped, who stands opposite to her. Relief of good character, which would suggest a better time than that of the inscription written in the pediment and on the architrave in large characters of the somewhat ornamented style of Roman times: (in the pediment) Κλαυδία, (on the architrave) Ἀφφειω ἐκ Μελιτέων. As to the second name of the lady, cf. *C. I. Gr.*, nos. 3167. 3278. H. 0.99. L. 0.50.

- P. 735, no. 117 *add*: Benndorf, *Vorlegeblätter*, C, Pl. 10, 2.  
 P. 745, no. 186, *A add*: Muratori 1144, 7 (Marchese Lovatelli at Rome).  
 P. 748, no. 219 *add*: Benndorf, *Vorlegeblätter*, C, Pl. 10, 1.  
 P. 768. ROME, COLLECTIONS, *add*:  
 Borioni *R.* Rossie 91  
 Capponi *R.* Ince 239  
 Casali Lowther 94  
 Cesarini *R.* Ince 318  
 Cesi *R.* London, Lansdowne 71  
 SS. Cosma e Damiano *R.* London, Lansdowne 16  
 Ficoroni *R.* Cambridge 88. 89. C. Howard 52  
 Giustiniani *R.* Ince 226. 364?  
 Lazzarini *R.* Liverpool 11  
 Lovatelli *R.* Woburn 186, *A*  
 Mancini *R.* C. Howard 50  
 Mattei in Trastevere *R.* London, Lansdowne 24  
 Montalto *R.* Ince 316. 362. Wilton 198

INTRODUCTION.

ON THE INFLUX OF ANTIQUE SCULPTURES  
INTO GREAT BRITAIN.



## INTRODUCTION.

### ON THE INFLUX OF ANTIQUE SCULPTURES INTO GREAT BRITAIN.

#### PRELIMINARY.

NO other country in Europe can at this day boast of such a wealth of Private Collections of antique works of art as England, which in this particular recalls the Rome of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Great is the number of town-houses and palaces, still greater the number of country-seats, in which the noble and the rich treasure up, by the side of incomparable masterpieces of modern painting, considerable collections of antique works of art, especially of sculpture. So numerous are they, that few have any notion of this abundance of treasures, and perhaps no one individual enjoys a really comprehensive knowledge of them. Whatever has once reached the region of this Enchanted Island has remained there as it were spell-bound. These collections have in frequent instances experienced great vicissitudes. Many have more than once changed owners, many have come to the hammer in public auction; they have been moved from one place to another, and in consequence have often found their way into remote and inaccessible hiding-places; indeed a certain number of specimens have been utterly lost sight of, so that only a happy chance can bring them back to light. Very few however, and those under quite peculiar circumstances, have made their way back across the Channel. "England," says a gifted writer on art, "is to works of art what the grave is to the dead; her gates do not open again to let them out<sup>1</sup>."

<sup>1</sup> Bürger, W., *Les Trésors d'Art en Angleterre*, Brussels and Ostend, 1862, p. 1.  
M. C. I

The works of ancient Greek and Roman art in England alone constitute the subject of the present volume. The student who attempts to trace the introduction of such works into the country, will soon notice that there are three clearly defined periods in the development of this branch of dilettantism. In the first, which embraces the time of the Stuarts and their immediate successors, it is individual collectors who strike into the path indicated. Only a few undertook to collect the larger works in marble. There is consequently a preponderance over these of the smaller objects of art, bronzes, coins, gems, which, being more easily attainable and more easy to transport, have at all times formed a favourite object of the antiquarian collector's enthusiasm. The destinies of these old collections are for the most part, like the whole circumstances of the time, variable and frequently violent. At the end of the period only a few had entirely or even partially preserved their old condition. At this day the collection at Wilton House is the solitary unimpaired representative of that epoch; besides which, of the treasures of the illustrious Earl of Arundel the greater part is still to be found at Oxford, in the secure possession, not of a private person, but of the University.

Then comes the heyday of dilettantism in England, the last century, especially in its latter half. In an unintermitting stream the ancient marbles of Rome poured into the palaces of the aristocracy of Britain, whose wealth in some cases afforded the means of gratifying a real artistic taste by these rare possessions, and in others enabled them at any rate to fall into the new fashion of dilettantism, the *furor* for antique art. The older Roman collections were bought up; fresh excavations were instituted. Englishmen settled in Rome and dealt in the acquisitions without which *milord* on his travels could not well return home from the 'grand tour.' Of course other countries tried to secure their share, but England stood foremost. During

this period of fifty or sixty years there came into being most of the private collections of antiques in which the island abounds, and those the largest and most valuable. Their general character depends upon the fact that their origin has been almost exclusively in the soil of Rome and its immediate vicinity.

At the beginning of this century the possession of a gallery of sculpture ceased to be indispensable to *bon ton*. The importation of antiques came to a stop, owing to the interruption of commercial intercourse entailed by the protracted war against Napoleon. Other fashionable tastes sprang into existence or were revived. Once again the interest, or at any rate the active enthusiasm, for collections of antique works of art, became the privilege of a few real lovers of such things. While however this abatement of zeal took place in private circles, the State stepped into the place of individual amateurs with abundant energy. Since the opening of this century the British Museum has advanced with rapid strides to the supreme position of having the finest collection of antiques in the world. It was no longer Rome, or Italy generally, which filled the rooms of this institution with late copies or imitations of Greek originals; but Greek art itself, represented by a stately series of its most beautiful creations, entered the museum in triumph, and asserted a might of simple grandeur before unknown. The British Museum must in this respect remain altogether beyond the reach of rivalry. The sum of its priceless treasures has been completed by means of excavations specially undertaken, and successful acquisitions made with unremitting zeal at the sites of discoveries. They have often been increased by donations or purchases of private collections. In fact, the British Museum has gradually thrown all private collections far into the background. It seems therefore only natural and desirable that in the future also the several brooklets should discharge themselves into this mighty stream.

The object of the ensuing sketch is to follow this development more closely into detail, and at the same time to draw attention to such general considerations as must necessarily escape notice during the study of the collections taken severally. If in these preliminary remarks the older collections are found to be treated more fully than the newer, and those which have been dispersed than those still existing, no apology is needed.

I cannot help lamenting the general inadequacy of the aids at my disposal. Only occasionally have I been enabled to give more than a mere outline of my subject. However, I have at any rate aimed at accuracy and certainty in its delineation. Much will undoubtedly have escaped me, notwithstanding the assistance of friends quite qualified to offer criticism and advice, as I was able to devote but a short time to the use of a mass of literary aids only available in England. But in the case of the great majority of these collections, there is an absolute dearth of accounts of their origination and of the sources of their component elements. There is undoubtedly much information on such matters, either in the form of short memoranda or complete correspondence, still preserved among the archives of those families whose ancestors in bygone times acquired the collections. I have had access to only a small proportion of such unprinted papers. It is to be hoped that my book will call forth communications of such records. Of previous labourers in a more general style in the same field, it is only necessary to mention the occasional paragraphs in Horace Walpole's *Anecdotes of Painting*, and Dallaway's useful though too superficial and uncritical books. Should these drawbacks not seem sufficient to secure indulgence for the shortcomings of the following sketch, the reader may earn the gratitude of the public and of the author by pointing out or laying open new sources of inquiry.

## I.

### THE ARUNDEL MARBLES AND OTHER EARLY COLLECTIONS.

I. IT was late before England joined the competition of the nations which desired to possess a share of the abundance of antique sculptures which since the fifteenth century have come to light in unheard-of numbers from the soil of Italy. In the course of the sixteenth century we see Francis I. of France, Philip II. of Spain, Rudolf II. of Germany, taking pains to raise their residences in Paris, Madrid, and Prague to equal rank with the palaces of the Roman nobles by decorating them with works of antique art. Princes of lesser rank, such as the Electors of Bavaria, follow their example; and even private persons of wealth are loth to be left behind. I may instance the Welser family of Augsburg, between which city and Italy there were intimate connections. In England during the Tudor period no trace yet showed itself of a similar interest; although the influence of Italy in other fields of culture was scarcely so deeply impressed on England at any other time as in the sixteenth century. The long distance from Italy, the insular position of the country, the keenness of political and religious oppositions and dissensions, a puritanical aversion from images of heathen deities, might constitute the main reasons why in this particular England lagged behind the continental states throughout the whole of the sixteenth century.

*No antiques in England in the 16th century.*

Henry,  
Prince of  
Wales.

2. It was under the Kings of the house of Stuart that a change first began. It appears that the first to aim at the possession of antique works of art was the eldest son of James I., PRINCE HENRY, "that hopeful cherisher of great and noble things," who died young A.D. 1612. He laid the foundation of a collection of coins which his brother Charles subsequently enlarged, and acquired the collection of gems made by Abraham Gorlaeus of the Netherlands (*d. A.D. 1609*)<sup>2</sup>. He further left his brother eighteen small statues, but as they are designated in the catalogue of works of art in the possession of King Charles the First, as "Florentine brazen statues," and as their description contains several strange particulars<sup>3</sup>, it is doubtful whether genuine antique statues are meant or whether they were not rather modern imitations, like many specimens in the possession of Charles I. Prince Henry had not yet reached his eighteenth year when he died. Had he lived longer, to his lot there would probably have fallen a share of the glory, which now belongs to another, of being proverbially styled the "father of *vertù*" in this country. We pass now to the individual thus designated, from whom a distinguished Society of friends and promoters of genuine art has been able with propriety to take its name.

Lord  
Arundel's  
tours in  
Italy.

3. THOMAS HOWARD, EARL OF ARUNDEL AND SURREY (*b. A.D. 1585*), reinstated by A.D. 1621 in the dignity hereditary in his family of Earl Marshal of England, stands indisputably at the head of English art collectors<sup>4</sup>. His delicate health had early taken him to Italy for a comparatively long visit, from which he

<sup>2</sup> Evelyn, *Letter to Pepys*, 1689, Aug. 12. Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting*, ch. viii. (Sal. de Caus). ix. (Charles I.). Chamberlain to Carleton in Birch's *Court and Times of James I.* i. p. 207.

<sup>3</sup> *A Catalogue of King Charles the First's Capital Collection*, transcribed by Vertue, London, 1757, p. 21, "the

eighteen little Statues which came to his Majesty by the decease of Prince Henry." Cf. Carleton to Chamberlain (Birch, *James I.* i. p. 212).

<sup>4</sup> Walpole, *Anecd.* ch. ix. Dal-laway, *Anecdotes*, p. 229. Ellis, H., *The Townley Gallery*, i. p. 57. Edwards, *Lives of the Founders of the British Museum*, i. p. 183. Cf.

first returned home at the end of the year 1612. The direction of his taste was finally determined by a renewed sojourn of twelve months, A.D. 1613, 1614. By the King's order the young lord, accompanied by his wife Alatheia Talbot, daughter of the Earl of Shrewsbury, had conducted the Princess Elizabeth as bride to her betrothed husband, Frederick, the Elector Palatine. "Thence he went into Italy, where he very much pleased himself, and either took up or improved his natural disposition of being the great master and favourer of arts, especially of sculpture, design, painting and architecture, which rendered him famous and acceptable to all ingenious spirits both at home and abroad<sup>5</sup>." Thus we are told by Sir Edward Walker, who had stood in close relations to him and his house. Peacham's often-quoted words refer to the same juncture as the beginning of the Earl's activity as a collector. They will be found in their proper place further on. It deserves notice that Arundel had in his suite no less a person than Inigo Jones, whose artistic taste developed itself for the first time during this journey in the direction of that classical style which characterized his later designs<sup>6</sup>. We may fairly conjecture that the Earl's natural taste for art must have been much stimulated by the influence of the practical knowledge and mature judgment of his elder companion. Relations were in various forms kept up between the two men afterwards.

4. We cannot now prove in detail how much Lord Arundel got together at that time in person, how much gradually by his agents, several of whom he employed in Italy and "generally in any part of Europe where rarities were to be had<sup>7</sup>." He is said to have himself

*His Italian  
Marbles.*

Michaelis in *Im neuen Reich*, 1878, I. pp. 921, 964. I have taken pains to refer on all occasions as far as possible to the original authorities, and I hope that the account has consequently been made both more complete and more accurate.

<sup>5</sup> *Historical Discourses*, London, 1705, p. 212.

<sup>6</sup> Sir Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain, 1613, July 9 (Birch, *James I.* p. 255).

<sup>7</sup> Walker, *Hist. Disc.* p. 222.

obtained leave to institute excavations on the sites of ruins about Rome, and it is also related that he discovered in subterraneous chambers a whole number at a time of splendid Roman portrait-statues. These were soon restored in the usual manner, and furnished with the high-sounding names of Cicero, Marius, and so forth. They still at this day adorn the collection at Oxford<sup>8</sup>. Others were obtained by purchase. "He made a wonderful and costly purchase of excellent statues, whilst he was in Italy and Rome, some whereof he could never obtain permission to remove from Rome, though he had paid for them<sup>9</sup>." That Arundel's aims were pitched high we learn from two instances accidentally recorded<sup>10</sup>. In the Circus of Maxentius (usually called of Caracalla) not far from the Via Appia, there lay an obelisk of about sixteen metres in length broken into four pieces. It was only the difficulty of transport to the sea which deterred the Earl from purchasing the fragments and putting them together in London; which city might otherwise have been able to boast an obelisk long before the bringing over of Cleopatra's needle. What happened instead was that Bernini (A.D. 1651) crowned his fantastic fountain in the Piazza Navona with the obelisk in question. The purchase of the Meleager (then called Adonis) of the Pighini palace, which now constitutes one of the chief ornaments of the Belvedere, was likewise one of Arundel's schemes, but it miscarried upon the refusal of the owner to part with his treasure even for a high price. For the element of cost never came into consideration with respect to the Earl's passion for collecting. "His expenses," says his embittered opponent Lord Clarendon<sup>11</sup>, "were without any measure, and always exceeded very much his revenue." If we measure those aspirations by the results, certainly most of the sculptures of Italian origin, which

<sup>8</sup> Dallaway, *Anecd.* p. 256.

<sup>9</sup> Clarendon, *Hist. of the Rebellion*,  
Oxf. 1849, i. p. 78.

<sup>10</sup> Evelyn, *Diary*, 1645, Feb. 16.  
1644, Nov. 6.

<sup>11</sup> *Hist. of the Reb.* l. cit.

are still to be found among the remains of the Arundel collection at Oxford, seem rather insignificant. For there are only a few specimens which rise above the level of mediocrity; the best portion of that collection being undoubtedly or probably derived not from Italy but from Greece.

5. In the first period of the reawakening of classical culture, Poggio Bracciolini, the great pioneer of the Renaissance, had already made use of his connection with some friends in Chios to get a few antiques from Greece to grace his villa near Florence, the Valdarniana<sup>12</sup>. Again, about the middle of the fifteenth century, the enthusiastic traveller Ciriaco de' Pizzicolti of Ancona, during his repeated wanderings through the islands of the Archipelago, had turned his attention to the relics of Greek art<sup>13</sup>. These districts were then under the rule of Italian princes. But since the Turks had established themselves in absolute dominion over them, it had become more and more difficult to pursue such interests. At best the nobles and merchants of Venice could place themselves in possession of one or two specimens, and there was a general impression that "all above ground was gone to Venice"<sup>14</sup>. Or else the ambassador of a Western power to the Sublime Porte would use his residence as an opportunity for collecting what presented itself to him. So it was with the French ambassador, Des Hayes<sup>15</sup>. We hear too of similar efforts of the Provençal scholar Claude Peiresc, who most zealously turned to account his wide-spread connections for his scientific works<sup>16</sup>. But the merit of having caused these classic shores to be ransacked for the express purpose of collecting antiques belongs to the Earl of Arundel, and

*The  
country of  
Greece.*

<sup>12</sup> Shepherd, *Life of Poggio Bracciolini*, Liverp. 1802, p. 291. G. Voigt, *Die Wiederbelebung des class. Alterthums*, Berlin, 1859, p. 173.

<sup>13</sup> Jahn, O., *Aus der Alterthums-wissenschaft*, Bonn, 1868, p. 333.

<sup>14</sup> Roe, T., *Negotiations*, London, 1740, p. 647.

<sup>15</sup> Roe, p. 154. Laborde, *Athènes*, t. p. 62.

<sup>16</sup> Gassendi, *Fabr. de Peiresc vita*, Par. 1641, p. 227.

the energy with which he followed up this task in the midst of so many others, quite answers to one of the characteristic qualities of his nation.

*Sir  
Thomas  
Roe in  
Constanti-  
nople.*

6. The first opportunity was presented by the mission of Sir Thomas Roe to Constantinople, as ambassador from James I., in the year 1621<sup>17</sup>. The Earl Marshal, by birth and position one of the foremost among the dignitaries of the English nobility, might well count on meeting with no refusal if he earnestly requested the ambassador at his departure to pay regard in his interest to the treasures of antiquity, works of art, and manuscripts, and to collect them for him. In fact, Sir Thomas was quite willing to be of service, and declared himself ready "to look back upon antiquity" besides pursuing his own vocation, which was "to attend new things," all the more so as he was himself "a lover of such vertues," though no great connoisseur. Had he had an idea to what troubles and unpleasantnesses he was about to expose himself by undertaking this commission, he would probably have been less ready and willing to enter upon this "quarry and stone business." For some time indeed the affair went on tolerably smoothly. Immediately upon his arrival at Constantinople Roe collected information about the localities which gave the best promise of a return. In particular the Bishop of Andros pointed out the places of sepulture in Rheneia (great Delos) as a rich mine of treasures. This spot has been ransacked again and again up to the present day, and is not yet exhausted. He set the British consul to work to institute inquiries within his district. Here was the commencement of a system which has since been employed with such important results. Sir Thomas was indefatigable in asking the necessary permis-

<sup>17</sup> *The Negotiations of Sir Th. Roe in his Embassy to the Ottoman Porte*, London, 1740. These letters have been often used since the time of Horace Walpole, but never thoroughly used up. So far as they refer to our present subject, they will be found

arranged in order in the Appendix to this Introduction. I have looked through some other correspondence of Sir Thomas', which is preserved in the British Museum, for notices of this kind, but to no purpose.

sion from the Turkish authorities, though not always with the desired effect. The very first letters tell of a "maid of Smyrna," which Arundel seems to have mentioned to Roe, and of a fragment of a lion holding a bull's head in its claws at Lampsacus. The two specimens were not however secured. Yet Sir Thomas, though barely arrived at the Bosphorus, was already on the high road towards anticipating the fame of Dr Schliemann, since he was able to offer the Earl "a stone taken out of the old palace of Priam in Troy, cut in horned shape." It is a pity that this stone, as indeed many other Trojan antiquities, had no recommendations except the high-sounding name of its alleged place of discovery.

7. Unfortunately there are only a few letters remaining of the correspondence between Roe and Arundel. Consequently we cannot say what induced the Earl, Roe's efforts notwithstanding, to send out a special agent to the Levant, —whether, for instance, the practical fruit of the exertions of the much-occupied diplomatist seemed too trifling, or whether he perhaps had knowledge that a dangerous rival would likewise lay claim to Sir Thomas' services. However this might be, in the last months of the year 1624 there first appeared at Smyrna, and at the beginning of the ensuing year actually at Constantinople, William Petty, charged with commissions from Lord Arundel, and warmly recommended to the ambassador. This gentleman had been educated at Cambridge<sup>18</sup>, and had entered Lord Arundel's service. In all probability his value had already been proved by lucky purchases in Italy before he was sent out to the East with the new commission<sup>19</sup>. At all events he forthwith impressed Sir Thomas Roe with his superior practical knowledge,

*William  
Petty.*

<sup>18</sup> Dallaway, *Of Statuary*, p. 277, quoting Cole's *Athene Cantabrigienses* (MS.). The often-repeated assertion that this Petty is an ancestor of the Marquis of Lansdowne rests on a confusion with the famous Sir William Petty, whose daughter, Anne

Petty, married to Thomas Fitzmaurice, Earl of Kerry, was the grandmother of the first Marquis of Lansdowne. The two William Pettys were not, so far as I know, related to one another.

<sup>19</sup> Chandler, R., *Marmora Oxoniensia*, Oxf. 1763, p. 1.

which the latter recognised without reservation. With this Petty combined an unflinching energy, a power of endurance proof against all exertions and privations, and lastly a regardlessness in gaining every advantage which Roe was destined soon to learn to his cost. The latter writes to Lord Arundel, "There was never man so fitted to an employment, that encounters all accident with so unwearied patience, eates with Greeks on their worst days, lies with fishermen on planks at the best, is all things to all men, that he may obtain his ends, which are your lordship's service." And on another occasion, not without bitterness, "Your lordship had good experience in a man for such an employment, that spares no pains nor arts to effect his services."

*The Duke  
of Buck-  
ingham.*

8. It was certainly high time for Lord Arundel to transfer his interests to such active hands. Not long before Petty arrived at Constantinople, GEORGE VILLIERS, DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM, had preferred to Sir Thomas Roe a similar request to that which Lord Arundel had made earlier. The uncontrolled favourite of King James and his son had entered into competition with Arundel in more than one order of connoisseurship. In Antwerp he had purchased the collection of the great Peter Paul Rubens, which comprised, besides pictures, antique vases, statues and medals<sup>20</sup>. "At Yorke House<sup>21</sup>," says an eye-witness, "the Galleries and Roomes are ennobled with the possession of these Romane Heads and Statues, which lately belonged to Sir Peter Paul Rubens." In Venice Buckingham had purchases of pictures effected through the ambassador Sir Henry Wotton, just as he now laid claim to Sir Thomas Roe's services for the

<sup>20</sup> Walpole, *Anecd.* ch. x. (Rubens).

<sup>21</sup> Peacham, H., *The Compleat Gentleman*, 2nd Impression, London, 1634, p. 108. York House in the Strand is meant, not the Palace of Whitehall, which at that time was still often called York House in addition to its other names. In the *Catalogue of the Curious Collection of*

*Pictures of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham*, London, W. Bathoe, 1758, there are indeed no antiques, only a few copies of antiques in bronze (pp. 22, 23); but this catalogue comprises merely the portion of the old collection which was rescued from the storms of the revolution for the young duke.

acquisition of antique sculptures. Not, to be sure, all specimens whatsoever without discrimination. For instance, he cautioned Sir Thomas against the purchase of works in alabaster, as being seldom genuine. "Neither am I so fond of antiquity as to court it in a deformed or mishapen stone; but where you shall meet beauty with antiquity together in a statue, I shall not stand upon any cost your judgment shall value it at." It is a matter of course that the ambassador did not neglect the wishes of the all-powerful minister, but willingly agreed to execute his directions (Jan. A.D. 1625). At the same time he did not forget his obligations to Lord Arundel, who had been beforehand in enlisting his services.

9. Not long afterwards Petty presented himself to Sir Thomas, and soon found out how on the one hand to prove himself serviceable to him by his practical knowledge, and on the other hand to inform himself as to the ambassador's plans, and to provide himself plentifully with permits and letters of authorization such as could only be procured through the intervention of the ambassador. At first all went on in perfect harmony, and the two men launched out together into high-flown and quite romantic plans. When in our own generation Ponsonby first conceived the idea of removing the reliefs from the Mausoleum out of the walls of the Turkish fortress of Budrum, and acquiring them for England, some regarded this as "an unreasonable request" to the Porte<sup>22</sup>. Yet how modest this wish was compared with the designs of Roe and Petty! They proposed nothing less than to get into their power six out of the twelve large reliefs which adorned the so-called "Golden Gate," the finest of the gates of Constantinople. This gate was erected by Theodosios the Great. Through it the Byzantine Emperors used to make their solemn entry into the city. But since the conquest by the Turks it had not been opened, but built up and enclosed with

*Roe's and  
Petty's  
joint plans.*

<sup>22</sup> Fellows, *The Xanthian Marbles*, p. 9.

new strong works of defence, the so-called "Seven Towers." Though it had become consequently quite inaccessible, yet it was still regarded as the principal gate. For about a year this Quixotic plan cuts a grand figure in the correspondence. To get the consent of the Sultan to the demolition soon proved to be just as impracticable as the idea of reaching their object by corrupting the highest functionaries of State. A clandestine removal with the help of the soldiers stationed on the spot was impossible on account of the weight of the marble slabs and the height at which they were built in. So they had recourse to stratagem. It was agreed that a Turkish priest should denounce the figure sculptures, as opposed to the religion of Mohammed, and so bring about their removal from their conspicuous position. If once they were transferred to another place it would not be difficult to get them out of the way. In fact a priest was engaged for this purpose, and a sum of 600 crowns proffered in case of success; a temporary deposit of 500 dollars being actually made by way of preliminary. But even this hope proved delusive. At last the Grand Treasurer, whose coffers could in times of war take advantage of every extra source of supply, promised to take the matter in hand and to contrive a clandestine removal. Now however the garrison began to get uneasy. A superstitious feeling gained ground that in connection with the removal of the enchanted sculptures a great mischief threatened the city. There was nothing left, unless they would expose themselves to serious danger, but to give up the whole plan. We cannot but regret this, as the reliefs soon afterwards disappeared altogether. Only a few of the many visitors to Constantinople ever saw them again<sup>23</sup>; no one has drawn or described them more closely, so that Roe's tolerably full description consequently retains some value.

<sup>23</sup> E. g. Wheler, *Journey into Voyage d'Italie &c.*, Lyons, 1678, I. *Græce*, London, 1682, p. 194. Spon, p. 262.

10. Sir Thomas, who had undertaken engagements in two quarters, considered that he should be keeping faith with both parties if he were to divide the fruit of the joint labours of Petty and himself between Lord Arundel and the Duke of Buckingham (this indeed was his plan with reference to the sculptures just mentioned); while he reserved exclusively for Buckingham what he should acquire by himself without Petty's cooperation. To this effect he entered into agreements with Petty, in which the latter apparently acquiesced, and submitted like proposals to Arundel. But the illustrious Earl Marshal, full of pride in his noble ancestry, was not disposed to entertain the idea of any such compromise with the detested upstart of whom he had just begun to find himself the antagonist in the field of politics. The notion of taking shares with the new-created Duke was not at all to the taste of the twenty-first representative of the long line of Earls of Arundel, who according to the testimony of an adversary "lived towards all favourites, and great officers, without any kind of condescension"<sup>24</sup>. The impassioned collector could not make up his mind thus to share the spoil for which he had at first instituted the chase with the rival who had come later upon the scene. He roundly refused the proposal, to the great embarrassment of Sir Thomas, who now found himself saddled with the difficult task of serving two masters.

11. Petty meanwhile, after a stay of some months in Constantinople, had set off on his travels. His nominal purpose was energetic action for their common interests. The needful firmans and permits had been got by means of Roe. But as a matter of fact Petty evinced little inclination for partnership with the ambassador, and was probably confirmed in this disinclination by Lord Arundel. It could not possibly escape him how much more favourable the prospects were for himself than for the diplomatist,

<sup>24</sup> Clarendon, *Hist. of the Rebellion*, 1. p. 78.

tied by his office to the Court and obliged to depend on the zeal and acumen of his agents. For Petty the road to his special undertakings lay open. His conduct with respect to the Golden Gate was in the highest degree characteristic. The reliefs had originally appeared to Roe too much mutilated to be of value. Petty however formed a far more favourable judgment of them, and persuaded Roe to offer for them the sum above-mentioned. Now, while on his travels, Petty suddenly advised the ambassador not to apply more than two hundred dollars to that purpose. The latter, who had in the meantime become suspicious of Petty's designs, got an inkling of his desire to place himself in sole possession of the reliefs at a convenient season. So he gave Petty free leave to withdraw from their common transactions, but at the same time explained that he would himself in any case pursue the undertaking further and at his convenience divide the spoil between Buckingham and Arundel. When Petty found the ambassador so resolute, he without more ado gave up his objection and actually went back to the original agreement. His route took him at first to Pergamon and Samos. According to his letters to Roe he found only a trifling spoil, fragments of no considerable value. But the ambassador learnt through other channels that the harvest had been very rich and highly valuable, and so found himself overreached by the "close and subtle borderer." He openly expressed his chagrin to Lord Arundel (Oct. 20, A.D. 1625). However he none the less bestirred himself, when Petty on his voyage from Samos to Ephesos suffered shipwreck in the narrow strait, and lost not merely his collections but also his papers, to replace the latter by fresh ones, such precarious work it was to apply so often for such orders and permits. Petty himself was not discouraged by his mischance, but at once resumed his activity. At first he was put into prison by the Turks as a spy, but soon managed to satisfy them as to his status and to get

free. He promptly set to work in Chios and made preparations for fishing the submerged treasures up again from the bottom of the sea. In this he seems to have actually succeeded. Then he betook himself to Ephesos and Smyrna. Here he was lucky enough to make a valuable haul<sup>25</sup>. One Samson, commissioned by the Provençal scholar Peiresc, had not long before acquired a number of stones bearing inscriptions at the price of fifty gold pieces. Among these was the extremely valuable chronological table destined to be known to all the world as the *Marmor Parium*. Through some intrigues on the part of the sellers Samson had been cast into prison and the collection had been dispersed. Petty now arrived, and had the good fortune to bring the specimens together again and to secure them, though at a high price, for Lord Arundel. Thence he went to Athens, where he spent the summer of the year 1626. He there met with an emissary of Roe's. Through him Sir Thomas probably learnt what Petty had achieved. He writes to Buckingham in November of that year: "Mr Petty has raked together two hundred pieces, all broken, or few entire; what they will prove, I cannot judge." Apparently Petty left the Levant soon after this, but not before he had despatched the result of his labours to England, where the marbles arrived at Arundel House in the year 1627. Here they forthwith excited the greatest interest, especially the inscriptions; and among these again principally the two large fragments of the chronological table. The renowned John Selden, the *magnus dictator doctrinae nationis Anglicae*, undertook the deciphering and interpretation, assisted by Patrick Young and Richard James. By the following year, A.D. 1628, appeared Selden's *Marmora Arundelliana*, which spread abroad the fame of the inscriptions and of their collector over all the world<sup>26</sup>. (In the same year was born

<sup>25</sup> Gassendi, *N. Cl. Fabricii de Peiresc vita*, Par. 1641, p. 227, *ad annum* 1629. Prideaux, *Marm. Oxon.*

Oxf. 1676, præf. fol. 5.

<sup>26</sup> Selden's book unfortunately includes only 29 Greek and 10 Latin

the Earl's grandson, Henry Howard, through whom the collection was subsequently scattered to the winds.) Peiresc too now learnt what had become of his former property; but so far from being envious, he expressed delight that both the stones themselves and the task of appreciating them had fallen into such good hands. About the sculptures there was at first less talk.

*Roe's  
efforts.*

12. In the meantime Sir Thomas Roe most zealously endeavoured, even independently of Petty, to minister fairly to the desires of his noble employers. At first he even yet purposed to let the Earl Marshal as well as the Duke of Buckingham have his share. But the former, as we can easily understand, fell gradually more and more into the background. His and Petty's conduct had after all annoyed Roe not a little, and moreover Buckingham, as the confidential adviser of the king and leading statesman of the hour, could throw quite another weight into the scale:—through his mediation, that is to say, Sir Thomas might well hope to be recalled as soon as possible from his difficult and unpleasant post. So we find no letter of Roe's to Arundel in the collection later than March A.D. 1626; on the other hand there is an unbroken series of reports to Buckingham as to the progress of the researches. For a long time the result was extremely small, although no pains were spared. These researches extended as far as Alexandria and Sinope. Some of the chief towns of Asia Minor, such as Ankyra and Brussa, again Troy and Pergamon, the south coast of Roumelia, and the principal islands of the Archipelago, were searched thoroughly by the British consuls, by native speculators, by agents specially sent out. But yet little or no success presented itself; stones entirely defaced or modern works were purchased for high prices, or the difficulty of transport frustrated the

inscriptions. This is all the more to be regretted, because in the following period a large portion of the inscrip-

tions were utterly lost before copies of them had been taken.

hopes of bringing away the heavier specimens from the interior to the sea. A few fragments of statues, some heads and reliefs, composed the entire produce, until at last, at the beginning of the year 1627, a more competent agent travelled through the Morea. For almost a year he collected in the different districts of the peninsula and on the islands, and contrived to inflame the zeal of the poorer inhabitants:—"Our search has begotten a diligence and care in all the inhabitants of the Arches and Morea." Now at length there came to light whole statues, beautiful and well-preserved specimens, and part at least of these were successfully conveyed to accessible harbours, such as Patras. Some, to be sure, had to wait for a better opportunity. So the efforts of Sir Thomas then seemed after all to be receiving their reward, but only just in time, as in the meanwhile his hopes of a speedy recall were realised. He reported with pride on the handsome acknowledgments which competent judges paid to his collection; moreover, his excellent new agent expressed himself willing and ready to go on collecting for Buckingham even after Roe's departure. Suddenly, at the beginning of the year 1628, the news came that this agent had died at Patras. Fresh difficulties as a matter of course presented themselves; the treasures, which were still scattered far and wide, had to be secured and collected. Roe must have been glad to be able to hand the business over for completion to his successor, who had meanwhile arrived (April, A.D. 1628). On the 27th of June, A.D. 1628, being already in Smyrna, he announces to the Duke that he is now having the fruit of the labours of many years put on board ship.

13. Buckingham was destined not to enjoy the actual possession of these treasures. When they arrived in London he had already fallen by the hand of an assassin (Aug. 23, A.D. 1628). What became of the antiques seems to be indicated by an undated letter of Lord Arundel to his Countess, which, it would seem, can only be assigned to the

*Buckingham's  
marbles.  
Other collectors at  
Court.*

beginning of the year 1629<sup>27</sup>. Scarcely had the Earl, who was engaged at Court at the royal palace of Theobald's, heard of Sir Thomas Roe's return, when he instructed his Countess to look well after whatever he might have brought with him in the way of "antiquities, goddes, vases, inscriptions, medals, or such like," and with this view to get the assistance of the learned Sir Robert Cotton, or at any rate of a fit and proper person, and that too with all speed, so that the Lord Chamberlain might not anticipate her. This dreaded rival was PHILIP HERBERT, EARL OF MONTGOMERY, later fourth Earl of Pembroke, destined afterwards to secure himself a place in the history of art as Vandyck's principal patron. Vandyck's portrait-group of the Earl and his family at Wilton House, one of the most celebrated works of the master, is an appropriate commemoration of his fame. This Lord Pembroke is, however, otherwise scarcely known as a collector of antiques. For the rest we do not know whether Lord Arundel's pains were crowned with success. If they were, Sir Thomas's exertions turned out after all to be exclusively for his benefit. We learn, at all events, from these lines that there were already other connoisseurs of antiques at Court<sup>28</sup>. Two

<sup>27</sup> See Appendix No. 19. The careful Tierney (*Hist. of Arundel*, II. p. 435) conjecturally places the undated letter in the year 1619, after Roe's return from his ambassadorship to the Great Mogul (Sept. 1619, see Thomas Birch, *Court and Times of James I.* II. p. 190); yet the antiquities are little in accordance with such an occasion. The return from Constantinople occurred after many perils at the beginning of the year 1629 (Birch, *Charles II.* I. pp. 409, 415, II. pp. 5, 8); the ship *Samson*, of London, in which he had embarked, had in November A. D. 1628 already arrived in London (Birch, I. p. 434). That the Court in those years frequently resided at Theobald's, is to be inferred from several letters in Birch (I. p. 452, II. pp. 23, 24). In July, A. D. 1628, Arundel had, after a long period of disgrace, again

gained admission to Court and was enjoying the royal favour (Birch, I. pp. 382, 419, 441, 449). Nothing consequently stands in the way of my proposed date. Thus the Lord Chamberlain was not William, 3rd Earl of Pembroke, as Tierney thinks, but his younger brother Philip, Earl of Montgomery, who succeeded his brother in that office A. D. 1626 (Birch, I. p. 123 and *passim*, II. p. 74, *Simonds d'Evres' Autobiogr.* London, 1845, II. p. 189).

<sup>28</sup> From a letter of Lord De L'Isle and Dudley, the present owner of Penshurst, to Mr G. Scharf, I extract the note that there "of antique sculpture a great collection once existed belonging to the second Earl, but with many other things has long since passed away." THE SECOND EARL OF LEICESTER, Robert Sidney (A. D. 1595—1616), was the father of

other notices confirm this evidence. The accomplished LUCY, COUNTESS OF BEDFORD, of whom Ben Jonson sang, one of the most distinguished ladies of the Court of the first Stuarts, had likewise laid claim to Roe's services, that he might enrich her collection of coins during his stay at Constantinople; and in the year 1626 the sorely pestered diplomatist was able to send her tidings that her wishes had been fulfilled<sup>29</sup>. Nay, so early as the year 1617 mention is made of antique heads in the possession of SIR MICHAEL DORMER. These were coveted after the owner's death by other connoisseurs<sup>30</sup>, and when in the autumn of A.D. 1616 LORD ROOS quitted England for ever, "he gave the Earl of Arundel all the statues he brought out of Italy, at one clap"<sup>31</sup>—so much better than any one else did the Earl seem entitled to the possession of such treasures. It is presumably also to be attributed to the example of Lord Arundel that KING CHARLES I. likewise collected antiques, besides forming his wonderful picture-gallery. Before his accession he had added to the modest beginnings made by Prince Henry, by purchases of his own, and as a matter of course he had no lack of presents<sup>32</sup>. Now, however, in the year 1628, we see the king likewise turning his eyes to Greece. He had let Roe go unmolested, but now turned to account the presence in the Archipelago of his admiral Sir Kenelm Digby, in order to get antiques collected for himself in those regions.

Algernon Sidney and of Waller's Sacharissa. I find neither in Collin and Blencowe, *Sidney Papers*, nor in Ewald, *Life of Algernon Sidney*, any mention of those antiques.

<sup>29</sup> Appendix No. 12. The Countess was already dead in the following year. With respect to her cf. L. Aikin, *Memoirs of the Court of James I.* i. p. 211. Wiffen, *Memoirs of the House of Russell*, London, 1833, II. p. 106, 117.

<sup>30</sup> Chamberlain to Carleton, 1617, Apr. 19 (Birch, *James I.* II. p. 6).

<sup>31</sup> Chamberlain to Carleton, 1616, Oct. 12 (Birch, I. p. 428).

<sup>32</sup> In the *Catalogue of Charles I.'s Collection*, p. 17 No. 69, p. 181 No. 8, antiques are mentioned, which the King had bought when prince. He had brought with him from Spain a statue of Faustina (p. 181 No. 9) which he had obtained on the well-known journey for a bride. Others he had bought when King (p. 25 No. 25, p. 26 No. 27) or had received as presents "of the young Heriott's widow, at his decease" (p. 12 No. 10, p. 23 No. 14) or from Lord Cottington (p. 23 No. 12, pp. 28, &c.), probably modern through-out.

*Peacham's  
"Compleat  
Gentle-  
man."*

14. Very characteristic of the contrast between these beginnings of English collections and those of the continent is the distinction laid down by Henry Peacham, a scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, in the second edition of his *Compleat Gentleman* (A.D. 1634), a survey of all that is best worth knowing for a gentleman<sup>83</sup>. In Italy, he observes, the antiques are certainly the most beautiful, but owing to the strict ordinances against their exportation very difficult to secure. "But in Greece and other parts of the Grand Signiors Dominions (where sometime there were more Statues standing than men living, so much had Art out-stripped Nature in those dayes) they may be had for digging and carrying. For by reason of the barbarous religion of the Turks, which alloweth not the likenesse or representation of any living thing, they haue been for the most part buried in ruines or broken to peeces; so that it is a hard matter to light upon any there, that are not headlesse and lame, yet most of them venerable for antiquitye and elegancy. And here I cannot but with much reverence, mention the every way Right honourable Thomas Howard Lord high Marshall of England, as great for his noble Patronage of Arts and ancient learning, as for his birth and place. To whose liberrall charges and magnificence this angle of the world oweth the first sight of Greeke and Romane Statues, with whose admired presence he began to honour the Gardens and Galleries of Arundel-House about twentie yeeres agoe, and hath ever since continued to transplant old Greece into England. King Charles also ever since his comming to the Crowne, hath amply testified a Royall liking of ancient statues, by causing a whole army of old forraine Emperours, Captaines, and Senators all at once to land on his coasts, to come and doe him homage, and attend him in his palaces of Saint James, and Sommerset house. A great part of

<sup>83</sup> The passage, which is in chapter XII. *Of Antiquities*, pp. 107, 108, is wanting in the first edition of A.D. 1622. Peacham was tutor to the Earl

of Arundel's children, whom he attended into the Low Countries (Walpole, *Anecd., Catal. of Engravers* under the year 1637).

these belonged to the late Duke of Mantua: and some of the Old Greeke marble-bases, columnes, and altars were brought from the ruines of Apollo's Temple at Delos, by that noble and absolutely compleat Gentleman, Sir Kenhelme Digby, Knight<sup>84</sup>."

15. Peacham's remark about the Greek statues in question, that they are generally headless and lame, is confirmed by the condition of the remains of the Arundel collection at Oxford. Perhaps not a single statue of undoubted Greek origin among them is preserved with its original head,—but neither, in truth, can so very many statues discovered in Italy boast of this distinction. They include, however, a number of very fair draped statues, which do not, it is true, belong to the dazzling prime of Greek sculpture, yet in comparison with Roman draped figures from Italy exhibit the superiority of a fresher and more naïf treatment, and certainly deserve to be allowed the opportunity of making the most of this superiority by being better placed for exhibition. They remind the student strongly of sculptures known to be derived from Asia Minor<sup>85</sup>, and are therefore likely to belong to the collection of specimens which Petty made there. In order that he might be the better able to apply these statues to the decoration of his house, Lord Arundel had them restored, by a fairly qualified artist, to the completeness which they lacked<sup>86</sup>. At this day manifest restorations are here and there to be recognised, which are as different from Guelfi's later abominable botchings as day is from night. All the full-length statues, however, are far surpassed in value by one female

*Lord  
Arundel's  
Greek  
Sculptures.*

<sup>84</sup> In the year 1639 the French ambassador de la Haye saw in Delos a statue of Apollo, "*que les Anglais ont scide en deux, de haut en bas, pour en emporter une partie*" (*Les Voyages du Sieur Du Loir*, Paris, 1654, p. 8). Thus so early as that time the English were made answerable for all the injuries which befell antiques.

<sup>85</sup> See below, Cat., art. London, South Kensington Museum, Nos. 1, 2.

<sup>86</sup> This is vouched for by Kennedy, who is, to be sure, anything but trustworthy (*Descr. of Wilton House*, p. 14). It is, however, also confirmed by the statues themselves. Lord Arundel employed, amongst others, the sculptors Hubert le Soeur and Francesco Fanelli (Dallaway, *Anecd.* p. 230), yet they were both mainly, if not exclusively, bronze-founders.

bust, though even this is not entirely uninjured. This was the only one of the antiques belonging to Lord Arundel which the engraver Wenzel Hollar, when brought by the Earl to England and variously employed by him, found worthy of his burin<sup>37</sup>. Besides this a few Greek reliefs, especially of the sepulchral class, call for attention; these, though not of the very first rank, are nevertheless fine examples of this attractive class of sculpture.

*Increase of  
the collec-  
tion. Its  
rising  
fame.*

16. The formation of the Arundel collection was by no means brought to a close on the arrival of Petty's Greek marbles in the above-named year 1628. We even learn that immediately before the outbreak of the civil war a fresh batch of antiquities arrived<sup>38</sup>. Petty continued to be actively engaged on behalf of the Earl even after his return from the Levant. Some years later he tried hard, though in vain, to win over the mathematician John Greaves to Lord Arundel's service. This gentleman had travelled with Petty in Italy, and was then contemplating travels in the East. Petty offered him on behalf of the Earl a fixed salary of £200 a year and "such fortunes as that Lord could heap upon him," if he would accompany him (Petty) to Greece<sup>39</sup>. Notwithstanding Greaves' refusal, the idea of farther researches in Greece was not given up. The chief augmentations to the collection came, however, still from Italy, where in addition to Petty the younger Henry Vanderborcht collected for Lord Arundel. By this artist, too, the Earl caused many specimens in his collections to be drawn or engraved<sup>40</sup>; as indeed at that time access to these treasures was to all appearance made easy for artists in

<sup>37</sup> Oxford, Univ. Gall. No. 59. G. Parthey, *Wenzel Hollar*, Berlin, 1853, p. 126 No. 590; the engraving is dated A. D. 1645.

<sup>38</sup> Chandler, *Marm. Oxon.* p. 2.

<sup>39</sup> Ward, John, *The Lives of the Professors of Gresham College*, London, 1760, p. 337. Greaves was in Italy probably from A. D. 1633 to 1636; in

the year after that he was Pococke's travelling companion.

<sup>40</sup> Walpole, *Anecd.* ch. IX. (Arundel). He also states in the *Catalogue of Engravers* to the year 1631 that there was in Paris a collection of 567 engravings from objects in the Arundel collection, prepared between A. D. 1631 and 1638.

general<sup>41</sup>. Arundel House became in this way a sort of gathering-place for scholars and friends of art. The guests at Lord Arundel's house made up for any deficiency in learned culture on the part of their host<sup>42</sup>. Francis Junius, who had stayed in his service from A.D. 1620 as librarian and tutor, first to his youngest son (the ill-fated Lord Stafford) and subsequently to his grandsons<sup>43</sup>, wrote at Arundel's instance his learned work *de Pictura Veterum* (1637),—in which, singularly enough, we find no allusion to the antiques of the house. Other scholars, Cotton, Selden, Young, James, have been already mentioned. There was also no lack of distinguished visitors. In December A.D. 1628 King Charles and his Queen honoured Arundel House with a visit, on which occasion all the rooms were inspected<sup>44</sup>. Foreigners who came to London were welcome guests at Arundel House, and in their presence the Earl, who had himself lived a long time abroad, if he showed them his treasures, laid aside some of that unbending punctilious dignity which he never threw off in the presence of his own countrymen<sup>45</sup>. The latter took their revenge in all manner of sarcasms. One observed that "he was only able to buy the antiquities, never to understand them"<sup>46</sup>. Another thought it ridiculous in Lord Arundel "to give so many hundred crowns for an urn a mason would not have valued at a penny"<sup>47</sup>. "Sir Francis Bacon coming into the Earl of Arundel's garden, where there were a great number of ancient statues of naked men and women, made a stand,

<sup>41</sup> Jan de Bisschop (Episcopius) has engraved several Arundel statues in his *Signorum veterum Icones, semicenturia altera* (about A.D. 1670), after drawings of the younger Jaques de Geyn, who had travelled in England.

<sup>42</sup> This at any rate is the view of Clarendon, *Hist. of the Rebellion*, Oxf. 1849, I. p. 78.

<sup>43</sup> Tierney, *Hist. of Arundel*, II. p. 507.

<sup>44</sup> Pory to Joseph Mead, 1628, Dec.

19 (Birch, *Charles I.* I. p. 451).

<sup>45</sup> Clarendon, *Hist. of the Reb.*, I. *cit.* R. Symondes in Walpole's *Anecd.* ch. IX. (Arundel). The fame of the collection naturally extended even in foreign countries. See J. Sandrart, *Teutsche Akademie*, Nürnberg, 1675, I. p. 41.

<sup>46</sup> Clarendon, *l. cit.*

<sup>47</sup> Osborn, F., *Historical Memoirs*, in his Works, 7th ed., London, 1673, p. 497.

and as astonished cried out: The resurrection<sup>48</sup>! Strange that on Easter Sunday A.D. 1626 it was the great philosopher's own fate to close his eyes in this very house<sup>49</sup>!

*General  
view of the  
Arundel  
collection.*

17. The marbles, which are always brought forward as the most popular division of the Arundelian antiques, are said according to old catalogues to have amounted to thirty-seven statues, one hundred and twenty-eight busts, and two hundred and fifty inscribed stones, exclusive of sarcophagi, altars and fragments<sup>50</sup>. A portrait painted by Paul Vansomer in A.D. 1618 shows the Earl in the act of pointing with a stick to various statues near him<sup>51</sup>. In a much later picture by Vandyck, which represents the Earl and his Countess, there is introduced as a subsidiary figure the beautiful bronze head of the so-called Homer (more correctly of the aged Sophokles). This was one of the choicest pieces of the collection, and has since then found the place which it merits in the British Museum<sup>52</sup>. The statues were distributed over the house and garden. The busts were chiefly used for the decoration of the gallery. The inscriptions were for the most part let into the garden walls. To the sculptures are to be added two other valuable classes of objects, namely, the gems and the coins. Arundel bought Daniel Nice's cabinet, comprising examples in both these classes, for £10,000<sup>53</sup>. His collection of coins was considered quite admirable<sup>54</sup>, but the fame of the Arundel gems stood still higher. This collection comprised not less than one hundred and thirty cameos and one hundred and

<sup>48</sup> *Works of Bacon*, ed. Spedding, vii. p. 177, from Tenison's *Baconiana*, 1679.

<sup>49</sup> Spedding, *Letters and Life of Bacon*, vii. p. 550.

<sup>50</sup> Kennedy, *Descr. of Wilton House*, pp. 13—15, drawn up from papers belonging to Thomas Earl of Pembroke; after whom Dallaway, *Anecd.* p. 233. Sundry errors in their representations are corrected according to superior authorities in the following pages.

<sup>51</sup> Dallaway (*Anecd.* p. 238 note)

was acquainted with the picture in Worksop Manor. Another portrait of the Earl and Countess by the same master is in Arundel Castle (Waagen, *Treas.* III. p. 30).

<sup>52</sup> Walpole, *Anecd.* ch. IX. *ad fin.* The picture is in Arundel Castle (Waagen, *Treas.* III. p. 30).

<sup>53</sup> Evelyn to Pepys, 1689, Aug. 12.

<sup>54</sup> Clarendon, *Hist. of the Rebellion*, I. p. 78, ed. Oxon.

thirty-three intaglios. To be sure, far from all the contents of the cabinet were really antique; yet of not less artistic value, at least, than real antiques, were such master-pieces of the glyptic art of the Cinquecento as the world-renowned gem with the marriage of Cupid and Psyche, bearing the supposititious signature of an engraver, Tryphon<sup>55</sup>.

18. With respect to the antiques of KING CHARLES, which Peacham couples with Arundel's, we possess only imperfect information from the catalogue which Abr. Vanderdoort, keeper of the royal collection in Whitehall, made about the year 1639<sup>56</sup>. At Whitehall was kept the most unimportant portion of the sculptures, chiefly statuettes and busts. The catalogue never states whence they were derived; nor is it always clear whether they were antique or modern. This document is supplemented by some statistical statements in the inventories subsequently made at the instance of Parliament with a view to the sale of the collections<sup>57</sup>. According to these, there were in the residences named by Peacham (A.D. 1634), St James's and Somersct House to wit, and in their gardens, one hundred and sixty-nine statues altogether, and as many as two hundred and thirty more in the Palace of Greenwich. It is obvious that this large number of nearly four hundred statues did not consist merely of antiques. Many were undoubtedly modern works manufactured by Nicholas Stone and others for the adornment of the gardens and galleries. To some extent we can still realise the nature of the collection to our mind's eye by means of a resource hitherto overlooked. In the Royal Library at Windsor there

*King  
Charles I.'s  
collection of  
Antiquities.*

<sup>55</sup> Brunn, *Geschichte der griech. Künstler*, II. p. 635.

<sup>56</sup> *A Catalogue and Description of King Charles the First's Capital Collection of pictures, limnings, statues, bronzes, medals, and other curiosities; now first published from an Original Manuscript in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford. The whole transcribed and prepared for the press, and a great*

*part of it printed, by the late ingenious Mr Vertue, and now finished from his papers.* London, printed for W. Bathoe, 1757, 4. There are several copies (Brit. Mus. Harl. 7352); a portion of the original ms., with King Charles's notes in his own handwriting, is in the Royal Library at Windsor.

<sup>57</sup> Vertue has given extracts therefrom in his *Catalogue*.

is a book with drawings in red chalk of statues and busts which were lost in the burning of Whitehall A.D. 1698<sup>58</sup>. The great majority of these are presumably derived from Charles I.'s collection. There are drawings of sixty-four statues, of which the greater number appear to be antique, though much restored. Others are certainly modern. None of them are of the first class, but several specimens are not without interest. The genuineness of the busts, nearly two hundred in number, is far more open to suspicion. High-sounding names have been arbitrarily given to them, considerable ingenuity having been expended in their selection. All the specimens in this book maintain throughout the character of antiques or imitations of Italian origin. It may be that, as Peacham intimates, part of them were derived from the Gonzaga collection at Mantua, whence Charles, about A.D. 1629, had obtained the most valuable portion of his picture gallery<sup>59</sup>. Nothing in these drawings suggests Greek extraction. Among all the vestiges of the royal collection, I can recognise the signs of Greek origin only in a single modest monument, which is probably to be traced to Sir Kenelm's exertions on behalf of the King in the Archipelago. This is a round pedestal with a Greek inscription, from Delos, which at first stood in St James's Park, later in the gardens of Whitehall<sup>60</sup>.

*Vicissitudes of the Royal Collection after 1649.*

19. The zeal both of the King and his Earl Marshal for the collection of antiquities was brought to an unwelcome end by the outbreak of the civil war. As early as A.D. 1645 Parliament attached the Buckingham collec-

<sup>58</sup> Cf. *Archaeol. Zeitung*, 1874, p. 68. The folio volume bears the title: Drawings of Statues and Busts that were in the Palace at Whitehall before it was burnt. Preserved by Sir John Stanley, Bart., who belonged to the Lord Chamberlayne's office at the time the Palace was burnt down. (He was deputy Chamberlain.) The letterpress is Italian. Eighteen specimens are mentioned specially by name on a prefatory sheet. I shall give a

fuller account of the contents of this volume in another place.

<sup>59</sup> As to the determination of the date see Waagen, *Treasures of Art*, I. p. 7. The acquisition thus occurred during the confusion of the Mantuan War of Succession.

<sup>60</sup> *C. I. G.* 2286. Patrick Young had seen the marble in the Garden of St James's (A. D. 1633), Pridenau at Whitehall (A. D. 1676).

tion at York House. The paintings and statues were dispersed<sup>61</sup>. A similar fate presently befell the royal collection<sup>62</sup>. Only a few months after the monarch's death Parliament decreed the sale of his property, of which the works of art constituted not the least valuable part (March, A.D. 1649). Inventories were taken by a special commission. From these are taken the numerical estimates above cited. A reserve price was fixed for each work of art, and in many cases this reserve was tolerably high. A "Commodus in the habit of Hercules," a Muse, and a terminal figure, were valued at £200 apiece; a "Tiberius Caesar in the habit of a priest" at £500, a Silenus even at £600; and, as it seems, these pieces were actually sold.<sup>63</sup> The valuation of the grand total of three hundred and ninety-nine statues reached the sum of £17,989. 10s. 6d<sup>64</sup>. A large number were unfortunately dispersed. Cardinal Mazarin is reported to have bought many statues. All that is certain is that Queen Christina of Sweden purchased the choice of all the medals and jewels<sup>65</sup>. The auctions dragged on till the year 1653. It is certain however that far from all the antique sculptures were sold. Parliament itself had already from the very beginning of the sale reserved such works "as should be thought fit to be reserved for the use of the state," and delegated their

<sup>61</sup> Walpole, *Anecd.* ch. IX. (Charles I.) according to the *Journal of the Commons. Catalogue of the Collection of the Duke of Buckingham*, Lond. 1758, preface.

<sup>62</sup> For the subject generally cf. the account given in Walpole's *Anecd.* ch. IX. Cf. also *Calendar of State Papers* (Domestic), 1649, pp. 10, 70, 170.

<sup>63</sup> I borrow these values from a pre-factory sheet of the book of drawings at Windsor, cited in note 58. Walpole, too, mentions the Tiberius; Dallaway, *Anecd.* p. 232, mentions others.

<sup>64</sup> *Catalogue of King Charles I.'s Collection*, p. 7. Waagen, *Treasures*, II. p. 467.

<sup>65</sup> Lord Clarendon is the principal

authority, *Hist. of the Rebellion*, book XI. § 251 (IV. p. 547, Oxf.). He makes the above statement about Queen Christina; of Mazarin's purchases he only mentions "all the rich beds and hangings and carpets," of those of Don Alonso de Cardenas, the Spanish Ambassador, "many pictures and other precious goods." Dallaway (*Anecd.* p. 232) reports that they both bought statues also; with reference to Mazarin, he probably borrowed this from the untrustworthy Kennedy, *Description of Wilton House*, p. 18. At that time no such antique sculptures seem to have gone to Spain. Cf. Hübner, *Die ant. Bildwerke in Madrid*, Berlin, 1862, p. 8.

selection to the Council of State. Cromwell exerted himself more than any one, though not always with success, to restrain a barbarous squandering of art-treasures. Thus for instance, on the 13th of February, A.D. 1651, the surveyor of the works, Mr Carter, was directed "to take care to bring twelve statues from James House to be placed in the garden of Whitehall, which are to be such as hee shall find to be most proper for that use." This direction was carried out, and on the 16th of April the twelve statues "worthy to be kept for their antiquity and rarity" were definitively excluded from the sale. The above-mentioned sculptures from St James's Palace also followed soon, when that building was fitted up as barracks. They were to be brought "to some other place more convenient"; "the heads with the pedestalls belonging unto them may be sent into the gallerie in Whitehall to stand there until the Trustees [for sale of the late King's goods] shall make sale of them<sup>66</sup>." In fact they underwent such a sale in the same year 1651; but Cromwell prevented their delivery to the purchasers, who after his death laid a complaint before the Council of State; we do not know with what result<sup>67</sup>. At any rate an important part of the sculptures remained in Whitehall, which was, as is well known, the usual residence of the Protector in his last years. These sculptures formed, we can tell, the nucleus of the royal collection of antiques after the Restoration; for some of the statues included in the inventories for the sale of King Charles's property reappear among the drawings of the above-mentioned book in the Library at Windsor<sup>68</sup>. It is however evident from this latter that the collection also

<sup>66</sup> The documents concerning the transaction in the Record Office have been published by W. Noel Sainsbury, in *The Fine Arts Quarterly Review*, I. 1863, p. 166; cf. now too *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic)*, 1651, pp. 45, 78, 151, 202, 218, 243, 252, 257.

<sup>67</sup> Walpole, *l. cit.*

<sup>68</sup> The *Catalogue of King Charles I.'s Collection*, p. 7 (Waagen, *Treasures*, II. p. 467), brings nine statues into special prominence; three of which (Nos. 3, 6, 8) recur amongst the drawings, two (Nos. 1, 7) were modern copies in bronze.

received sundry additions under Charles II., through the agency of the painter Sir Peter Lely<sup>69</sup>. On the other hand, it is not clear how it comes about that those drawings comprise almost twice as many specimens as the "list of the Statues in Marble and Figures in Brass, in Whitehall," which Will. Chiffinch, of the King's bedchamber, had drawn up for James II.<sup>70</sup> This list is, at least apparently, official. While it enumerates only twenty-eight groups and statues, one hundred and six busts and one relief, the book contains sixty-four groups and statues and one hundred and ninety-six busts; moreover the numbers attached to the several drawings seem to indicate that the collection altogether contained more specimens than are shown in the extant drawings. Since, as is well known, a very considerable part of the picture gallery of Charles I. was also brought together again after the Restoration, it is clear that the halls and galleries of Whitehall will have contained a very fine collection of art-treasures so long as it continued to be the luxurious residence of the court of the two last Stuarts. Yet it fell out as though this creation of the dynasty of the Stuarts had been destined not to outlive their fall. All that grandeur perished on the disastrous night of the 4th of January, A.D. 1698, when a fearful fire destroyed the whole palace except Inigo Jones's Banqueting Hall<sup>71</sup>. Sundry sculptures were rescued and stolen in the general confusion. This was the case with a crouching Venus which had been purchased by Lely; four years later however it was found and recovered by the Crown<sup>72</sup>. But

<sup>69</sup> On fol. 26 there is a lead-pencil note to No. 88, a crouching Venus, "bought by Lilly the Painter, with several other his Ma<sup>s</sup> rarities." Note 72, 121.

<sup>70</sup> *A Catalogue of the Collection of Pictures, &c., belonging to King James the Second.* London, W. Bathoe, 1758, p. 101. The print has been made from a copy of Vertue's; the original manuscript is in the British Museum, *Cod. Harl.* 1890.

<sup>71</sup> Evelyn, *Diary*, 1698, Jan. 5. Macaulay, *History of England*, ch. XXIII. The equanimity with which King William took the loss is shown by a letter to Heinsius of the 7/17 Jan. (old and new style) 1698 in Ranke's *Englische Geschichte*, IX. p. 212, 2nd ed.

<sup>72</sup> Walpole, *l. cit.* She is to be found in Chiffinch, p. 108 No. 1356; among the drawings at Windsor on fol. 26 No. 88 (see above, note 69) as "Elena di Troia." A very beautiful

the collection of Charles I. as a whole was utterly and irretrievably lost.

*The Arundel collection during the Revolution.*

20. The Arundel collection fared somewhat better. The Earl Marshal had quitted England for ever A.D. 1641, and died soon afterwards (A.D. 1646) at Padua. A valuable portion of his collections, the gems and jewels, had previously been taken to Holland for safety<sup>73</sup>. By the Earl's will all his goods were left to his Countess Alatheia to be at her own disposal absolutely, the greatest part of them having been purchased with her money<sup>74</sup>. Most uncomfortable relations subsisting between the mother and her eldest son Henry Frederick, the new Earl, are said to have brought about a partial breaking-up of the collections, yet this is by no means certain<sup>75</sup>. Again, it is not clear whether the antiques were divided at once or rather after the death of the old Countess<sup>76</sup>. One share fell to the mother's favourite, her younger son, William Howard, Viscount Stafford, and was removed to Tart Hall, a house situated in the neighbourhood of Buckingham Gate, which the Countess had had built for her A.D. 1638 by Nich. Stone<sup>77</sup>. This part of the collection remained there until A.D. 1720, when after the death of Henry, Earl of Stafford, eldest son of the hapless Viscount, all the contents were sold by auction. On this occasion Dr Mead purchased the above-mentioned bronze head of "Homer." Works in marble appear by the sale-catalogues not to have been included in this portion of the property<sup>78</sup>. In any case the majority of the sculp-

relief of King Charles's collection is the magnificent cameo with the portrait of the Emperor Claudius in Windsor (Fortnum in the *Archæologia* XLV. pl. 1).

<sup>73</sup> Evelyn, *Letter to S. Pepys*, 1689, Aug. 12, mentions Amsterdam; Walpole, *Anecd.* ch. IX. (Arundel), Antwerp. Pictures also were sent there. See Causton, *The Howard Papers*, p. 56.

<sup>74</sup> Tierney, *Hist. of Arundel*, II. p. 503. The will is published in Howard, Ch., *Historical Anecdotes*, London, 1769.

<sup>75</sup> Evelyn, *l. cit.*, but Tierney, *l. cit.*, contradicts him.

<sup>76</sup> Walpole, *l. cit.* Dallaway, *Anecd.* p. 234.

<sup>77</sup> Walpole, *Anecd.* ch. VIII. (Stone).

<sup>78</sup> Walpole, *Anecd.* ch. IX. (Arundel), had seen a printed catalogue, which was miserably drawn up, with the prices, in the possession of Mr West; he states the amount of the proceeds at £6,535; Dallaway, *Anecd.* p. 239, *Of Statuary*, p. 284, mentions, after Howard's *Historical Anecdotes*, £8,852. 11s., and gives the several

tures, as indeed of the antiques generally, remained in Arundel House as the heritage of the eldest son. There fresh dangers threatened them. For by order of Parliament the entire property of the Arundel family was laid under attachment, A.D. 1651, and, just as in the case of the king's collections, an inventory of the "severall goodes, picktures, and statues at Arundell House in the Strand" was prepared. Indeed, owing to "the recusancy of Alatheia, late Countesse Dowager of Arundell and Surrey," the proposal of sale was again raised two years after her death (A.D. 1656), and to some extent at least was carried out<sup>79</sup>. However, to all appearance only pictures were dealt with by this measure; the antiques most likely suffered damage through insufficient supervision on the part of the owner and negligence on that of his personal attendants rather than by direct measures of the government<sup>80</sup>.

21. By the time that the Restoration had put an end to the insecurity of personal property, the Earl Henry Frederick had died (A.D. 1652). His eldest son, Thomas Howard, who was reinstated by Charles II. in the old family dignity of the Duchy of Norfolk (A.D. 1662), resided as a lunatic at Padua, where he died (A.D. 1677). The care of the family property consequently devolved upon the second son, Henry Howard, whom his father had already regarded as his future heir and successor<sup>81</sup>. To his charge then Arundel House with its costly collections was entrusted. But he had nothing in common with the artistic interests of his grandfather. The derangement of the property and family circumstances explain his paying no heed to a proposal<sup>82</sup>, which came from a thoroughly friendly quarter, to make the statues known to the world by an illustrated

*The neglect thereof.  
The inscriptions presented to Oxford.*

classes; for example, Jewels and Curiosities £2,467. 7s. 10d., Medals £50. 10s. 6d.

<sup>79</sup> See Sainsbury, W. Noel, in *The Fine Arts Quarterly Review*, I. 1863, p. 168, "Extracts from the Documents of the Record Office."

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Edw. Browne's *Journal*,

1664, March 1, in Brit. Mus. Sloane MS. 1906 (Causton, *The Howard Papers*, p. 143).

<sup>81</sup> Causton, *The Howard Papers*, p. 63.

<sup>82</sup> Evelyn, in letter to Henry Howard, of Norfolk, 1667, Aug. 4.

publication. The carelessness with which the venerable relics were allowed to perish was inexcusable, nay absolutely criminal. The inscriptions, which Selden's book had made especially famous, were "miserably neglected and scattered up and down about the garden and other parts of Arundel House, exceedingly impaired by the corrosive air of London<sup>83</sup>". Many were destroyed, others stolen; indeed they were so little regarded that on the repair of the house they were used as building material! In this way the upper half of the very valuable *Marmor Parium* disappeared in a chimney of the palace, and it would have been utterly lost to the learned world had not the diligence of Selden and his friends discovered it betimes<sup>84</sup>. The heir behaved with equal carelessness with respect to the famous library of his ancestors, "suffering the priests and everybody to carry away and dispose of what they pleas'd, so that abundance of rare things were irrevocably gone<sup>85</sup>." Under such circumstances it was a veritable deliverance that an old friend of the family, John Evelyn, used his influence with the owner to such purpose that he assigned his treasures to safe hands, more, it is true, in indifference to their value than from high-minded liberality. In the year 1667 the library was at Evelyn's instance presented to the Royal Society<sup>86</sup>, which had not long before been founded. The presentation of the marbles to the University of Oxford followed. They comprised "all those stones, coins, altars, &c., and whatever had inscriptions on them, that were not statues," inclusive of the slabs let into the garden walls<sup>87</sup>. This collection had once consisted of two hundred and fifty inscribed stones. But of these only one hundred and thirty-six arrived at Oxford<sup>88</sup>. The remainder had been lost in those few decades! The

<sup>83</sup> Evelyn, *Diary*, 1667, Sept. 19, and in the letter quoted.

<sup>84</sup> Prideaux, *Marmora Oxoniensia*, Oxf. 1676, preface.

<sup>85</sup> Evelyn, *Diary*, 1678, Aug. 29.

<sup>86</sup> Evelyn, *Diary*, 1667, Jan. 9, Mar. 4, 1678, Aug. 29.

<sup>87</sup> Evelyn, in letter to H. Howard, 1667, Aug. 4. *Diary*, 1667, Sept. 19, Oct. 8, 17, 25.

<sup>88</sup> Prideaux, *l. cit.*

University did not fail to bestow academic honours on the giver of the donation as well as on Evelyn who had suggested it. The marbles themselves retained the honourable name of *Marmora Arundeliana*. Yet even there they at first found only partial protection, "inserted in the walls that compass the area of the [Sheldonian] theatre<sup>89</sup>." It was no sufficient amends for this treatment that the University had them edited afresh by one of her scholars in a folio volume, which was dedicated to Lord Henry Howard<sup>90</sup>. It was not until a much later period that the stones were brought out of the open air into a room in the neighbouring Schools, where they lay for a long time promiscuously in utter disorder, until at last most of them were built into the walls; others, quite separated from their old companions, must to this day be sought in a damp basement room of the Ashmolean Museum, which lies near the Schools. The various collections which especially belong to this Museum were presented to the University ten years later than the Arundelian marbles.

22. The donation of the inscriptions was only the beginning of the dispersion of the collections of Arundel House<sup>91</sup>. In the year 1678 Lord Henry, now 6th Duke of Norfolk and Earl Marshal, resolved to pull down the old family seat with a view to the laying out of streets (Arundel Street, Norfolk Street, Surrey Street) and the erection of dwelling-houses on the land. A part only of the garden next the river was reserved for the site of the new ducal palace (Norfolk House). The antiques were now got rid

*Dispersion  
of the whole  
collection.*

<sup>89</sup> Evelyn, *Diary*, 1669, July 7—15. H. Howard had already received the degree of D.C.L. on June 5, A.D. 1668 (Wood, *Fasti*, II. p. 303).

<sup>90</sup> *Marmora Oxoniensia, ex Arundellianis, Seldonianis aliisque confata. Rec. et expl. Humphridus Prideaux.* Oxf. 1676, fol. The book comprises besides 14 inscriptions bequeathed by J. Selden or presented by sundry benefactors. A gift also of the well-known Oriental traveller George Wheler was soon added (A.D. 1683).

<sup>91</sup> Most of the details of the following account are taken from a letter from James Theobald to Lord Willoughby de Parham, P.S.A., 1757, May 10, which is copied in Howard, Ch., *Historical Anecdotes of some of the Howard family*, London, 1769, pp. 91—110. On this point cf. Walpole, *Anecd.* ch. IX. (Arundel). Kennedy, *Description of Wilton House*, p. xv. Dallaway, *Anecd.* p. 236. Causton, *Howard Papers*, pp. 176, 189.

of, probably all the more recklessly that by the following year the Duke went to reside for a long time out of England, in consequence of the measures taken by Parliament after the Popish Plot<sup>92</sup>. As no purchaser came forward for the whole quantity, a partition began. The majority of the busts, together with a number of statues and bas-reliefs, which had adorned the gallery, were bought by Thomas, Earl of Pembroke. We do not know accurately when this purchase was made. A few of the statues were appropriated after the Duke's death (A.D. 1684) by his widow, whose second husband, Col. Maxwell, wanted four years later to have them sold by auction; but the new Duke protested against this<sup>93</sup>. The remainder were at first brought over into the reserved part of the garden, partly under a colonnade which was situated there. Yet the emptying of the house was carried on with such remissness, that broken statues and sarcophagi, remnants of the Arundel collection, were found ten years later in the cellars of the newly-built houses in Norfolk Street. The statues under the colonnade fared ill indeed. "When the workmen began to build next the Strand, in order to prevent incroachments, a cross wall was built to separate the ground let to building from that reserved for the family mansion; and many of the workmen, to save the expense of carrying away the rubbish, threw it over this cross wall, where it fell upon the colonnade, and at last by its weight broke it down, and falling on the statues, &c. placed there broke several of them." In spite of this sad mishap a purchaser was found for the greater part in the year 1691<sup>94</sup>, in the person of Sir William Fermor, afterwards Lord Lempster. He had them brought to his country seat, Easton Neston, near Towcester, Northamptonshire. The purchase money

<sup>92</sup> Causton, *l. cit.* p. 202, quotes Pennant as follows: "During the madness of the popish plot, the statues were buried: the mob would have mistaken them for popish saints." May not there be some confusion

here with the facts to be next mentioned?

<sup>93</sup> Causton, *l. cit.* p. 269, quotes to this effect the *Journals of the House of Lords*, XIV. pp. 105, 106.

<sup>94</sup> Evelyn, *Diary*, 1691, Mar. 21.

was extremely small, being only £300; but the Duke's want of cash was so pressing, that he did not hesitate to close the bargain<sup>95</sup>. Of the remainder a few broken statues were given by the Duke to a servant of the family named Boyder Cuper, who used them for the decoration of a pleasure-ground which he kept, called Cuper's or Cupid's Gardens, in Lambeth, opposite Somerset House<sup>96</sup>. Here they subsequently (A.D. 1717) attracted the attention of two lovers of art, John Freeman Cook, of Fawley Court, Henley on Thames, and Edmond Waller (of the poet's family), of Beaconsfield. These gentlemen bought the specimens for £75, divided them between themselves, and conveyed them to the two places mentioned. Lastly, whatever statues and fragments remained in the gardens of Arundel House after these repeated dispersals, the Duke of Norfolk had removed across the Thames to a piece of ground at Kennington which he held on lease. In this situation the marbles were gradually buried under deep layers of rubbish intended to protect the ground from the inundations of the neighbouring river. After a considerable lapse of time, when houses were being built on that site, several of these specimens were again brought into the light of day. This was their second disinterment, their first having been from the soil of Greece. They then passed into the possession of that famous lover of art, Lord

<sup>95</sup> With respect to the Duke's want of cash, see Causton, *l. cit.* pp. 238, 246. Walpole, Horace, *Anecd.* ch. ix. (Arundel), and Howard, Henry, *Family Memorials*, 1836, p. 41, ascribe the sale to the Duchess, who was in need of money. She was, according to their own testimony (Causton, p. 238), not in England at all till the autumn of A. D. 1691; still the matter is not free from doubt (see *ibidem*, p. 260).

<sup>96</sup> Cunningham, *Handbook of London*, 1850, p. 150. The garden no longer exists; see Horace Walpole's letter to Montague, 1746, June 24 (*Letters*, ed. Cunningham, II. p. 32).

According to Dallaway, *Of Statuary*, p. 282 note n, "the marbles placed in Cuper's Garden were drawn and engraved for the last edition of Aubrey's *Antiquities of Surrey*." I am only acquainted with the edition of 1719, which contains no such engravings. Smith (*Nollekens*, II. p. 201) mentions etchings of several of the Arundelian fragments given in Nichols, *History of Lambeth*. Cf. also Ince, No. 64. In the year 1854 W. P. Williams Freeman, Esq., presented to the British Museum a statue (Graeco-Roman Sculp. No. 9) said to have been formerly in the Arundel collection (*Synopsis*, 63rd ed., 1856, p. 88).

Burlington, who had them brought to Chiswick. Indeed at Lord Petre's suggestion a regular excavation was made, in the course of which there were "discovered six statues, without heads or arms, lying close to each other, some of colossal size, the drapery of which was thought to be exceeding fine." These torsi were removed to Worksop Manor, the seat of the Duke of Norfolk, where they probably perished in the great fire of A.D. 1761<sup>97</sup>. Other specimens were dispersed at other times. One fragment of a pillar actually came to be used as a roller for Mr Theobald's bowling-green at Waltham Place, Berkshire. *Sic transit gloria mundi.*

*The coins  
and gems.*

23. Thus the marbles of the first collection of antiques in England were scattered to the winds—an example and a warning of the insecurity which attaches to such property when in private hands. It fared no better with the other departments of the collection. "The coins and medals came into the possession of Thomas Earl of Winchelsea, and in A.D. 1696 were sold by his executors to Mr Thomas Hall<sup>98</sup>." It is not known what became of them subsequently. The fortunes of the celebrated collection of gems were particularly strange. It had with the exception of a few pieces remained in its original condition<sup>99</sup>. When the Duke of Norfolk, after scandalous litigation which extended over many years, obtained in A.D. 1700 a divorce from his wife Lady Mary Mordaunt, she kept as security for her claims on the Duke, according to the terms agreed to between the parties, "a box of jewels of great value which had belonged to the old Duke<sup>100</sup>," that is to say about two hundred and

<sup>97</sup> Causton, *Howard Papers*, p. 324, where it is also said "The statues of the Arundel collection have been preserved to memory by the etchings of Dr Ducarel."

<sup>98</sup> Walpole, *Anecd.* ch. ix. (Arundel). Earl Thomas is not meant, for he was dead by A.D. 1639, but his son, John Heneage, 3rd Earl, who died A.D. 1689. Besides this another

collection of coins belonging in A.D. 1719 to the Earl of Winchelsea, at that time Heneage, the 5th Earl, is mentioned by Haym, *Tesoro Britannico*, 1719, I. p. xi.

<sup>99</sup> Walpole, *l. cit.*, Story-Maskelyne, *The Marlborough Gems*, 1870, pref.

<sup>100</sup> Luttrell, *Diary*, iv. p. 622.

fifty cameos and intaglios of either antique or Renaissance workmanship. As the Duke died in the following year without having yet discharged his obligations, Lady Mary treated the gems as her own property and bequeathed them A.D. 1705 to her second husband Sir John Germain. He in turn left them to his second wife Lady Elizabeth Berkeley, who in A.D. 1762 presented them as a wedding gift to her great-niece Lady Mary Beauclerk, on the occasion of her marriage with Lord Charles Spencer. Lastly this lady made over the costly collection to her brother-in-law George Spencer, 3rd Duke of Marlborough, in accordance with a family arrangement. Thus the old Arundel collection, after having passed in the course of time through so many hands, formed the nucleus of the famous Marlborough gems. These were transferred, so recently as the year 1875, into the possession of Mr Broomielow, of Manchester, and are now kept at his country seat of Battlesden in the neighbourhood of Woburn.

24. We must however return to the marbles. The portion which Lord Lempster had bought and taken to Easton Neston was here visited by a melancholy fate. The purchaser's son Lord Thomas, afterwards first EARL OF POMFRET, having been in Rome, conceived the unhappy idea of having the statues, which in truth had suffered severely, restored in the Italian manner. He therefore engaged a scholar of Camillo Rusconi, one Guelfi, whom Lord Burlington had brought over to England about A.D. 1714, to do the work. It could not easily have been entrusted to more unfortunate hands. Great as has been the blundering perpetrated in all quarters in the shape of so-called "restorations," yet hardly ever have any antiques been so shamefully tampered with as in the tasteless additions made by this shallow botcher. Even subsequently the protection afforded to the marbles was very insufficient, as we learn from a description by George Vertue, who paid the house a visit probably in A.D. 1734. The small statues

*The Pomfret marbles.*

and busts fared best. These, as for instance the so-called "Marius," were employed for the adornment of the hall and staircase of the house. A large number of the sculptures were set out along the garden front of the house, or in the various parts of the garden itself, and so once more exposed to all the decaying influence of the damp climate<sup>101</sup>. No wonder if the traces of such gross negligence are but too manifest at the present day. Special attention was here aroused by the "Tomb of Germanicus," that is to say, a very ordinary Roman sarcophagus, on which had once stood in Arundel House a genuine or supposed bust of that Prince found in Ankyra<sup>102</sup>, and which now retained its silly name though a small statue of Jupiter had succeeded to the place of the bust in question. The majority, however, were contained in a conservatory "full of statues, busts, bassorilievos, urns, altars, crammed full, and lying confusedly as if it was the shop of a statuary!" Here stood in one corner the supposed Cicero "with his handkerchief in his right hand," in another the colossal Minerva, against the walls a number of other statues, with fragments of bas-reliefs scattered about over the floor, &c. &c. The impression conveyed is effectively described by the young Horace Walpole: "in an old green-house is a wonderful fine statue of Tully haranguing a numerous assembly of decayed emperors, vestal virgins with new noses, Colossus's, Venus's, headless carcases and carcaseless heads, pieces of tombs, and hieroglyphics<sup>103</sup>." The gardener and housekeeper, the usual

<sup>101</sup> *A Description of Easton Neston in Northamptonshire, the seat of the Right Hon. the Earl of Pomfret*, printed as an appendix to the *Catalogue of the Collection of the Duke of Buckingham*, London, Bathoe, 1758, pp. 53—59. The time of the visit seems to follow from the enumeration of Vertue's travels in Horace Walpole's *Anecdotes* (Vertue).

<sup>102</sup> Chandler, R., *Marmora Oxoniensis*, p. vii. No. CL.

<sup>103</sup> Walpole to G. Montague, 1736, May 20. Cf. the same to H. Mann, 1753, July 21: "The Cicero is fine and celebrated; the Marius I think still finer. The rest are Scipios, Cincinnatuses, and the Lord knows who, which have lost more of their little value than of their false pretensions by living out of doors; and there is a green-house full of colossal fragments."<sup>7</sup>

*ciceroni* for English art-collections, were able to tell Vertue the high prices which would be asked for some of the figures. No wonder, if such a curious kind of sculpture-gallery had really been taken for a shop! But at least the fate of dispersal was spared to this portion of the Arundel collection. For when after the death of the Earl of Pomfret his son and successor, being deeply in debt, was obliged to sell the furniture of Easton Neston, the Countess dowager Henrietta-Louisa bought the statues and presented them to the University of Oxford (A.D. 1755). The chief portion of the Arundel sculptures were thus once more brought together with the inscribed stones of the same collection<sup>104</sup>. The University did honour to the donor in a solemn *actus*, of which Horace Walpole has again given us an ironical description<sup>105</sup>; and made provision for a handsome publication by the learned Hellenist, Richard Chandler<sup>106</sup>, of its collection of antiques as thus enriched. The sculptures themselves, however, remained in the Schools for more than a century in a confusion similar to that at Easton Neston. Now at least they are disencumbered from Guelfi's restorations, and for the most part arranged. Only, however, by far the smallest number of specimens are in the well-lighted ground-floor rooms of the magnificent University galleries; most can only be found after wearisome search in the gloomy cellars of this palatial building, even into their darkest recesses. We hope that this is the last stage of ill-treatment which the famous Arundel marbles have had to suffer, and that for them there may even yet be at some time a day of final resurrection.

<sup>104</sup> Walpole to H. Mann, 1755, March 10. In Easton Neston there remains a memorial of the sculptures in the wall-paintings of the staircase by Sir James Thornhill, who has introduced a number of the antiques of the Pomfret collection in his series of pictures illustrating the history of Diocletian.

<sup>105</sup> Walpole to H. Mann, 1756, July

24. Cf. 1762, Jan. 4, on the wish of the Countess to be buried in Oxford: —“I dare say she has treasured up some idea of the Countess Matilda, that gave St Peter his patrimony.”

<sup>106</sup> *Marmora Oxoniensia*, Oxford, 1763, fol. Here Guelfi's abominable restorations have been immortalised. It is only quite lately that they have been done away with.

Thomas,  
Lord  
Pembroke.

25. In this respect it fared best with that section of the Arundel marbles which had come into the possession of Lord Pembroke. To the love of art, by which more than one member of the Herbert family has distinguished himself, Wilton House bears conspicuous testimony. William, the first Earl, had Holbein for his adviser with respect to the building of his mansion in place of the ancient abbey. Philip, the fourth Earl, likewise employed Inigo Jones as architect, and was the most distinguished patron of Vanduyck. He laid the foundation of the noble picture-gallery. We have before observed (p. 20) from a casual remark of Lord Arundel's that he also turned his attention to antiques. The Grand Duke of Tuscany, who had been his guest for three weeks at Wilton House, is said to have made him a present of some statues<sup>107</sup>. But THOMAS HERBERT, EIGHTH EARL OF PEMBROKE (*succ.* A.D. 1683), was the real founder of the collection of sculptures, which equally with the picture-gallery constitutes at this day the fame of Wilton House; he also spared no pains or expense to form a very rich cabinet of medals<sup>108</sup>. He can in this respect be designated as the most distinguished imitator of Lord Arundel in this early period. He too, like Lord Arundel, knew Italy from personal observation. He seems to have acquired the basis of his collection of antiques by the purchase of the sculptures in the gallery of Arundel House. It consisted chiefly though not exclusively of busts. For these Lord Pembroke, like many collectors of that time, had a particular enthusiasm. He found a great satisfaction in seeing himself surrounded by the great men of old in effigy, in the same manner as his walls were crowded with

<sup>107</sup> I find this notice in Volkmann, *Neueste Reisen durch England*, Leipzig, 1781, i. p. 482, without being able to trace its origin. Of the two works named therein one (Wilton No. 70) is certainly derived from the Mazarin collection; about the other, a Flora, I cannot ascertain anything. The whole account is very suspicious.

Evelyn, who was in 1654 at Wilton, only mentions "the court and fountaine of the stables adorn'd with the [antique?] Caesar's heads" (*Diary*, 1654, July 20).

<sup>108</sup> *Ædes Pembrockianæ*, London, 1774, p. 93. *Numismata Pembrockiana*, 1746, 4.

the portraits of illustrious members of the family and other contemporaries. To satisfy that predilection, he was, it is true, liberal in bestowing great names upon busts impossible really to identify. This characteristic of the Earl is found also in the most celebrated bust-collector of Rome, Cardinal Alessandro Albani, who could not bear a bust to be nameless, and on account of his eagerness in christening unknown heads was occasionally designated by Winckelmann as "the audacious priest" (*kecker Pfarrerherr*)<sup>109</sup>. "An ancient virtuoso," remarks Horace Walpole<sup>110</sup>, "indeed would be a little surprised to find so many of his acquaintances new baptized. Earl Thomas did not, like the Popes, convert Pagan chiefs into Christian; but many an emperor acts the part at Wilton of scarcer Caesars." And yet even this is not the worst. A great part of these high-sounding names are bestowed upon works manifestly of the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries; for perhaps no other collection in England is so well supplied with false antiques as that in Wilton House.

26. The eighteenth century was destined to bring important accessions to the collection, above all by the purchase of a great part of the Mazarin cabinet. Strange to say, Lord Arundel's name was connected with these sculptures too. He had once, that is to say, helped Cardinal Richelieu with advice and practical aid in the collection, in Italy and especially in Rome, of his much-admired gallery of sculptures. The Earl Marshal had, it is said, given the Cardinal the opportunity of buying a whole palace in Rome, the antiques from which the latter forthwith had conveyed to Paris, and had moreover given him information as to about eighty busts in different parts of Italy<sup>111</sup>. After Richelieu's death (A.D. 1642) the sculptures out of the *Palais Cardinal*, which was subsequently, as is well known, the *Palais Royal*, came

*The  
Mazarin  
collection.*

<sup>109</sup> Winckelmann, letter to Muzel-Stosch, 1760, Jan. 5.

<sup>110</sup> *Anecdotes* (Vertue).

<sup>111</sup> Kennedy, *Description of Wilton House*, p. xvii.

into the possession of his successor Cardinal Mazarin. He made additions to them by further important purchases in Rome, and employed them all for the adornment of the neighbouring *Palais Mazarin* newly built by him<sup>112</sup>. Nearly four hundred sculptures were here altogether. Among these were about one hundred and sixty statues and more than two hundred busts, the latter mostly provided with modern drapery of costly variegated kinds of marble, and placed on correspondingly rich pedestals. Among the heads themselves there were indeed very many modern works. The lower gallery of the palace as well as the adjoining rooms were filled exclusively with sculptures, while the gallery on the first floor was furnished with statues only in the niches, but for the rest was chiefly adorned with pictures and other works of art. The whole was regarded as one of the greatest sights of Paris, as the *merveille de la France*. Yet the fortunes of the collection were hardly less varied than those of the contemporary English collections. During the war of the Fronde, when Mazarin was obliged to leave Paris and even France for a time, a part of the sculptures was sold and dispersed (A.D. 1652); but so great was the dread inspired by the all-powerful minister, that after his return all his scattered property was delivered up to him again. When the Cardinal died in A.D. 1661 the antiques were valued at 150,000 livres. They fell in equal shares, as did the whole palace, to the Duc de Mazarin with his wife, a niece of the Cardinal's, and her brother the Duc de Nevers. The former, a rough and half-crazy man who lived in a perpetual state of quarrel with his wife, took advantage of the absence of the co-heiress to enter the gallery one fine morning armed with a large hammer, and to belabour the undressed statues in a fit of pretended

<sup>112</sup> For the Mazarin collection cf. *Inventaire de tous les meubles du Cardinal Mazarin. Dressé en 1653* [by J. Bapt. Colbert] et publié d'après l'original conservé dans les archives de Condé [by Henri d'Orléans, duc

d'Aumale]. London 1861. H. Sauval, *Histoire et Recherches des Antiquités de la ville de Paris*, Paris 1724, II. pp. 175—177 (written about 1654). Laborde, *le Palais Mazarin*, Paris 1846, p. 185, note 68.

prudery; not content with this, and regardless of all remonstrance, he returned in the evening with five or six attendants all armed in like fashion, and carried on his crack-brained work of destruction till midnight. Whatever was naked, male or female, fell a victim to his mad fury, and he only allowed the draped figures and busts to remain. This happened in the year 1670<sup>113</sup>. The scandalous event made the greatest sensation in Paris. However, the misfortune had occurred and could not be undone. It was not in the least lessened, but only relegated to the region of the comic, by the nude statues being "frosted" in a sort of drapery of plaster of Paris, just as the Pope's sense of decency a hundred years later enveloped the Aphrodite of Knidos in a cloak of tin. For a long time the antiques in the Palais Mazarin continued to stand in that ridiculous disguise. In this state the well-known naturalist, Dr Martin Lister, saw them in A.D. 1698, and the sight elicited from him some ironical remarks<sup>114</sup>. Subsequently, perhaps when the palace was purchased by the *Compagnie des Indes* and became the show place of John Law's bubble company, Lord Pembroke secured a large portion of the sculptures, while the rest remained in the palace up to the time of the French Revolution<sup>115</sup>. The Earl had here too made the busts his chief object, purchasing them to the number of fifty-two with their costly variegated marble pedestals. But his predilection furnished most of them with new names. Even at the present day busts of this origin at Wilton House can for the most part be recognised with tolerable certainty, but still more unmistakable evidence of their source is borne by the statues derived from the Mazarin collection, some of them still furnished with the numbers they originally bore there, in the hammer-marks

<sup>113</sup> *Mélange curieux des meilleures pièces attribuées à Mr. de Saint-Evremond*, 3rd edition, Amsterdam 1726, II. pp. 272, 307.

<sup>114</sup> *A Journey to Paris in the year 1698*, London 1699, p. 29.

<sup>115</sup> Blondel, *Architecte française*, Paris 1754, III. p. 71. It appears to have given a *catalogue raisonné*, cf. Kennedy, *Description of Wilton House*, p. xii.

with which their nude parts are disfigured. Some reliefs also were bought by Lord Pembroke at the same time.

*The  
Antiques  
in  
Wilton  
House.*

27. Lastly the Earl completed his gallery by the purchase of single pieces. When the Giustiniani family of Rome began to sell the antiques of their superabundantly rich collection, which was estimated at thirteen hundred pieces, Pembroke was among the buyers, along with the most distinguished of the antiquaries of Rome, Cardinal Alessandro Albani. Some few busts were contributed by the collection of sculptures belonging to the honourable but then lately impoverished family of Valetta in Naples, which was sold A.D. 1720, it is said, for 1100 ducats<sup>116</sup>. One of these acquisitions was the very effective bust bearing the arbitrary name of Apollonios of Tyana (Wilton No. 94), for which was paid the high price of £270. Sir Andrew Fountaine, a friend of Lord Pembroke, brought with him from Italy a rare specimen, a mosaic relief (No. 27), clearly a modern counterfeit, but in any case a great curiosity, worthy to shine amongst the other treasures of Wilton House<sup>117</sup>. All these works were distributed over the halls, galleries, saloons and rooms of the spacious mansion, and provided the favourite amusement of the owner. Unfortunately the Earl was not satisfied with christening and re-christening the statues and busts on labels placed on the pedestals, or in catalogues, but often the newly forged names were chiselled into the monuments themselves, sometimes in Latin, sometimes in extremely questionable Greek. This has even been done in the case of a cinerary urn, which its inscription would authenticate as that of Horace! It was another ingenuous development of this taste to ascribe pieces of middling decorative sculpture to artists of high renown, as for instance Kleomenes<sup>118</sup>, or to assign to a work

<sup>116</sup> There seems to have been a catalogue of the collection by Fabretti, v. Kennedy, *l. cit.* p. xviii., cf. Justi, *Winckelmann*, II. 2 p. 392.

<sup>117</sup> Winckelmann, *Werke*, III. p. xxxiii., Dresden. Engelmann, *Rhein*.

*Museum*, XXIX. 1874, p. 561 &c. In Wilton House there are two busts of Sir Andrew, by Roubiliac and by Hoare.

<sup>118</sup> Wilton Nos. 10. 124. 151. 170. The popularity of this name was

the most fabulous origin without having found any palpable support for it<sup>119</sup>. Earl Thomas himself left notices of this kind, and the year before he died at the age of seventy-eight (A.D. 1732), there appeared the first printed catalogue, which has been followed by a whole series of works of a similar description<sup>120</sup>. Thus the fame won by the Pembroke collection soon extended far beyond the boundaries of England, and was maintained undiminished even when other collections had in truth outstripped it, not only in the artistic value of their contents but in comparative freedom from the intermixture of spurious antiques. Even at this day the collection of Wilton House exercises a peculiar charm. Recently it has been arranged with great taste after the design of the late Westmacott in the cloister-like galleries round the square court of the mansion. Though this favourable impression fades a little on a closer examination of the numerous antiques, yet there is amongst them a small number of works which are of unusual interest and which will always hold their own.

28. The Royal collection, the Arundel collection, and the beginnings of the Pembroke collection were the chief evidences of English interest in antiques during the time of the Stuarts. The first was annihilated by fire before the century came to its close. The second passed out of the possession of the family into many strange hands. The third alone has been preserved by a more propitious fortune uninjured to this day. Besides these, but meagre records of similar efforts have been handed down from the seventeenth century. SIR PETER LELY, for instance, in addition to his celebrated collection of pictures, many of

*P. Lely,  
Lord Win-  
chelsea,  
Lord  
Carteret,  
J. Kemp.*

due to the Venus de' Medici. To illustrate the *naïveté* of such christenings, Kennedy's effusion (p. xxx.) is peculiarly apposite: "Among the best pieces of sculpture relating to the Romans may be reckoned that by Cleomenes, of Curtius leaping into the fiery gulph" [No. 87, a modern relief]. "This sculptor was one of the most eminent of his time, and

was sent from Corinth to Rome by Polybius, the celebrated Historian, to execute this work"! Winkelmann was quite right to ask why Polybius might not rather have sent Kleomenes straight to Wilton (*Werke*, III. p. vi.).

<sup>119</sup> Wilton No. 144.

<sup>120</sup> For a list, see below, Cat., art. Wilton House (introduction).

which came from the Buckingham and Arundel collections, possessed a few antiques which were sold with the above-mentioned objects of art in A.D. 1682<sup>121</sup>. Another collector was JOHN HENEAGE, THIRD EARL OF WINCHELSEA, who, as we saw above (p. 38), secured the coins and medals of the Arundel collection. When ambassador to the Porte, he took advantage of a stay at Athens (A.D. 1675) to purchase a few sculptures<sup>122</sup>. Soon after his death (A.D. 1689), his collections, either in whole or part, were sold (A.D. 1696)<sup>123</sup>. Interest in art was also kept up in other members of his family. His second son Heneage, later fifth Earl, visited the cabinet of one Jean Gailhard, at Angers, A.D. 1676. This he saw again at Paris seven years afterwards, then considerably increased. Indeed this collection came to England, not however into the possession of the nobleman just mentioned, but into that of GEORGE, FIRST BARON CARTERET, who in consideration thereof settled an annuity of £200 on its collector, his former governor. Lord Carteret died A.D. 1695, and during the minority of his son John, afterwards Earl of Granville, JOHN KEMP, F.R.S., bought a considerable portion of the collection, and enlarged it by other purchases<sup>124</sup>. Kemp's cabinet, at that time one of the curiosities of London, comprised a number of marbles, to wit eleven statues, but almost all of them under two feet in height, besides twenty busts, sixteen reliefs and a remarkable number of inscriptions. These specimens were with few exceptions derived from Italy. The principal portion of the antiques, however, consisted of the small bronzes, among which were sixty-three statuettes, which at that time gained

<sup>121</sup> *A Catalogue of Sir Peter Lely's capital Collection of Pictures, Statues, Bronzes, &c.*, as an appendix of the *Collection of the Duke of Buckingham*, London, Bathoe, 1758. Of antiques only a statue of Apollo and two heads are specified (p. 52); a crouching Venus of which Episcopius knew as existing in his house (*Signorum Veterum Icones* Plate 77) passed into the royal collection, see above, note 69. The

auction took place 1682, see Walpole *Anecd.* ch. xii. (Lely).

<sup>122</sup> Spon, *Voyage d'Italie &c.*, Lyons, 1678, II. p. 187.

<sup>123</sup> See above, note 98.

<sup>124</sup> MS. note of the learned Thomas Birch (*d.* A.D. 1766) in his copy of the *Monumenta Kempiana*, now in the British Museum. In reference to Lord Winchelsea, cf. Dallaway, *Of Statuary*, p. 164, note *m.*

for the collection considerable fame. A year after Lord Stafford's share of the Arundel collection at Tart Hall had been sold, the Kemp collection too came under the hammer (March, A. D. 1721). It was described by R. Ainsworth in an extraordinary catalogue. The sum realised by it was one thousand and ninety pounds eight shillings and sixpence<sup>125</sup>.

29. Among the purchasers at these sales we come *Dr Mead*. across DR RICHARD MEAD, the most celebrated physician of his time, already at that period Vice-President of the Royal Society, and afterwards physician in ordinary to George II. He was born A. D. 1673, and received his early training from the renowned Graevius of Utrecht. He made a journey to Italy in the years 1695 and 1696, which took him to Florence, Rome, and Naples. This tour was not merely turned to account for the benefit of his medical studies, but was also utilized for laying the foundation of a collection of antiques<sup>126</sup>. Of this, the most extensive part consisted of coins and gems. There were, however, nine especially valuable fragments of antique mural paintings, six of which most probably came from the Baths of Titus<sup>127</sup>. Antique works of this class are, it need not be said, very rare, and it is consequently only natural that Mead should have set a high value on this acquisition; for his credit's sake we will hope that it was not he who authorized the wretched re-painting which so sorely disfigures the extant

<sup>125</sup> *Monumenta Vetustatis Kempiana et vetustis scriptoribus illustrata eosque vicissim illustrantia*. London, 1720. The sum is stated by Birch, *l. cit.*

<sup>126</sup> *Museum Meadianum*, London (1754). The first part, the coins, was sold by auction in February; the second, the antique and modern works of art together with natural curiosities, in March, 1755. There is a copy in the British Museum with a list of the buyers and the prices, from which I have taken a portion of the above account. Cf. also Walpole to R. Bentley, 1755, March 27.

<sup>127</sup> *Mus. Mead.* pp. 241—243. Seven of them can be traced, viz. in Bartoli, *Picturae antiquae cryptarum Romanarum, &c. delin. a Petro Sancti Bartholi, illustr. a Bellorio et Causseo*, Rome, 1750, pl. 3, 5, 6, and Turnbull, *Curious Collection of Ancient Paintings*, London, 1744, pl. 3, 26, 29, 30. The two last are now in the British Museum; of the others two passed to Mr White (still in the possession of Sir M. White Ridley in London), two to Mr Stewart, one to Mr Hollis, one to Mr Muscell, the ninth (Turnbull 3) was in the first instance excluded from the sale.

remains. Especially numerous again in Mead's collection were the small bronzes, which are proportionally less costly and more easily moveable than larger specimens, and at the same time present the advantage of offering opportunity for the display of much erudition. Still there was no lack of works in marble, to wit, three statues, various reliefs, many of which were decidedly spurious, and a fair quantity of busts. The crown of the collection was without question the Arundel bronze head of 'Homer' (Sophokles), which Mead had purchased at the auction in Tart Hall. Lastly there were, as an excellent supplement of the highest value to the above-mentioned fragments of painting, one hundred and sixty copies of antique pictures which had been discovered at Rome, executed by the artistic hand of Pietro Sante Bartoli. They had originally belonged to Cardinal Massimi. Mead set such a peculiarly high value on these drawings, that he bequeathed them in his will, together with one of the original antique paintings, to be preserved as heirlooms in the family. His intentions, it is true, produced no lasting effect, for the drawings at least appear to have been soon afterward purchased by George III., and are to this day in the Royal Library at Windsor.<sup>128</sup>

Soon after Mead's death (A.D. 1753), the remainder of his collection was sold by public auction (A.D. 1755). The Earl of Exeter secured the bronze head for one hundred and thirty guineas, and a few years afterwards bequeathed it to the British Museum, thus at last placing it in safe hands. Subsequently a few of the antique paintings found their way to the same destination. Sir Philip Methuen

<sup>128</sup> The volume at Windsor, furnished with George I.'s stamp and the arms of the Vittoria family (*Arch. Zeitung*, 1874, p. 67, XXII.), belonged originally to "Don Vincenzo Vittoria, Canonico di Xativa nel regno di Valenza," yet the painted title-page proceeds jointly from Cardinal Massimi, who had been nuncio in Spain for

some time, and from P. Sante Bartoli. The contents are in agreement with the accounts in *Mus. Mead.* p. 212 and in Turnbull, *Coll. of Anc. Paintings*, p. 5, note 3, p. 9. There are now indeed only somewhere over one hundred and forty drawings remaining, but a few sheets are wanting.

purchased a bronze head of Silenus. By a singular chance, two remarkable terminal busts with inscriptions, one the portrait of Theophrastos, and one purporting to be that of Xenokrates—were bought for Cardinal Albani, and after a brief interval made the return journey to Rome, where they had once adorned<sup>129</sup> the Palazzo Massimi alle colonne. The majority of purchasers however were English. Their number affords clear evidence how widely spread was the taste for collecting antiques about the middle of the last century, especially for collecting small works of art. We shall come across many of the names again (Lord Leicester, Lord Carlisle, Marquis of Rockingham, Lord Egremont, Lord Cavendish, Horace Walpole, Hollis and Brand, Lyde Browne); others I have not again met with in connection with these researches. This may be said of some of the most eager bidders, such as General Campbell, Captain Bootle, Mr Mussell, Mr Stewart, &c. It is only the first-named whom I find again; namely at the sale (A.D. 1742) of the Earl of Oxford's collection, which is of little importance as to antiques. Here he figures as the purchaser of a marble bust of Alexander the Great<sup>130</sup>. Might not this possibly be the beautiful bust at Blenheim?

30. Small bronzes also made up the principal portion of the collection of CONYERS MIDDLETON, which this scholar, who is especially known as the biographer of Cicero, had formed during his residence in Italy about A.D. 1724. Besides statuettes, there were in particular all sorts of utensils, lamps, sacrificial and culinary implements, to which his attention was chiefly turned. He devoted to their explanation a special volume furnished with illustrations (A.D. 1745). Shortly before, he had sold the whole collection to Horace Walpole, who subsequently exhibited them at

*Conyers  
Middleton.  
Collectors  
of coins.  
Courten.  
Hans  
Sloane.*

<sup>129</sup> Visconti, *Iconogr. grecque*, i. pp. 259, 307, Mil. Cf. Spon, *Voyage d'Italie*, i. p. 396. Winckelmann, *Mon. Ined.* i. p. 77. The "Xenokrates"

is now in Munich (Glypt. no. 155).

<sup>130</sup> *A Catalogue of the Collection of the Rt. Hon. Edward, Earl of Oxford.* Sold by auction, March, 1741-42. 4to.

Strawberry Hill<sup>131</sup>. But the most widely-spread form of the passion for antiques was that for ancient coins. Haym, the meritorious editor of the *Tesoro Britannico*, enumerated about A.D. 1720 seventeen considerable collections of coins in England<sup>132</sup>. A larger or smaller collection of coins was also rarely wanting in that very favourite kind of 'museum' which mixed up in motley confusion all possible curiosities from the realms of nature and art. The Ashmolean Museum in Oxford affords an example of this to the present day. The germ of this institution was the oldest cabinet of the kind, formed by the two Tradescants, father and son. Of a similar character was WILLIAM COURTEN'S museum (Charleton's)<sup>133</sup>, "perhaps the most noble collection of natural and artificial curiosities, of ancient [especially Roman] and modern coins and medals that any private person in the world enjoys<sup>134</sup>." "It consisted of minatures, drawings, shells, insects, medailles, natural things, animals, minerals, precious stones, vessels, curiosities in amber, christal, achat, &c.<sup>135</sup>." The bare enumeration of all 'these glories dazes one.' And yet the collection has every claim to our respect. For after it had been made over by the founder (A.D. 1702) to DR HANS SLOANE, the later physician in ordinary to George I., and more and more materially increased by him (so that the "antiquities of Egypt, Greece, Etruria, Rome, Britain and even America" filled several ground-floor rooms of his house in Chelsea), it passed immediately after Sloane's death (A.D. 1753) into the possession of the State for the sum of twenty thousand pounds, and constituted, with the Harleian Manuscripts and the Cottonian Library, one of the foundation stones of the

<sup>131</sup> Middleton, Conyers, *Germana quaedam antiquitatis eruditae monumenta, quibus Romanorum veterum varii ritus illustrantur*. London, 1745, 4to. Walpole to Mann, 1744, June 18. Cf. below, note 172.

<sup>132</sup> *Tesoro Brit.* I. p. xi., II. p. v. On coin-collectors of the 17th century, see Evelyn, in letter to S. Pepys,

1689, Aug. 12.

<sup>133</sup> Edwards, *Lives of the Founders of the British Museum*, I. p. 264.

<sup>134</sup> Thoresby, *Diary*, 1695, May 24. Cf. Evelyn, *Diary*, 1690, March 11.

<sup>135</sup> Evelyn, *Diary*, 1686, Dec. 16. Cf. also his letter to Pepys, quoted in note 132.

British Museum<sup>136</sup>. At that time the number of medals and coins amounted to thirty-two thousand, of "antiquities" to one thousand one hundred and twenty-five, of cameos and intaglios to about seven hundred. Two apartments in Montagu House, the first home of the Museum, sufficed for the accommodation of this portion of the newly-formed national collection. Nowadays the Sloane antiques are utterly overwhelmed by the immense riches of the department of antiquities; but it must never be forgotten that the wish expressed by Sir Hans in his will, gave occasion for the founding of the grandest museum in the world, and that his example pointed out the right way of rescuing costly collections, brought together with trouble and expense, from the vicissitudes of private possession.

31. The last-named collectors belonged principally to the rank of commoners, and had for the most part themselves formed their cabinets when travelling in foreign countries. There was however in the first decades of the last century no lack of nobles to follow, although in relatively modest guise, the example of Arundel and Pembroke. Horace Walpole<sup>137</sup> mentions by the side of the latter, as a collector of coins and statues in the time of Queen Anne, the DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE. He probably means William, the first Duke, who died A.D. 1707. He was much engaged in travel, and enjoyed the reputation of a connoisseur in art and poet; he too it was who raised the splendid mansion of Chatsworth. Love for art indeed was at one time quite domiciled in his family. A grandson of the said Duke, Lord Charles Cavendish, was one of the original trustees of the British Museum<sup>138</sup>, and his great-grandson William, fourth Duke, a son-in-law of Lord Burlington, the oracle on art in the time of George I., joined the Society of Dilettanti soon after its foundation<sup>139</sup>. Meantime the

*The Duke  
of Devon-  
shire.*

<sup>136</sup> Edwards, *l. cit.*, I. p. 273. *ad init.*

*Gentl. Mag.* XVIII. (1743) p. 302.

<sup>137</sup> *Anecd. of Painting*, ch. XVI.

<sup>138</sup> Edwards, *l. cit.* I. p. 321.

<sup>139</sup> 1740, Febr. 1. *Historical*

passion for collecting seems to have turned in the main more towards modern art, and in the sphere of antiques, more towards engraved gems than sculptures<sup>140</sup>. It has already been mentioned that EDWARD HARLEY, SECOND EARL OF OXFORD, possessed several sculptures; they were however quite subordinate to the treasures of the well-known Harleian library, which he zealously increased. Of more importance for our study is another group of noblemen who travelled and collected for themselves in Italy. These find their more appropriate place in the next section.

*Notices of the Society of Dilettanti*, London, 1855, p. 117. Winckelmann, *Gesch. d. Kunst*, VII. 2, 17, mentions a bronze head of Plato which it seems likely that the Duke of Devonshire had got over from Greece about thirty years before (that is to say about 1730); this would refer to the second

or third Duke, who died respectively A.D. 1729 and A.D. 1755, unless Winckelmann was thinking (A. D. 1762) of the then living Duke, the fourth.

<sup>140</sup> See below, Cat., arts. Chatsworth, and London, Devonshire House.

## II.

### THE GOLDEN AGE OF CLASSIC DILETTANTISM.

#### ROME AND ENGLAND.

32. AS early as the sixteenth century it was quite usual for Englishmen to go to Italy in pursuit of the higher culture. The flourishing universities of Bologna and Padua were regarded by the British lovers of learning as the proper high school, particularly for the students of Law and Medicine; and the youth of the nobility was not slow to improve its manners in the chief towns of Italy—or to corrupt them according to the opinion of the stricter sort, who were never tired of descanting upon the ruinous influence of Hesperian licentiousness, or of quoting the proverb ‘*Inglese italianato è un diavolo incarnato*<sup>141</sup>.’ English language and poetry were, like English music, under the special influence of Italy. It is therefore all the more remarkable that neither in the works of the poets nor of the moralists, to whom the subject would have been so appropriate, do we find even the smallest allusions to the master-pieces of antique art, which were scattered in such profuse abundance throughout the whole of the peninsula and concentrated in particular at Rome. We can only

*Travels to  
the South  
in the time  
of the  
Stuarts.*

<sup>141</sup> My friend and colleague, Prof. B. ten Brink, refers me to Roger Ascham's *Schoolmaster*, written A. D. 1563 (*The English Works of R. A.*, London, 1761, p. 245—261), and to William Harrison's *Description of*

*England*, 2d ed. 1587, book 2, ch. 3 and 5 (pp. 81, 129, ed. Furnivall). Ascham betrays in another place (*Works*, p. 394) an interest in antique coins.

suppose that the eyes of the young Briton of that day were not yet open to them; that to his Northern nature the peculiar excellences of ancient sculpture were still a sealed book.

In the seventeenth century it was different. Lord Arundel gave the lead, in the sense of being the first who visited Italy for nothing so much as for her art treasures. From the diary of John Evelyn, whom Lord Arundel himself when on his death-bed provided with the necessary hints, we are introduced in a lively manner to the pursuits of a well-educated gentleman, who lets slip no opportunity of gaining that personal knowledge of the remains of ancient beauty, which Peacham had already reckoned among the essentials of his complete gentleman. George Wheler's description of the journey to Greece and the Levant which he took in company with Jacob Spon of Lyons (A.D. 1675—1676), has, together with the work of his then travelling companion, the charm and the value of a first journey of exploration in a land at that time almost unknown. Towards the close of the century the number rose greatly of those who visited the south for the sake of art, and brought home some memento or other of their travels. Lord Pembroke, Lord Lempster, the Duke of Devonshire, and Dr Mead may be mentioned here once more as instances of this growing habit.

*The  
fashion of  
the 'grand  
tour.'*

*Sir A.  
Fountaine.*

*Lord  
Burling-  
ton.*

33. The idea, however, that 'the grand tour,' through the continental countries, particularly France and Italy, was the necessary complement to a refined training and gave it a final polish, and that art was an essential element in this higher culture, does not appear to have been very generally realised before the beginning of the eighteenth century. The travellers naturally found Rome the most agreeable rendezvous, and the English soon formed the chief contingent in that international society, which there took part in the *conversazioni* of native learned men and friends of art, and which allowed itself to be initiated into the

wonders of the Eternal City in a shorter or longer time, by obliging *ciceroni*, like Francesco de' Ficoroni (*d.* A.D. 1747)<sup>142</sup>. Purchases of pictures and antiquities were perpetually made, extravagant or modest according to the means and inclination of individuals. The result was that the English gradually attained the first rank among purchasers of art-treasures. The conviction of their inexhaustible wealth thus gained by practical experience overcame in the natives all prejudices aroused by the heresy and habits of life of their northern guests. The treasures they had collected were used by the English gentlemen to adorn the beautiful country-houses scattered over the country, and more than one traveller after his return enjoyed on the strength of the information picked up in Italy the reputation of a distinguished connoisseur, or even of an infallible oracle in matters of good taste and art. The advice of SIR ANDREW FOUNTAINE (A.D. 1675—1753), who travelled in Italy at the beginning of the century and who interested himself particularly in ancient coins, was eagerly sought by collectors at home<sup>143</sup>; thus we have already found him concerned in the formation of the Pembroke Collection. The position which RICHARD BOYLE, EARL OF BURLINGTON (A.D. 1695—1753), the patron of Will. Kent, Geo. Vertue, and other artists, occupied after his return from Italy as an authority on architectural matters is well known, though every one does not agree to the almost unqualified encomium of Horace Walpole<sup>144</sup>. In the garden of his villa at Chiswick, which he built himself, and which eventually became the property of his son-in-law, the Duke of Devon-

<sup>142</sup> Ficoroni himself mentions some of his English acquaintances, *Le Vestigia e Rarità di Roma Antica*, Rom. 1744, preface. With respect to Ficoroni, whose name is inseparably connected with the noblest creation of antique draughtsmanship, the bronze cista of the Collegio Romano, cf. Justi, C., in Lützow's *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, VII. (1872) p. 302. I

have to thank this scholar for the communication of several extracts from Ficoroni's unpublished correspondence.

<sup>143</sup> Ficoroni, *Vestigia*, p. 98, Haym, *Tesoro Britannico*, I. p. xi., Justi in the *Neues rhein. Museum*, XXIX. (1874) p. 582.

<sup>144</sup> Walpole, *Anecd.* ch. XXII. (Burlington, Kent).

shire, stood several ancient statues, which had been found in the villa of Hadrian at Tivoli<sup>145</sup>. In his town mansion, the stately Burlington House, the Elgin marbles were later to find a temporary home. The present use of the site for the head-quarters of the most prominent societies who have devoted themselves to the nurture of art and antiquities in England, ensures the perpetuation of Lord Burlington's name in a manner most appropriate to the interests he had at heart.

*Th. Coke  
(Lord  
Leicester.)*

34. A younger contemporary of Lord Burlington was MR THOMAS COKE (A. D. 1728 LORD LOVEL, A. D. 1744 EARL OF LEICESTER), who spent a long period in Italy, and of whose travels a number of interesting details are to be gathered from an account-book kept by one of his servants, which is now preserved in the library at Holkham<sup>146</sup>. In this we find in the broadest contrast items for kitchen purposes, tailor, &c. side by side with *pour-boires* for seeing collections, travelling expenses, payments for art purchases, &c. Mr Coke was absent from England from A. D. 1714 to A. D. 1718, travelling in France and Germany as well as Italy. He was at Rome in the year 1716, and again the following year after an excursion to Florence and Pisa. He had dealings with the above-mentioned antiquary Ficoroni, a needy fellow, of whom drawings from antique gems could be occasionally bought for a few crowns. There occurs even more frequently the name of Francesco Sante Bartoli, son of the celebrated engraver Pietro: and no inconsiderable number of copies from ancient paintings, which form a conspicuous feature in the library at Holkham, may be traced to the artistic hands of the two Bartoli. The 'Cavaliere' Coke, as he was called in Italy, was diligent in having sketches made

<sup>145</sup> Volkmann, *Neueste Reisen durch England*, Leipz. 1781, II. p. 440. Cf. above, § 22.

<sup>146</sup> For the opportunity of examining this volume I have to thank the

Reverend Alexander Napier of Holkham, who had discovered this very interesting document in the library (of Holkham) entrusted to his care.

of other antiques, statues, busts, &c. ; and he was so fortunate as to obtain for fifty crowns a book of drawings, which are partly executed by no less a person than the great Raphael himself. Lastly, however, Mr Coke obtained possession of a small number of original works in marble of more remarkable artistic character than anything that had hitherto been brought from Italy to England. In some of these transactions he employed as agent William Kent, who afterwards designed for him the plan of Holkham Hall. Among these works are : The Artemis from the Casa Consiglieri, which cost nine hundred crowns<sup>147</sup>; the so-called Lucius Antonius, which was restored in a masterly manner by Bernini ; and the so-called Zeus, to which Kent intended to give a place of honour on the staircase of the new mansion<sup>148</sup>. All these are objects which would suffice to adorn any museum, and which must have aroused double admiration before the still brighter splendour of Lord Leicester's later acquisitions put them somewhat in the shade.

The warm interest for antiquity, which Mr Coke brought home with him from Italy, was however in the mean time to be splendidly illustrated in another way. Among the autographical treasures that he obtained was an exhaustive work, in manuscript, by Thomas Dempster, a Scotchman who had died almost one hundred years before (A.D. 1625) while working as a professor at Bologna. It was an extraordinarily industrious and learned compilation of every sort of information about Etruria and the Etruscans. Coke not only had this work printed in Florence in two large folio volumes, but further had sketches made of all the Etruscan works of art that were within his reach, and then had them engraved on ninety-three copper plates.

<sup>147</sup> See below, Cat., art. Holkham, no. 24. "Purchased and sent out of Rome by the Earl of Leicester; for which offence his Lordship was put under arrest, but released soon after at the instances of the Grand Duke of

Tuscany." So Mr Brettingham tells us in his work on Holkham; to the same effect Dallaway, *Anecd.* p. 276; the statements in the account-book contain no confirmation of the story.

<sup>148</sup> Holkham, no. 36, 51.

He further induced a friend from Florence, the excellent and learned senator Filippo Buonarroti, to add to the work an appendix containing observations of solid value<sup>149</sup>. The book thus produced (through Coke's liberality) has acquired a heightened interest inasmuch as it has been the innocent cause of that foolish Etruscomania which prevailed for many years in Italy—a startling example of the length to which that people can be led by misdirected local patriotism in conjunction with confused, uncritical learning.

*Lord Carlisle, Lord Bessborough, Duke of Beaufort.*

35. At the same time that Mr Coke was in Italy, Ficoroni had the opportunity of making the acquaintance of HENRY HOWARD, afterwards FOURTH EARL OF CARLISLE (A. D. 1694—1758), a connection of the Howards of Arundel and Norfolk, and of making him familiar with the antiquities of Rome (A. D. 1717). Later (A. D. 1739) he looked with pride on this pupil of his, who then surpassed his former teacher in knowledge<sup>150</sup>. The vast Castle Howard, one of Vanbrugh's ponderous creations, which the third Earl had begun, and Earl Henry finished, still contains a very heterogeneous collection, the foundation of which was laid in Italy by Earl Henry at the time of which we speak. This collection includes few objects of real consequence, and illustrates by the number of its portrait-busts, particularly those of imperial Roman times, the prevailing tendency of antiquarian interest in that period. It will however always possess a certain importance on account of the number and variety of its antiques, a number afterwards increased by art-loving successors of the first collector.

The fate of the collection founded by WILLIAM PONSONBY, VISCOUNT DUNCANNON, later SECOND EARL

<sup>149</sup> *Thomæ Dempsteri de Etruria Regali libri VII., nunc primum editi curante Thoma Coke Magnæ Britanniae armigero*, II. fol. Flor. 1723, 1724. The text was ready for the press as early as A. D. 1719, but Buonarroti's supplement delayed the appearance of the second volume until

the year 1726. For the *Etruscheria*, cf. Justi, *Winkelmann*, II. 1, pp. 245—249, 267—270.

<sup>150</sup> According to a letter of Ficoroni; cf. his *Vestigia*, p. 132. A characteristic anecdote relating to the year 1739 is told by Walpole in a letter to R. West, 1740, May 7.