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The original intention of this study was to survey the entire career of John Wollaston in America, 1749 through 1767, by examining the artist's work in New York, Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania and South Carolina. The plan was found to be virtually impossible for a paper of this length. Over three-hundred American portraits are attributed to Wollaston and are scattered throughout the United States, Canada and England. A critical analysis of such a large body of material to determine authenticity and chronological placement would require years of research and travel and result in a manuscript well beyond the scope of a master's thesis.

For this reason the essential design for the project was modified by confining research to several aspects of Wollaston's sojourn to America. The result is a body of materials which relate to his career rather than define it in every area. In a few important instances new facts and ideas have been discovered which add significantly to information already known about the artist's life. The primary concern, however, has been to explore one period of his American career, that in Virginia, in order to illustrate the nature and extent of his painting and his influence as a major artist in the American colonies.

Many gaps remain in our knowledge of Wollaston's sojourn to America. Rather than ignore these missing links I have attempted to
introduce them within the context of the paper. In recognizing these problems it is hoped that scholars in the field of American painting will be made aware of the need to reappraise Wollaston's activity in every area of the colonies and his contributions to portrait art in this country prior to the Revolution.

In dealing with paintings, especially colonial American paintings, the results or conclusions reached are often independent of documented material. That is, absolute designations and attributions are difficult to come by if one is to depend on written documents alone, for all too few of the latter exist. With Wollaston this situation is further complicated because he rarely signed his paintings. Thorough examination of a painting by laboratory techniques such as x-ray photography, black light, and microscopy becomes increasingly important when documented evidence is lacking. These tools have been helpful in analyzing portraits attributed to Wollaston. Unfortunately, such facilities were not available in every museum or institution housing his portraits, and analysis then relied upon stylistic characteristics that were visible to the eye.

It must be noted that careful examination of every portrait referred to in the study was impossible. Photographs and other types of reproductions were consulted in cases where portraits could not be located, no longer survived, or were in other ways inaccessible to the author.

Biographical information relating to Wollaston with some exception has been gathered and checked from previously published articles.

The discussion of Wollaston's activity in Virginia relies heavily on primary sources, the portraits as they exist, and unpublished manuscript materials. Surviving documents of each sitter's family and descendants were researched when possible for any mention of the artist and the particular portraits involved. As it turned out, references to Wollaston in such materials were few although the portraits were sometimes mentioned in wills and inventories. A considerable amount of research was devoted to ownership histories and genealogical relationships between the various families where groups of portraits by the artist have survived. Thus, it has been possible to suggest a chronological and geographical history of Wollaston's work in the colony of Virginia.

The final consideration of the artist's stylistic development is based on comparative analysis. The paper includes a chapter on the artist's style and development as based on recently discovered paintings and research. Previous studies of the artist, as cited before, established Wollaston as a practitioner of the Rococo style and disregarded any comparative analysis of his early work in England which relates more closely to the Baroque style. This writer has included numerous comparisons which illustrate that Wollaston borrowed both from the Baroque
and Rococo. His paintings are transitional in this respect, displaying techniques and formulas from the English Baroque and Rococo portraiture he knew from his training and experience in London art circles.

Both published and unpublished materials have been used to illustrate Wollaston's growth as a portrait artist. Since the Virginia period comes during the middle of his career, it serves well as a point of comparison for his earlier works in New York, Philadelphia and Maryland and his later portraits in South Carolina and again in Pennsylvania. Information gathered through x-ray examinations of portraits executed in the various colonies has been used to help define and illustrate the painting techniques used by Wollaston. The possible origins of his portrait style and his influence on other American painters such as Benjamin West, John Greenwood and John Hesselius are shown through comparisons of portraits.

In summary, the material presented in this study should help clarify Wollaston's position as a major artist working in the eighteenth-century colonies, particularly in Virginia. It is a step towards understanding his stylistic development and his contribution to early American portraiture.

Though only one name appears as the author on the title page of the study it is really the work of the collected cooperation of many. Dr. Wayne Craven of the University of Delaware, who served as advisor for the paper, has given invaluable advice and assistance. A more general indebtedness is acknowledged to staff assembling the "Catalogue of American Portraits," National Portrait Gallery; and Frank L. Horton,
director of the Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts, who has urged and made possible the completion of this paper. I would also like to express sincere thanks to the following individuals who have helped in locating portraits or have shared previously unpublished materials: Townley McElhiney Sharpe, Doreen Bolger, Bradford Lee Rauschenberg, Virginius Hall, Robert G. Stewart, K. E. Butler, Henry Grunder, Eleanor G. Robey, Frances Follin Jones, Wendy A. Cooper, Gilbert T. Vincent, W. S. Tarlton, John Laurel Russell, Conover Hunt, William Odell, Mary Sittig, and Dr. Peter Mooz.

The generosity of Robert McNeill made possible the x-ray studies of many of the Wollaston portraits mentioned in Chapter Three. Special thanks go to the following institutions which have kindly provided photographs and additional information on large bodies of portraits: the College of William and Mary, the Virginia Historical Society, the Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum, the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, the Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts, the Frick Art Reference Library, the Newark Museum, the Brooklyn Museum, the National Portrait Gallery, the Bodleian Library (Oxford, England), the National Portrait Gallery (London, England), the Gibbes Art Gallery.

Finally, I would like to add an indebtedness to the late Dr. George C. Groce, former Wollaston scholar, whose unpublished notes were extremely helpful in preparing this paper.
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In the three sections following the Virginia portraits the entries are referred to only by their figure number as there are no catalogue entries.

**Virginia Portraits by John Wollaston**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>John Wollaston: William Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Mrs. William Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Mrs. William Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Thomas Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Mrs. Thomas Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Judith Carey Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Robert Bolling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>John Wollaston: George Braxton, III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Mrs. George Braxton, III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Colonel William Brent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Mrs. William Brent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>John Wollaston: John Carter Byrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Thomas Taylor Byrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Mrs. William Byrd, III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Charles Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Mrs. Charles Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Landon Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Mrs. Robert Carter, III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Mrs. John Chiswell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Daniel Parke Custis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIGURE</td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Mrs. Daniel Parke Custis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>John Wollaston: John Parke Custis and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Martha Dandridge Custis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Thomas Craven Hodgson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Edmund Jennings ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Commandore Augustus Keppel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Lettice Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Colonel Fielding Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Mrs. Fielding Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Colonel Warner Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Mrs. Warner Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Warner Lewis, II, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rebecca Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Mary Lightfoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>John Wollaston: William Lightfoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Unknown Man of Lightfoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Colonel David Meade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Mrs. David Meade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>John Wollaston: John Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>John Wollaston: John Page, II, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Page ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Mrs. Mann Page, II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>John Wollaston: Matthew Page ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE NUMBER

41  41  John Wollaston: Beverley Randolph ?
42  42  John Wollaston: Colonel Peter Randolph
43  43  John Wollaston: Mrs. Peter Randolph
44  44  John Wollaston: Mrs. Peter Randolph ?
45  45  John Wollaston: Peyton Randolph
46  46  John Wollaston: Mrs. Peyton Randolph
47  47  John Wollaston: Mrs. Peyton Randolph ?
48  48  John Wollaston: Elizabeth Randolph ?
49  49  John Wollaston: Anne Randolph ?
50  50  John Wollaston: Richard Randolph
51  51  John Wollaston: Richard Randolph, II
52  52  John Wollaston: Mrs. Richard Randolph, II
53  53  John Wollaston: Colonel William Randolph, II
54  54  John Wollaston: John Robinson
55  55  John Wollaston: Colonel John Tayloe, II
56  56  John Wollaston: Mrs. John Tayloe and Mary Tayloe
57  57  John Wollaston: Mrs. Anthony Walke, II
58  58  John Wollaston: Ralph Wormeley, IV
59  59  John Wollaston: Mrs. Ralph Wormeley, IV
60  60  John Wollaston: Ralph Wormeley, V
English and Other Portraits by John Wollaston

FIGURE

61 John Wollaston: John Beale, South Carolina
62 John Wollaston: Mrs. John Beale, South Carolina
63 John Wollaston: Daniel Carroll, II, Maryland
64 John Wollaston: Thomas Gordon, Pennsylvania
65 John Wollaston: Mrs. Samuel Gouverneur, Pennsylvania
66 John Wollaston: Sir Thomas Hales, England
67 John Wollaston: Mrs. John Livingston, New York
68 John Wollaston: James Monk, England
69 John Wollaston: Staats Long Morris, New York
70 John Wollaston: Mrs. Lucy Parry, probably American
71 John Wollaston: Reverend George Whitefield in an Attitude of Preaching, England
72 John Wollaston: Unknown Family Group, unknown
73 John Wollaston: Dr. Thomas Sydenham, England
74 John Wollaston: X-ray of Thomas Gordon
75 John Wollaston: X-ray of Mrs. Samuel Gouverneur
76 John Wollaston: X-ray of Peggy Oswald Chew
77 John Wollaston: X-ray of John Beale

Portraits by English Artists of Wollaston's Period

78 Michael Dahl: Admiral Sir Cloudesley Shovell
79 Bartholomew Dandridge: The Price Family
80 Bartholomew Dandridge: Unknown Lady
81 Thomas Hudson: Sir John and Lady Pole
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FIGURE

82 Sir Godfrey Kneller: Princess Anne (Mezzotint by Smith after Kneller)
83 John B. Medina: Ann Roydhouse (Mezzotint by Smith after Medina)
84 Richard Wilson: The Maid of Honour
85 Richard Wilson: Prince Edward (Mezzotint by J. Faber after Wilson)
86 William Wissing: Princess Anne (Mezzotint by Beckett after Wissing)
87 Artist unknown: Unknown Little Girl with Doll

Portraits by American Artists Who Were Influenced by John Wollaston

88 Henry Benbridge: Mary (Polly) Gordon Thompson
89 John Greenwood: Elizabeth Moffatt
90 John Hesselius: Eleanor Calvert
91 John Hesselius: Samuel Lloyd Chew
92 John Hesselius: Mrs. Thomas Gough
93 Benjamin West: Thomas Mifflin
John Wollaston was not a great artist in the sense of England's Sir Godfrey Kneller and other distinguished members of the Royal Academy. He was a competent portrait painter, possessing certain skills and techniques, a sensitivity to color and a genius for producing charming, delightful portraits. It was Wollaston's ability to paint fanciful, decorative portraits that ultimately placed his work above that of native colonial limners who worked during the years of his sojourn. Wollaston was an Englishman, a Londoner bred and trained to the art of portraiture, and to the colonist his paintings must have seemed the epitomy of sophistication and fashion. Everywhere he traveled in the colonies, whether in cities or in rural areas, he drew a clientele of distinguished persons. A list of his subjects reads like an eighteenth-century social register. He was, in a real way, the "court painter" to the New World aristocracy.

It is not difficult to understand the widespread popularity Wollaston enjoyed in America. If anything, it was symptomatic of the cultural and artistic mood which was established before his arrival. Trade and commerce with England and other foreign markets grew tremendously in the colonies prior to 1750. With it came wealth, new class distinctions and a desire to imitate what was vogue abroad, particularly in London. The intellectual climate of eighteenth-century England centered around ideals of dignity, education and an aristocratic life.
These ideals affected every area of the arts, creating an era of cultural and artistic expression which was vital in the development of western civilization. It was not without its effect on the colonies. Although the Atlantic Ocean presented formidable gaps in communication and the exchange of ideas, many colonists, particularly those in the South, tried to maintain a lifestyle which was thoroughly English in spirit.

Most of the colonists shared a common heritage with England and it is understandable that American decorative arts of these early years followed closely the fashions then popular in the mother country. What happened in painting in America at this time is only part of the larger story of what was happening in England.

There was little competition for Wollaston when he worked in the colonies. Joseph Blackburn, another English portraitist, did not arrive until 1753 to work in New England. Wollaston had then completed his work in New York and was working in Maryland. John Smibert (1688-1751), active in Newport, Rhode Island, and Boston, Massachusetts, was sixty-one years old when Wollaston came to America. Smibert's Baroque style had by this time disintegrated into a rather plain, blunt realism which could not compare with Wollaston's new, fanciful style.

The Baroque styles of Gustavus Hesselius and Robert Feke, both working extensively in Philadelphia about the time of Wollaston's arrival in the colonies, were decidedly stiff and dull beside the more decorative portraits which Wollaston produced.

The Swiss artist Jeremiah Theus immigrated to Charleston, South
Carolina, about 1739. His portrait work was predominately in the Baroque style. Although he incorporated Rococo coloring in a number of his likenesses after 1750, Theus was never able to imbue his likenesses with either charm or grace.

Other artists of any reputation working in the colonies circa 1750 had either completed their travels there or painted in a manner either outdated or inferior to Wollaston's.

It seems, taking a retrospective view of his total production in North America, that the majority of Wollaston's paintings were done for southern families—groups of individuals with social and political status. It is a point worth considering here, and there is sufficient historical fact to suggest the reason why the artist concentrated most of his work in this geographical area.

The social and economic climate of the South changed significantly during the late seventeenth century. This dramatic change, a result of the introduction of slavery which provided the labor force, did not affect the northern colonies to any appreciable degree. In Virginia and its neighboring colonies it all but destroyed the yeoman class, that group of small planters using neither slaves nor servants for agricultural production. This poorer class of people was ultimately driven either to the frontier areas of the southern colonies or to other colonies where slaves were not the predominant work force. The South, very generally speaking, was reduced to a society of slaves and slave owners in its eastern settlements.

This situation naturally made for a kind of aristocracy that,
while not identical with, was close to that of England. Consequently, the South's wealthy class expanded during the early years of the eighteenth century, maintaining close family ties and carrying with it a definite distinction between itself and the poor or non-slave-holding class. It was a fundamentally different society from that of New York, Pennsylvania and those colonies to the north. It considered itself genteel and it built houses, dressed, and entertained accordingly.

This eighteenth-century South was surely not the London that Wollaston had known. With the exception of Charleston, South Carolina, it was not characterized by large, urban centers. It was the mood, the cultural climate of the South, which Wollaston must have found agreeable and close to that of England.

Southern planters were as discriminant and careful in their selection of household furnishings as their colonial situation allowed. Their natural inclination towards material finery was not an insignificant matter. To them, as to the London connoisseur, the arts were to be studied and understood in terms of quality and style; out of this cultivated knowledge would hopefully emerge appreciation and enjoyment of material finery. The Marquis de Chastellux, traveling in the South in 1782, made particular note of Virginia planters and their lifestyle:

The Virginians have the reputation, and rightly so, of living nobly in their homes and of being hospitable; they receive strangers both willingly and well. This is because, on the one hand, having no large towns where they can gather, they know society only through visits they make to each other .... Their houses are spacious and well ornamented .... The chief magnificence of the Virginians consists in furniture, linen and silver plate; in which they resemble our own forefathers who had no private apartments in their castles, but only a well-stored wine cellar and handsome sideboard.
Very little is known of Wollaston, the man, his personality or private life. No personal correspondence or records survive for this artist. In surveying his work one is immediately made aware of the rather jovial, pleasant attitude of the sitters. The men and women in these portraits possess a kind of contentment and pleasantness which probably express much of the artist's own feelings and character. It seems obvious from his portraits that he truly enjoyed people and painting.

The man also possessed a sense of humor, as suggested by Thomas Gordon's recollection of the artist when he wrote to his stepson, Henry Benbridge: "If you should have a Patient, as Wollaston used to call the Ladies whose pictures he drew, worth ten or twenty thousand pounds . . . by all means pay her address and marry her."²
INTRODUCTION

NOTES


CHAPTER ONE

BIOGRAPHY OF THE ARTIST

John Wollaston's early life remains a mystery in many respects. That he was the son of John Woolaston, Sr., also a portrait painter, is suggested in Horace Walpole's 1765 edition of Anecdotes of Painting in England . . . . Since this account will be referred to several times in the course of this study it is best to quote it here in full.

J. Woolaston, born in London about 1672, was a portrait-painter, and happy in Taking likenesses, but I suppose never excellent, as his price was but five guineas for a 3/4 cloth. He married the daughter of one Green, an attorney, by whom he had several children, of which one son followed his father's profession. In 1704 the father resided in Warwick Lane, and afterwards Near Covent-Garden. He died an aged man in the Charter House. Besides painting, he performed on the violin and flute, and played at the concert held at the house of that extraordinary person, Thomas Britton, the small coal-man, whose picture he twice drew, one of which portraits was purchased by Sir Hans Sloane, and is now in the British Museum. There is a mezzotint from it.

Although there is no absolute proof that the "J. Woolaston" mentioned by Walpole is our John Wollaston's father there is sufficient reason to believe it. A dated and labeled New York portrait by Wollaston substantiates his London origins by the inscription "Johannes Wollaston Londoniensis." In addition, Charles Willson Peale recalled many years later that Wollaston studied in London. Treatises of the period, similar to Walpole's, carry no mention of any other artist by the same name.
Further research of information given in Walpole's account revealed several ideas about the kind of social and economic environment young John was a part of in London. Walpole notes that Wollaston's father, who consistently spelled his name with a double o instead of a double 1, married the daughter of an attorney, played the violin and flute in concert at Thomas Britton's and died an aged man in the Charter House. All of these facts indicate that the elder Woolaston was a man of some education and more than ordinary social circumstances. Britton's concerts were well-known in London and heard by the city's gentry and elite. The Charter House, where the father died, was in the eighteenth century a home for gentlemen-at-arms.

Walpole also wrote that the family moved from Warwick Lane to near Covent Garden. The Covent Garden area before 1730 was a fashionable district and noted as a cultural center. It appears that young John was exposed to the trends and fashions of London artists at an early age.

At least two art historians have suggested 1710 as the date of Wollaston's birth. Since no document has been found to refute this suggestion and because it allows for his artistic development as a portraitist by 1733 it seems reasonable.

Wollaston's early training in painting remains controversial. Walpole indicated that the elder Woolaston was "happy in taking likenesses . . . but never excellent." It is likely that the son received his first lessons from his father. Having accomplished all the techniques that his father could teach him, young John probably moved on as a student in one of the many studios of painting then in London.
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Charles Willson Peale noted that Wollaston "... had some instructions from a noted drapery painter in London." The question remains: who was this drapery artist?

The late George C. Groce wrote that Joseph van Aken (1709-1749) was "... the best qualified drapery painter of Wollaston's time." Van Aken came to London from Antwerp and was particularly skillful in rendering silks, satins, velvets, laces and various types of carving.

However, Edward Edwards, in his *Anecdotes of Painters...*, wrote in 1754 that Peter Toms, a member of the Royal Academy and the pupil of Thomas Hudson, was unsurpassed in his rendering of draperies. Toms was often employed by Sir Joshua Reynolds and Benjamin West as a drapery artist.

It is impossible to know from available sources whether Wollaston actually studied with either of these artists. The fact is there were several other contemporary London painters recognized for their skill in rendering fabrics during these years. In the final analysis one must consider Wollaston's portrait style and its possible sources in relation to drapery painting specialists.

Peter Toms' reputation as a drapery painter and his possible connection with Wollaston is enhanced by the fact that the early portraits of Toms' famous teacher, Thomas Hudson, are similar in style and composition to Wollaston's work. Hudson's portrait of Sir John and Lady Pole, 1755, compares with Wollaston's portrait of Warner Lewis II and his sister, Rebecca (figs. 81 and 31). Both portraits show two full-length figures in a landscape, the females wearing hats and placed on the left.
The male figures, on the right in both paintings, carry walking sticks and their hats are laid on the ground beside them. The elongated fingers of Lady Pole and the drawing of her mouth and eyes are stylistically similar to Wollaston's painting of Rebecca.

Another London artist of the period whose work shows a stylistic parallel to Wollaston's is Bartholomew Dandridge. The Wollaston portrait of Mrs. Lucy Parry is very close to Dandridge's portrait of an unknown woman in the Mellon Collection (figs. 70 and 80). The poses are identical. Dandridge repeatedly used the almond eye characteristic and elongated necks in his portraits of women. These features are particularly noticeable in his painting, "The Price Family," in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (fig. 79).

The Wollaston family's move to Covent Garden, mentioned earlier, is an important event in considering Wollaston's career and training in England. Thomas Wright, a London portrait artist of some note, lived in the Covent Garden area. Wright's contribution to London painting was his role as the first instructor to Richard Wilson who later became renowned for his landscape pieces. Wilson, like his master, worked in portraiture for a number of years and also made his residence in Covent Garden. It seems reasonable that Wollaston either had some contact with Wilson and Wright or at least was aware of their portrait styles.

Wilson's early portraits are particularly close to the kind of likenesses Wollaston painted all of his life. An example for comparison is Wilson's portrait of His Royal Majesty, Prince Edward (fig. 85). The elongation of the Prince's fingers, the thickening between the
forefinger and thumb, and the shape of the eyes and forehead are akin to Wollaston's rendering in the portrait of Peyton Randolph, of Virginia (fig. 45). Wollaston painted hands in this same unnatural manner throughout his career and whenever it is found in a colonial American portrait it is considered "characteristically Wollaston." Other portrait artists working in the colonies did not paint hands in this curious manner.

The comparison between Wilson and Wollaston can be carried even further. Wilson's three-quarter length portrait, "The Maid of Honour," compares with Wollaston's likeness of Mrs. Warner Lewis (figs. 34 and 30). The Maid's right arm and hand, with two fingers extended in a casual gesture of holding the dress skirt, are identical to Mrs. Lewis's pose. The almond shape of the eyes, the elongation of the neck, the high forehead and the modeling of facial features in Wilson's portrait parallel Wollaston's treatment in the same areas.

In summary, Wollaston's portraits indicate a close association with the works of Thomas Hudson, Bartholomew Dandridge, and particularly Richard Wilson. There are too many similarities found in comparing their works to ignore the possibility of Wollaston having studied with or been acquainted with one or more of these London painters.

There are so few of Wollaston's English portraits known that it is impossible to assess in detail the early years of his career. Before this study a portrait of a little girl and dog in a landscape, signed and dated, 1736, was generally accepted as Wollaston's earliest portrait. However, the location of this painting has not been discovered by this writer and its association with Wollaston cannot be verified.
Fortunately, two earlier, signed and dated works by Wollaston have come to light. One of these paintings, of James Monk of Boston and Nova Scotia, dated 1733, deserves to be called one of the artist's finest early works (fig. 68). The companion portrait, of a lady of the same family, was apparently executed the same year. According to the present owner, the signature and date were removed from the lady's portrait when it was cleaned some years ago.

James Monk and other members of his family arrived in Boston sometime in the early 1740's and probably brought the two family paintings with them at that time. Both paintings show the typical characteristics associated with the artist's style. They lack, however, the strength and vigor which he gave to his later paintings in the colonies.

Evidently Wollaston continued to work in the London area through the late 1740's. Surviving portraits from the period are extant although two of these attributions are questionable. The New York Spectator in 1809 published two engravings of the English Divines, John Henley and Henry Grove, noting that they were copied after the original 1740 portraits by "J. Woolaston." The engravings bear no stylistic resemblance to Wollaston's early portraits. It is possible the engravings were taken after portraits by Wollaston's father who spelled his name with a double o, or they may have been copies by the younger Wollaston of earlier portraits by another artist. Unfortunately the original paintings have never been found.

The "George Whitefield in the Attitude of Preaching" is attributed to Wollaston on the basis of a mezzotint taken from the painting;
the engraving is inscribed: "John Wollaston, Jr. Pinxt, 1742" (fig. 71). One suspects that the elder Woolaston was alive at this time by the use of "Jr." after John Wollaston's name. It bears most of the characteristics associated with the son's work—almond eyes, elongated necks, and chubby hands. The format and composition of this work are unique to the entire body of Wollaston's painting and its poor quality in these areas indicates that he would never become a master of monumental compositions where several figures and their spatial relationships had to be considered. It very definitely lacks the strength of line and most other characteristics associated with the artist's other English paintings.

There are, however, signed and/or dated English portraits by Wollaston which serve as excellent examples of his London career. These include portraits of Sir Thomas Hales (c. 1664-1784), dated 1744 (fig. 66), and Thomas Appleford, dated 1746. Both portraits are characteristic of Wollaston's style in the rendering of dark velvet fabrics with easy, smooth highlights, and in the elongated fingers and almond-shaped eyes. The Hales portrait, in the quality of execution, surpasses many of the artist's American likenesses. Other English portraits by Wollaston include those of Mrs. David Garrick (1724-1833), an unknown Naval Officer, date unknown, Edward Byng, Esquire, and several Oxford University notables now in the Bodleian Library's collection (fig. 73).

These few early paintings provide some insight into Wollaston's career before coming to the colonies. As artifacts they confirm that
he was working as a portrait artist in England and that he had a reputable clientele there. One must consider that these paintings may represent only a fraction of his total London work. Wollaston has never been considered an artist of importance by historians of English paintings.

The last documented reference of Wollaston in London is 1748 when he was listed among fifty artists painting in the city of London. He left for New York sometime before June 23, 1749, when he was recorded as a trial witness in the New York City court.

The inevitable question of why Wollaston left England to work in America must be considered although it cannot be solved completely. Wollaston, as an artist of the second or third rank in London, probably met with substantial competition. This may have partially accounted for his decision to look elsewhere for portrait commissions. New York, commercially prominent and fashion conscious, had need of a portrait artist in 1749. At least one member of the Duyckinck family of artists, Gerardus II, was active in New York when Wollaston arrived. Certainly he was no match for the fashionable style which Wollaston practiced. It is likely that Wollaston was aware of the situation in New York, and he chose to work there rather than in England because the opportunities for success were greater. The fact remains that he became extremely popular in the colonies and his success was realized immediately with his first portraits in New York.

Wollaston is believed to have painted more than seventy-five likenesses during his stay in New York. Of these, forty-seven are known. His clientele were the socially and financially prominent. He
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knew well that portraits of distinguished colonists, such as those of Mr. and Mrs. Brandt Schuyler, served better than any published advertisement in attracting future commissions and in establishing a reputation.\(^43\)

The Schuyler portraits are the earliest known signed New York works by Wollaston. Later, in 1751, he signed and dated a likeness of William Smith, Jr., and in 1752, that of Mrs. Philip Livingston.\(^44\) However, the majority of his paintings in New York were not signed, a practice which Wollaston unfortunately continued throughout his career in the colonies.\(^45\) Perhaps there was no need to sign his works, for in most areas of his activity, he had no competition.

Wollaston was asked on April 1, 1752, to copy a portrait of the Reverend William Vesey, a former rector of Trinity Church in New York City.\(^46\) No evidence has been found to place Wollaston in New York after this date or to prove that he accepted the Vesey commission. There is a tradition among historians that Wollaston returned to London for his daughter's wedding in 1752.\(^47\) Recent research has revealed that this was not the sequence of events in the artist's life.

The late George C. Groce noted his reasons for suspecting Wollaston's return to England after working in New York, particularly that Wollaston began to incorporate several changes in his sitters' costumes after 1752: queue ribbons were introduced and double ruffles replaced protruding stocks for gentlemen; women were recorded without lace caps and neck ornaments and the wasp-type waist replaced the stomacher.\(^48\) But Groce's observations are valid only to a point. The
changes in costumes probably reflect either regional dress preferences
or simply a change in clothing fashion which occurred during Wollaston's
stay in the colonies. Furthermore, in Wollaston's Pennsylvania,
Maryland and Virginia work, all executed either during or after 1752,
there are examples of gentlemen wearing protruding stocks and minus the
queue ribbons. There are at least two surviving examples of women wear­ing
caps from this later group of portraits. It is observed, however,
that after 1752 Wollaston painted almost entirely three-quarter and full­
length portraits. This also may have been customer preference or more
likely the size of one's purse or the size of one's rooms where the
pictures were to hang. Only a few of these larger canvases are attrib­
uted to Wollaston's New York period. 49

When Wollaston left New York it was not for England but for the
county of Pennsylvania. He was evidently working there before October 20,
1752 when James Hamilton, then Governor, entered in his cash book "pd.
Mr. Woolaston for 2 half length Pictures 36 --." This entry documents
the first of Wollaston's two brief visits to the Pennsylvania capital. 50

Less than five months later on March 15, 1753, a Maryland admirer
was moved to write the following verses about "Mr. Wollaston."

EXTEMPORÉ: On seeing Mr. WOLLASTON'S Pictures

In Annapolis

By Dr. T. T.

Behold the won'drous Power of Art!
That mocks devouring Time and Death,
Can Nature's ev'ry Charm impart;
And make the lifeless Canvas Breathe.
The Lilly blended with the Rose,
Blooms gaily on each fertile Cheek.
Their Eyes the sparkling Gems disclose,
And balmy Lips, too, seem to speak.

Nature and We, must bless the Hand,
That can such heav'ny Charms portray
And save the Beauties of this Land
From envious Obscurity.
Whilst on each Piece we gaze,
In various Wonder, we are lost;
And know not justly which to praise,
Or Nature, Or the Painter, most.

The poem, published in the Maryland Gazette,\textsuperscript{51} suggests that Wollaston had been in town at least long enough to establish a reputation and to execute a few portraits.\textsuperscript{52} Wollaston is believed to have completed nearly sixty Maryland portraits, in Annapolis and the surrounding areas.\textsuperscript{53} Of this group less than half are known today and the last dated work is a likeness of Rebecca Calvert, for 1754.\textsuperscript{54}

Wollaston continued south from Maryland into Virginia. In 1755 he copied a portrait of Colonel William Randolph, II (fig. 53). During the next two years more than sixty Virginians had their likenesses recorded by the artist. As a transient painter, he moved around from one household to another working with facility and speed.

On October 21, 1757, Nellie Custis paid Wollaston fifty-six pistoles for three portraits he had done for the family.\textsuperscript{55} He left Virginia sometime after this and was either in or near Philadelphia for a second visit by September 1758 when the American Magazine published Francis Hopkinson’s poem praising the artist.\textsuperscript{56} The last dated reference to Wollaston there is May 19, 1759, when Henry Clifton charged Doctor Richard Hill for "a frame for 'Patsy's picture costing one pound ten
shillings and' for her picture to Woolaston costing eight pounds ten shillings."^57

It is evident that Wollaston did not remain long in Philadelphia during either of his visits there for less than twenty portraits from that area have survived. It is surprising that Wollaston, the most prolific artist in America prior to the Revolution, never worked extensively in Philadelphia, the most important trade center in the colonies during the period. ^58 He was far more active in New York, Virginia and Maryland. Robert Feke's work in the Pennsylvania capital in 1749-1750 may have discouraged additional portrait commissions among the prominent families there. ^59 Wollaston was surely well liked as Hopkinson went so far as to urge Benjamin West to follow Wollaston's example, but it was John Hesselius, more than any other artist working in the middle colonies, who adopted Wollaston's style. ^60

Where Wollaston went after working in Philadelphia in 1759 and before his arrival in South Carolina in 1765 is partially unknown although the theory that he was appointed a "writer" for the British East India Company has been widely supported in studies before this. While it makes a very tidy story there are discrepancies which make it unlikely that the "writer" and artist were the same person.

There is documentation that in London on November 11, 1757, a John Wollaston was appointed as "writer" for the East India Company. ^61 A letter of that date to the president and Council at Fort William in Bengal reads: "We have chosen and appointed the following writers to
serve the Company on the Bengal establishment . . . John Wollaston, . . ." 62

The same John Wollaston was in the British East Indies by September, 1759 when he was instrumental in bringing gunpowder to Chinsura, just north of Calcutta. 63 By August, 1760, he had advanced to the position of Magistrate in the Calcutta court, a position which would have required some knowledge of law and legal matters. 64 He was still there as late as February 19, 1766, when he served as an attorney for John Zaphaniah Holwell of London. 65 This John Wollaston was only nineteen years old when he went to India, placing his birth date in 1740 and seven years prior to the signed portrait of James Monk by John Wollaston the artist. 66

Recent research has revealed that John Wollaston the artist was not in the British East Indies but in the British West Indies at St. Christophers Island during a portion of this time. An entry in the Diary of John Baker, Solicitor-General of the Leeward Islands in the mid-eighteenth century, notes for July 31, 1775 in Southampton, England that "Mr. Woollaston the painter, . . . came up to me before dinner and claimed our acquaintance at Mr. Cottle's, St. Kitt's, in 1764 or 1765." 67 Just how long Wollaston stayed in the Leeward Islands and whether or not portraits survive from that period remains unknown at present.

There can be little doubt that Wollaston journeyed directly from the Caribbean to Charleston, South Carolina, where he was working by September 27, 1755. 68 Commerce and trade between South Carolina and
the West Indies was extensive during the eighteenth century and shipping between these two areas was common.

The exact date of Wollaston's arrival in Charleston is unknown although it is certain that he continued to work there through 1766 and most of 1767. On January 14, 1767 Eliza Lucas Pinckney of Charleston noted in a letter that "... Wollaston has summon'd me today to put the finishin' stroke on my shadow, which streightens me for the time ..."69 Only seventeen of Wollaston's Charleston paintings remain as testimony to the artist's last activity in the Colonies.

His Charleston portraits are very different from anything he did in Virginia and the northern colonies. By 1767 he was painting with tremendous self-assurance. His Charleston palette included the most delicate Rococo pastels as can be seen in the portraits of Mr. and Mrs. John Beale (figs. 61 and 62). He gave greater attention to decorative details of his sitters' costumes. John Beale's satin coat glimmers and the lace cuffs and buttons are painted with jewel-like precision. The soft modeling of Mrs. Beale's face, particularly around the nose and chin, surpasses anything seen in Wollaston's work before coming to Charleston. His previous method of rather hard-edge delineation all but disappears in his Charleston portraits. What accounted for such an amazing change in his painting technique is unknown. The outstanding quality of the Charleston portraits and the introduction of various new poses for sitters suggests that Wollaston never abandoned his brush and palette during those years for which we have no documented portraits, 1759 through 1764. If anything, his Charleston paintings indicate
artistic growth and refinement which could only have come about through continuous work and perhaps a fresh encounter with fashionable art works or circles, probably outside of the colonies.

Jeremiah Thöus was still living and painting portraits in Charleston at the time of Wollaston's visit. It is not known whether the two artists met during these two years but it is certain that they were aware of each other's work. Wollaston accepted commissions in several households where paintings by Thöus were hanging. And, there is at least one example of portrait copying by either Wollaston after Thöus or Thöus after Wollaston.⁷⁰

Wollaston's visit to Charleston was brief. In the January 19 through February 2, 1767 issues of the South Carolina Gazette he thanked his patrons and stated his intentions to return to England.⁷¹ In these announcements Wollaston also noted that he had "... a very good waiting boy to sell and a pleasant saddle horse."⁷² The artist had obviously attained some degree of wealth and comfort, and by previous references we know that he circulated happily among Charleston's fashionable society. He sailed for England on the Snow Portland on May 31 of the same year.⁷³

Charles Willson Peale, as previously mentioned, tells us of Wollaston's arrival in London and his death sometime thereafter at Bath, England.⁷⁴ Although the date of his death is unknown it is certain from the Baker diary, as quoted earlier, that he was still alive in 1775. His departure from the colonies in 1767 was probably precipitated by growing unrest and dissension between the colonies and England. It
would not have been unusual for Wollaston to have been aware of this and therefore he elected to leave the colonies while there was relative peace and safety in travel.

Peale's mention of Wollaston is significant for many reasons. It very clearly documents that Peale, an American artist of some repute, knew of Wollaston's activity in the colonies. Perhaps Peale even knew Wollaston in the mid-1760's when he was first commencing his career as a painter.

By the time of Wollaston's return to London he was, indeed, "... an eminent face-painter, whose name [was] sufficiently known in the world." Just as Charleston's public noted the departure of that "celebrated Limner" Peale found his arrival in London noteworthy. It was regrettable, though inevitable, that an artist of such fecundity, the major harbinger of the English Rococo portrait style in America, was soon to be forgotten in the wake of those artists who followed him—Benjamin West, John Singleton Copley, and Charles Willson Peale.
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3. In a letter from Charles Willson Peale to Rembrandt Peale, October 28, 1812, published in John Sartain's *The Reminiscences of a Very Old Man*, 1808-1897, (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1899), p. 147. The entire passage reads: "I must go back to about the year 1775, some time near that period Wollaston visited Annapolis and painted a number of portraits of the first families in that city. He had some instructions from a noted drapery painter in London, and soon after took his passage to New York; from thence he visited all the principal towns painting, to Charleston, S. Carolina."


5. Ibid. Groce concludes that the elder Wollaston died circa 1743, the year before his son dropped the "jr." from his signature.
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8. Groce, "John Wollaston," p. 133. Groce was the first art historian to suggest the 1710 date in a published article on the artist. He refers to Dr. Henry Wilder Foote's support of this date but this author has been unable to find any published work by Foote suggesting the date.
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23 Ibid. Constable relies on information gathered from Poor Rate Records of St. Paul's, Covent Garden, in the Westminster Public Libraries and the 1804 diary of Wilson's Pupil, Joseph Farington. Farington remembers Wilson living on Tavistock Street, Covent Garden. From March 1747 to March 1751 the Poor Rate Records show him occupying a house facing the market in Covent Garden.

24 Ibid., pl. 7c. This is an illustration of a mezzotint by J. Faber Jun. after the original which no longer exists. Wilson painted the portrait circa 1751.


The author was fortunate to learn of these two portraits in corresponding with their owner, John L. Russell of Montreal, Canada who brought them to my attention. Mr. Russell was kind enough to furnish a great deal of information which is included in Appendix A of this paper. James Monk was born in England in 1706 and married Elizabeth Harris. In 1749 they moved from Boston to Halifax, Nova Scotia.

See Appendix A.

See Appendix A.


Of interest is the fact that the mezzotint was executed by J. Faber, whose mezzotint after Wilson's portrait of Prince Edward resembles Wollaston's painting style. The Whitefield print and the original painting are owned by the National Portrait Gallery, London, England.

Groce, "John Wollaston," p. 136
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There are reportedly fifteen portraits in the Bodleian's collection which the late George C. Groce thought by Wollaston. An unknown quantity of these paintings are signed "J. W." and usually with a date. A photograph of one of these portraits (fig. 73) shows no evident similarity to other English works by Wollaston and particularly with the early portrait of James Monk (fig. 68). According to Groce, the Bodleian portraits are copies by Wollaston of earlier portraits. This may account for the lack of stylistic similarity.


Groce, "John Wollaston," p. 147, footnote 17. Groce writes "A Dr. Calhoun was stabbed by Oliver De Lancey. The De Lanceys were such a powerful faction politically that it was virtually impossible to find witnesses against Oliver De Lancey. I have never found proof that De Lancey was tried or that Wollaston appeared against him."
John Smibert was working in New England in 1749. Joseph Blackburn did not arrive in New England until 1752. Robert Feke, in 1749, was still in Philadelphia. Gustavus Eesselius and William Williams were also in Philadelphia circa 1745-1755.


There are photographs of these paintings in the Frick Art Reference Library in New York; however, present location(s) are unknown.

Mrs. Livingston's portrait has not been located. The William Smith, Jr. portrait, at the time of Bolton and Binse's article in 1931, was owned by General J. R. Delafield. Groce illustrates it in his article "Thomas Appleford by John Wollaston," New York Historical Society Quarterly XXXIV (October: 1950).

There are eight known signed and/or dated American portraits by Wollaston. A list of these, as well as signed English portraits by the artist is provided in Appendix H of this paper.

Bolton and Binse, "Wollaston," p. 30. In the minutes of the Vestry Board of Trinity Church, April 1, 1752, the following note of Wollaston was made: "Ordered that Mr. Marston, Mr. Duncan, and Mr. Nicholls do treat and agree with Mr. Wollaston to copy the late Rev. Commissary Vesey's picture, a half length, in order to be placed in the Vestry Room." Undoubtedly the Mr. Marston mentioned here was Nathaniel Marston whose portrait by Wollaston is listed in Appendix E, and the Mr. Nicholls may have been the husband of Margaret Nicholls whose portrait by Wollaston is also listed in Appendix E. Trinity Church retains a portrait in its collection of Vesey, but it bears absolutely no resemblance to Wollaston's work, even as a copy of an earlier portrait.

Groce, "John Wollaston," p. 139.
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Four particularly good examples of the New York three-quarter length portrait by Wollaston are those of Mr. and Mrs. William Walton, owned by the New-York Historical Society, and the portraits of Mr. and Mrs. Nathaniel Marston at the Museum of the City of New York.
The poem was published in Annapolis on May 15, 1753.

It is significant that the author of the poem entitled it "On Seeing Mr. Wollaston's Pictures in Annapolis," clearly indicating that the artist had been there long enough to have paintings to exhibit.

The portrait of Rebecca Calvert is owned by the Baltimore Museum of Art, Baltimore, Maryland.

The poem was written by Hopkinson in Philadelphia on September 18, 1758. It was not published until October 1758 in the American Magazine and Monthly Chronicle of the British Colonies, I, p. 508. It was reproduced first in the 1931 Bolton and Binsse article on Wollaston and is quoted here in part: "Oftimes with wonder and delight I stand/ To view th' amazing conduct of your hand./ At first unlabored sketches lightly trace/ The glimm'ring outlines of a human face:/ Then by degrees the liquid life o'erflows/ Each rising feature—the rich canvas glows/ With heightened charms—the forehead rises fair/ and glossy ringlets twine the nut-brown hair;/ . . . The well turned neck and luxuriant breast./ The silk that richly glows with graceful air—/ All tell the hand of Wollaston was there."


William Sawitsky, "The American Work of Benjamin West," Philadelphia Magazine of History and Biography XLII (October: 1938): 440. Hopkinson's verses addressed to West read "... may'st thou ever tread the pleasing paths your Wollaston has lead [sic]./ Let his just precepts all your works refine,/ Copy each grace, and learn like him to shine."
E. N. Sinha, *Fort William India House Correspondence, and other Contemporary Papers Relating thereto*, (Delhi: published for the National Archives of India by the Manager of Publications, Government of India, 1900- ), vol. II, p. 54.
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Ibid., p. 145. A letter dated March 23, 1759 to the President and Council at Fort William in Bengal contains the following information concerning John Wollaston: "We direct that Richard Baswell, one of the writers on your establishment, instead of the station he now stands in upon the list, be ranked with next below John Wollaston."


C. S. Srinivasachari, *Fort William India House Correspondence, and other Contemporary Papers Relating thereto*, (Delhi: published for the National Archives of India by the Manager of Publications, Government of India, 1900- ), vol. IV, p. 162. Item 102 reads: "The copy of a dated letter from Mr. John Zaphaniah Holwell dated in London the 13th April 1763 addressed to Mr. John Wollaston at Bengal has been communicated to us, signifying he has appointed him his attorney there for receiving on his account the rendering part of a teep or obliga­tion . . . ." Holwell acted as temporary Governor of Bengal during part of Wollaston's stay there, 28 January 1760 through 27 July 1760.

Mildred Archer, Librarian of India Office and Records, related these matters in correspondence to the author on September 30, 1975. Ms. Archer's research in the India Office Library Records revealed a certificate from the register of Christ Church, London, dated October 22, 1759. This document stated that John Wollaston, who went to India on behalf of the Company, was born December 5, 1739.

The author is grateful to Sir Ellis Waterhouse, Oxford, England, for sharing this important information. The original manuscript was owned in 1931 by Miss Dorothy Carleton of Newbuildings Place, England, and major portions of it were published in *The Diary of John Baker*, Philip C. Yorke, ed., (London: Hutchinson & Co., Ltd., 1931).

Anna Wells Rutledge, *Artists in the Life of Charleston*, (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1949), p. 118. Letter of Charles Willson Peale to Rembrandt Peale, October 28, 1812, as published in John Sartin's *Reminiscences*, p. 147. The reference in this last source cannot be ignored and some comment of it must be made here. Peale writes: "Wollaston visited Annapolis (c. 1755) and painted a number of portraits of the first families in that city. He had some instructions from a noted drapery painter in London, and soon after took his passage to New York, from thence he visited all the principal towns painting, to Charleston, S. Carolina and from thence he returned to England. I was in London when he returned from the East Indies very rich. He carried to the East Indies two daughters, one or both of them
married and thus acquired great fortunes. They died, and the father, soon after he arrived in London, went to Bath where I believe he died.” Charles Willson Peale was in London from 1767 to 1769, thus it must have been during these years when Wollaston returned to London. The interesting point here is that Peale notes that the artist came from the “East Indies”. Could he have meant the “West Indies” or so-called Leeward Islands for which we have documentation of Wollaston visiting just before 1765 and his stay in Charleston, South Carolina?


70 The portraits referred to are two of Benjamin Smith of Charleston, South Carolina. Smith is depicted in the same costume and pose in both portraits which came down through Smith descendants until their deposit at the Gibbes Art Gallery, Charleston, South Carolina.

71 South Carolina Gazette, 19 January-2 February 1767.
72 Ibid.
73 Ibid., 11 May-1 June, 1767.
74 See footnote 65, above.
75 See footnote 56, above.
76 See footnote 69, above.
CHAPTER TWO
JOHN WOLLASTON IN VIRGINIA

Virginia society, from its seventeenth-century beginnings, depended on agricultural development as a means of economic growth and financial survival. By the mid-eighteenth century the colony could boast numerous large plantations not unlike the small country estates of England. The families who built these mansions maintained their fortunes so long as their tobacco and other major crops succeeded. There were no large industries or thriving ports and because of this the growth of towns was slow. The colony had no urban metropolis comparable to Philadelphia, Boston, New York or Charleston.

Even Williamsburg, the capital and hub of Virginia politics in 1755, was small and came alive only during public days. Travelers there at other times of the year were honest enough to describe the town as "dull, forsaken and melancholy."^1

Virginia's wealth and cultural heritage lay in the countryside with estate owners like the Randolphs, Carters, and Pages. Lord Adam Gordon, visiting Virginia in 1764, wrote in his journal that Virginians "... live at their Seats and are seldom at Williamsburg but when the public Business requires their Attendance ... topping People have Houses there of their own, but in the Country they live on their Estates handsomely and plentifully ...."^2

30
The Virginia plantation owner's lifestyle was quite different from his wealthy northern counterpart's whose daily life centered around competitive markets and a growing international trade. Virginia society was close knit by social and political customs as well as intermarriage among prominent families. The social climate of Virginia during the mid-eighteenth century had long been established and Virginians were aware of their distinctiveness from the very beginning. The Reverend Hugh Jones wrote in his *The Present State of Virginia*, published in London in 1724, that in Virginia "... dwell several very good Families .... They live in the same neat Manner, dress after the same Modes, and behave themselves exactly as the Gentry in London ...."

In reality one must consider that this kind of pride which Virginians wore was often a facade. Wealth did not necessarily mean money in the purse. It was not uncommon for a planter's tobacco crop to fail, causing either bankruptcy or an extension of credit with his "factor" in London. The latter arrangement was definitely desirable and a quick glance through any number of eighteenth-century planters' account or letter books will soon reveal that credit was a way of life. In this manner a planter was able to order from London the various household goods he desired to furnish his comfortable country house. "English-Made" was a sure stamp of approval or acceptance as well as fashion. A local craftsman skillful enough to produce an item approaching the quality of imported wares was likely to be successful. This was the character of Virginia patronage when the English artist, John Wollaston, arrived in 1755 to copy a portrait of William Randolph, II, progenitor of one of the colony's
wealthiest and most distinguished families (no. 53). 6

Virginia, like New York City and rural Maryland, had never had a major artist to record her notable citizens. Charles Bridges painted portraits for William Byrd in 1735; 7 but he was then an old man and was never ambitious in his art. He departed a few years later, never to return. 8 John Hesselius appeared in the colony briefly in 1750 and possibly in 1755, but he was then a young, inexperienced artist and offered no competition to Wollaston. 9 The painter John Keaf, whose work remains unknown, was in Williamsburg during the early 1750's when he was suspected of counterfeiting. John Durand, portrait painter, did not appear in Virginia until the mid-1760's. 10 Other artists of reputation before Wollaston had probably avoided Virginia because of its rural nature.

Wollaston consequently chose a convenient time to visit and work in Virginia. Obviously he knew of possible commissions there among the many prominent families. In Virginia he never advertised his profession as other artists before and after him did. Having worked successfully for many of the leading families in Maryland it is probable that his reputation had reached the Virginia colony before him. Several of the genealogical connections between Wollaston's Virginia and Maryland patrons reveals how this was possible.

Wollaston executed a portrait of George Plater of St. Mary's County, Maryland, sometime prior to his trip to Virginia. 11 Plater's daughter, Rebecca, married John Tayloe, II, builder of "Mount Airy" in Warsaw, Virginia, on July 11, 1748. Portraits by Wollaston of John and
Hebecca Tayloe have hung at "Mount Airy" since it was built in 1758 (figs. 55 and 56). Either these paintings were executed in Maryland at the time of Plater's portrait or Tayloe subsequently saw or heard of Wollaston's work and engaged his services in Virginia.

Another example to illustrate this point is the connection between the Carters of Virginia and the Tasker family of Maryland. Benjamin Tasker of Prince George County, Maryland, commissioned Wollaston to do at least one portrait for the family. Tasker's daughter, Frances Ann (Mrs. Robert Carter, III) was one of several members of the Carter family to engage the artist's services when he was in Virginia (no. 18).

There is no documented evidence to show where the portraits of the Plater, Tayloe, Carter or Tasker families were painted, either in Virginia or Maryland. The most reasonable assumption is that they were executed in the owners' respective residences. What is important is the various intermarriages between these families, all occurring about the time that Wollaston came to the Virginia colony from Maryland. It is very likely that knowledge of Wollaston's skill as a portrait artist was learned in Virginia through such associations.

The first date for Wollaston's appearance in Maryland is March 15, 1753. The last dated record is for August, 1754 when he completed the portrait of little Rebecca Calvert. Between these dates the artist had recorded the images of numerous Marylanders, including members of the Boardley, Carroll, Digges, Dorsey, Dulaney, Galloway, Johns, and Key families.
Rebecca Calvert's portrait, as the last record of Wollaston's work in Maryland, is an important clue to his arrival in Virginia. Rebecca was the daughter of Benedict Calvert of "Mount Airy," Maryland. The Calvert mansion was located in St. Mary's County, bordering on the Potomac River which separates Maryland from Virginia. Wollaston had probably worked his way south from Annapolis, executing the Plater, Tasker, and Dulaney family portraits before working for the Calverts. The Calverts, like the Platers who intermarried with the Tayloes of Virginia, had close associations with Virginia families across the Potomac. Their younger daughter, Eleanor, later married John Parke Custis of Virginia.

During the eighteenth century, travel and trade back and forth across the Potomac was common. Families in one colony often had land holdings in the other. With Wollaston's work for the Calverts, Platers, and other wealthy land holders living near the Potomac shore of Maryland he had figuratively already crossed the Maryland border into Virginia society, the patronage of which he would enjoy for the following four years.

During these years Wollaston was an itinerant artist, moving from one household to another, often recording the faces of every member of the family. This was standard practice among many artists working in the South. In 1740 Jeremiah Thes of South Carolina advertised "... all gentlemen and Ladies may have their pictures drawn, likewise Landscapes of all sizes, Crests and Coats of Arms for Coaches and Chaises. Likewise for the convenience of those who live in the country he is willing to
wait on them at their respective plantations." This method definitely applies to Wollaston's work in southern Maryland and later in Virginia where he executed a surprisingly large number of portraits in a short period of time. By charting locations of the family homes where he worked in these two colonies a definite travel pattern can be seen (Appendix I).

Surviving portraits of the Tayloe, Washington, Carter and Beverley families of Virginia indicate that the artist must have worked for some time in Westmoreland and Richmond Counties, directly across the Potomac River from St. Mary's County, Maryland. It is possible that Wollaston came to this area of Virginia soon after he completed the Calvert family portraits in 1754. Another possibility is that Wollaston worked first in the Fredericksburg area, northwest of Westmoreland County, coming later to the last region. He had finished the portraits of Colonel and Mrs. William Brent of "Richland" in Stafford County before 1756, the year of Mrs. Brent's death (figs. 10 and 11). Colonel Fielding and Betty Washington Lewis of "Kenmore" and David and Susannah Everard Meade evidently posed for Wollaston during his sojourn to Fredericksburg (figs. 28, 29, 35, and 36).

From these two northern areas of the colony the artist probably continued south. In Northumberland and Lancaster Counties he completed portraits of Lattice Lee and of Charles Carter and his wife of "Corotoman" (figs. 26, 16, and 17). In Gloucester, Middlesex, and King and Queen Counties, the Braxtons, Robinsons, Pages, Lee, Warner Lewises and Womeleys commissioned a total of fifteen portraits and
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The last date for Wollaston's activity in Virginia is associated with this area. The artist "rec'd Oct 21 1757 of Mrs. Custis the sum of fifty six pistoles for three pictures, being in full of all demands" (Appendix J).

There are no documented references to support the idea that Wollaston based himself in Williamsburg during some period of his sojourn to Virginia although it is strongly suspected. A number of his commissions came from families living in that area and most of the gentlemen were in some way politically involved with colonial affairs necessitating visits to the Williamsburg capital. Of particular interest are the portraits which Wollaston did for Thomas Barker of Edenton, North Carolina. Portraits of Barker, his second wife, daughter and stepson survive (figs. 4, 5, and 23). Those of the parents and the stepson now hang in the "Cupola House" in Edenton, which was later owned by the Barkers' daughter and her husband Samuel Dickinson.

Barker's daughter, Betsey, was attending school in Williamsburg during the years Wollaston was painting in that area. It is believed that the Barkers visited Williamsburg and had the portraits commissioned during these years. Since no other documented North Carolina portraits by Wollaston have been discovered there is no reason to believe he would
journey as far as Edenton to complete one family's commissions.

Geographical groupings provide some evidence for the artist's career in Virginia but there remains the question of whether he arrived in the colony prior to 1755 when he copied the portrait of Colonel William Randolph, II (fig. 53). It is doubtful that this Randolph commission was carried out anywhere other than in southernmost Virginia, near Williamsburg, for one of the Randolph descendants living on the James River. Also, a portrait of Mrs. Anthony Walke, II of the Williamsburg area indicates that Wollaston was working in southern Virginia before 1756, the year of her death (fig. 57). No earlier portraits of Mrs. Walke are known and one must assume that the Wollaston likeness was taken from life.

The number of portraits which Wollaston executed in northern Virginia would not have kept him there longer than six or seven months. His largest group of portraits was done in the southern part of the colony. Beginning with the Middlesex and Gloucester County portraits and ending with the Henrico County, Randolph family paintings the artist completed more than forty-nine known commissions. For northern Virginia only eleven portraits by Wollaston have survived.

There is, unfortunately, no stylistic development evident in Wollaston's Virginia portraits to aid in establishing a chronology for his work in various areas of the colony. The quality of his Virginia paintings varies from very meticulous, sharply delineated and crisply executed figures to those which appear flat and hurriedly done. The
causes of these variations are not entirely clear at present but it should be observed that a number of the so-called "lesser quality" Virginia works were inexpertly restored and definitely stripped of the strong surface highlights which Wollaston was so fond of using throughout his painting career. 36

Manuscript collections of the numerous families he worked for have revealed little information about the artist or when he completed commissions. 37 Genealogical data and geographical grouping appear to be the best tools by which Wollaston's Virginia dates can be established.

In summary it is known that the artist was definitely working in southern Virginia by 1755. He probably executed the portraits of northern Virginians before this, possibly in 1754 through part of 1755. During 1755 he worked his way south into the Williamsburg area of the colony. He painted in southern Virginia from 1755 to October 21, 1757 and possibly afterwards. He left Virginia before June, 1758, and by May 19, 1759, he was in Philadelphia again where he had completed the portrait of Patsy Hill. 38
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E. G. Swem, LL.d., "Virginia Historical Portraiture," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography XXXIX (Virginia: 1931). Swem's article is really a review of Alexander Wilbourne Weddell's Memorial Volume of Virginia Historical Portraiture 1585-1830, (Richmond: The William Byrd Press, Inc., 1930) which was published as a catalogue in conjunction with an exhibit of Virginia paintings at the "Virginia House," Richmond, April 26 through May 27, 1929. Many of Wollaston's Virginia portraits hung in and were specifically restored for that exhibit. Swem, in his review, notes the following: "Many of the portraits needed repair . . . $7,000.00 was spent towards restoration. Mr. Charles Xavier Harris, known among all art collectors for his expert knowledge of early American portraits, was induced to move his studio to Virginia House. Here for a year and a half his time was devoted entirely to the preparation of the portraits for the exhibition."

Charles Xavier Harris, according to information this author has collected from nearly every institution housing Wollaston's paintings in Virginia, travelled around the state in a make-shift trailer restoring paintings. His mark, unfortunately, has been left on an overwhelming number of Virginia Wollastons. He was, in the most kind of observations, a dilettante when it came to painting restoration. Overcleaning with what must have been very abrasive solvents and inept repainting characterize his process. It is regrettable, particularly to this author and this study, that Harris was entrusted with the restoration of so many of Wollaston's Virginia portraits.
No adequate explanation can be offered for the absence of documented material in this category. All known and existing papers of families that Wollaston completed commissions for were examined for this paper.

Portrait painters in eighteenth-century England shared a common incentive: to record likenesses in the most fashionable manner. After Lely died in 1680, and John Riley in 1691, Sir Godfrey Kneller became the dominant artistic figure in England. Between 1694 and 1717, Kneller set the portrait style with his Kit Cat series and Hampton Court Beauties. And, as Governor of England's first Academy of Painting from 1711 to 1716, he established a studio tradition for portraiture which continued long after his death. One had only to recall the amusing story of John Ellis viewing Sir Joshua Reynolds' portrait of "Marchi" (c. 1750), to realize the enduring influence of Kneller's portrait style. Ellis remarked, "Ah! Reynolds, this will never answer! Why you don't paint in the least degree in the manner of Kneller." Reynolds' bold reply was: "Shakespeare in poetry, and Kneller in painting, damme!"

Portrait artists of every rank came under the influence of the fashionable "Knelleresque" including those stylistically associated with John Wollaston: Bartholomew Dandridge, Thomas Hudson, Richard Wilson and Thomas Wright. They trained and worked in studios where portraiture was the most popular painting format. This was the artistic environment from which Wollaston emerged.
In this same respect the early nineteenth-century American artist Robert Sully in correspondence with William Dunlap made a pertinent observation about Wollaston's work. Sully remarked that "The only artists that are remembered by the oldest inhabitants [of Virginia] are Durand, Manly, and Woolaston—the first tolerable, the second execrable, and the third very good. His portraits possess unquestionable merit . . . . The pictures of Woolaston are very much in the Kneller style; more feeble than the style of Reynolds, but with a very pretty taste."  

With the exception of Wayne Craven, in his paper given at the 1971 Winterthur Conference, art historians have continually described Wollaston's portrait style as curious or unique. Viewed against the entire spectrum of eighteenth-century American portraiture his almond eyes, elegant fingers in unnatural poses, elongated figures, and "thoroughly delightful fabrics" are somewhat unique. However, these so-called typically Wollaston features were merely part of the portrait vocabulary used by a number of London artists in the eighteenth century. This was illustrated earlier in Chapter One by comparing Wollaston's portraits with works by his English contemporaries, Richard Wilson, Thomas Hudson, and Bartholomew Dandridge. The many similarities noted in that analysis confirm that Wollaston's portrait formulas are not unique but representative of the Baroque portrait style then fashionable in London.

A comparative survey of Wollaston's American work from his arrival in 1749 to his final departure for England in 1767 reveals that he never completely abandoned Baroque portrait formulas although
his painting technique and palette in America continually developed towards the Rococo style as practiced in England.

Wollaston's known English portraits fall in the Baroque tradition of direct, incisive portraiture. His portrait of James Monk (fig. 68) is characterized by broad areas of light and dark hues; delineation of the figure is accomplished by a series of nearly straight, intersecting lines. The intricacies of folds in the costume seem stiff and angular when compared with the same areas in Wollaston's New York portrait of Staats Long Morris (fig. 69) where forms are defined by swinging curves.

In comparing these two portraits one notices a difference in the handling of paint. In the Monk portrait the modeling achieves greater depth and spatial complexity. Areas of contrasting color values, lights to darks, do not meet each other as abruptly as they do in the Morris portrait. In the Morris portrait color areas have greater value and there is minimal concern with shading between areas of contrasting value. The Monk portrait is more in the tradition of Baroque painting while the Morris portrait exhibits a number of Rococo characteristics.

It is not known what forces or influences precipitated Wollaston's break with what had been an essentially Baroque approach to portraiture. Other notable London artists of his generation such as William Hogarth were early practitioners of the Rococo in England. Undoubtedly Wollaston was aware of these new trends before his arrival in America and one suspects that his partial rejection of Baroque elements began well in advance of his departure from England.
When Wollaston arrived in New York in 1749 his reputation there was unchallenged. Here was an artist direct from London who could record likenesses in the latest fashion. His services were engaged by the most prominent New York families.

Wollaston used a variety of poses for his New York clientele, and his canvases ranged from bust length, three-quarter length, to full-length. The same poses and canvas sizes were to appear throughout his career in the South. However, Wollaston never again used the bust length format as frequently as he did in New York or immediately thereafter in Philadelphia.

The richly highlighted fabrics, meticulously rendered give evidence of the care and pride Wollaston took in his New York commissions as illustrated by the portrait of Mrs. John Livingston (fig. 67). The contrasting gradations from light to dark areas in the fabric are remarkably expert and convincing. In his portrait of New Yorker Philip Philipspe, the outline of the figure and the softly curved folds of the vest confirm Wollaston's understanding of Rococo line and fluid movement. The modeling of the subject's face demonstrates the artist's competence in using oil pigments.

The same smooth modeling and brilliant execution of fabrics appears throughout Wollaston's career in America and is best seen in his New York, Maryland and Charleston paintings. The exceptionally fine quality of the Charleston portraits may be explained by the artist's late arrival in South Carolina, circa 1765, after a six year period when
he may have returned briefly to England and experienced a fresh encounter with portrait styles and fashions.

Groce, as noted in Chapter One, attributed the excellent quality of the Maryland Portraits to Wollaston's return to London in 1752. As discussed previously, there is evidence to negate this theory. Furthermore, the Maryland portraits are very similar in quality and style to the paintings Wollaston had done earlier in New York. His portraits of Daniel Carroll, II (fig. 63) and Charles Carroll of Maryland are nearly identical to the New York portrait of Philip Philipse in pose, highlighting and modeling of fabrics, and in the painting of the face. There is no significant style change in Wollaston's Maryland work, which must have followed immediately his painting in New York and briefly in Philadelphia.

A sizable number of three-quarter and full length Maryland portraits by the artist have survived. Examples are the portraits of Daniel Carroll, II, Mrs. Daniel Carroll, II, Charles Carroll, Mrs. Charles Carroll, and Mrs. Daniel Dulaney. Wollaston seems always to have been at his finest in the three-quarter length female portrait as illustrated by the pictures of the Carroll women and the likeness of Mrs. Dulaney. The expanse of rich satin in their dresses, the delicate lace cuffs and sleeves gave the artist ample opportunity to show his skill as a master of drapery painting.

By the time Virginians first sat for Wollaston, probably in 1754, the artist had completed over 90 portraits in New York, Philadelphia and Maryland. He was to paint over half this number of portraits in Virginia.
alone, using the same formats time and time again.

The large number of surviving Virginia Wollastons document the variety of poses and background motifs the artist used throughout his career. As explained earlier in Chapter One, Wollaston borrowed heavily from English prototypes in this category and nearly all the attitudes he used can be associated with portrait formulas popularized by Kneller or well known London artists who came under his influence.

Male subjects in Wollaston's three-quarter length portraits from the Virginia period are frequently shown with one arm placed over the edge of a table or a pedestal and the other hand placed at the waist. In these portraits the first two fingers of the hand at the waist are always extended in a V gesture, a motif which is frequently observed in Kneller's work and those associated with him, suggesting that Wollaston continued to follow the pattern if not the Knelleresque Baroque style. The likenesses of Warner Lewis and Ralph Wormeley, IV, are excellent examples of this posture (figs. 29 and 58). A variation of this pose is seen in the painting of Beverley Randolph where one hand is at the waist and the other inside the vest (fig. 41). This gesture appears in several of the artist's Virginia portraits including those of Richard Randolph, Sr., and his son, Richard (figs. 51 and 50). Many of the male subjects in Wollaston's three-quarter length canvases are shown holding letters, books, and tri-cornered hats.

For the bust-length gentleman's portrait Wollaston frequently included only one hand extended in front of the sitter, the same gesture.
noted in Chapter One and seen in the English portraits of Richard Wilson. In Wollaston’s version the extended arm is often rested on the edge of a table or a pedestal as illustrated in the portrait of Richard Randolph, Sr. (fig. 51). Only in a few Virginia portraits of this size did the artist eliminate the hands of the subject as he did in his painting of Charles Carter (fig. 15). The inclusion of a sitter’s hand or both hands would have increased the price of the portrait as it increased the amount of work required of the artist. It is interesting that Wollaston used this inexpensive format, as noted before, quite often in New York and Philadelphia, but a grander type of three-quarter or full length prevailed in Virginia.

Wollaston’s surviving Virginia portraits of women are usually of the three-quarter length variety. Most of these female subjects are in a standing attitude. The difficulties of painting creased fabric in a full length seated figure may account for the extensive number of standing figures in this category. Several ladies are depicted in frontal position, holding fans as illustrated in the portraits of Lucy Harrison Randolph and Clara Walker Allen (figs. 47 and 2). This attitude is clearly traced to earlier English paintings by both Kneller and William Wissing (figs. 82 and 86). Ladies were also posed with one hand at the bosom and the other placed upon a marble top table. This same table, which must have been one of Wollaston’s favorite motifs, is seen in the portraits of Jane Bolling Randolph Walke and Mrs. Warner Lewis (figs. 57 and 30). The pose was used earlier by Sir John Baptist Medina (fig. 83).
In Wollaston's likeness of Susannah Meade her hands are placed in her lap with the right arm draped over the edge of a table (fig. 36). Variations of this popular attitude were used earlier in the colonies by Gerardus Duyckinck and John Smibert. Again, this formula is associated with Kneller as is seen in his portrait (fig. 82). Occasionally Wollaston used additional Knelleresque elements to show his lady sitters leafing through books or holding flowers (figs. 43 and 44).

Wollaston varied these formats only on rare occasions. His portrait of Commodore Keppel required a more formal pose, one illustrating the man's career as an officer (fig. 24). Keppel is shown holding a telescope in one hand while the other hand rests on the sword hilt at his side. In the background the artist included a ship to recall for the viewer the Commodore's naval activities. The artist seems to have borrowed the entire format for this painting from Michael Dahl's portrait of Admiral Sir Cloudesley Shovell, again documenting Wollaston's reliance on English prototypes (fig. 78).²²

Children's portraits by Wollaston also show his adherence to standardized sitter poses. In Virginia examples most subjects appear beside or behind tables. Elizabeth Randolph stands by a table holding a doll (fig. 48). An English portrait by an unknown artist of an unidentified young girl of the same period, compares favorably with Wollaston's in execution of the doll and figure (fig. 87).²³ The companion portrait of Elizabeth's sister shows the girl carrying a basket and represents another format which Wollaston used for children. In Mary Lightfoot's likeness (fig. 32) Wollaston incorporated the same
doll and pose as he did for Elizabeth Randolph, except the Lightfoot child faces left instead of right. In the painting of Ralph Wormeley as a young boy Wollaston shows the subject holding a basket of peaches (fig. 60). In the portraits of the Byrd children the artist illustrated one of the boys playing with a bird’s nest and the other child holding a bow and arrow. Perhaps the most unique of Wollaston’s child likenesses are three double portraits of the Lewis, Custis and Page children (figs. 31, 22, and 38).

In the Lewis painting (fig. 31) the sitters are placed against a landscape. Rebecca stands to the left wearing a hat and holds fruit in her lap while her brother is seated to the right holding a walking stick. Young Warner’s hat and toy ball are seen in the right foreground. This portrait represents the most ambitious format used by Wollaston in Virginia. An unidentified family group of mother, father and child now in the Newark Museum in New Jersey is decidedly Wollaston’s most monumental portrait (fig. 72). Unfortunately no definite provenance can be established for this important work. It was found with other New York portraits by Wollaston in England during the early 1950’s.

Although Wollaston’s Virginia paintings illustrate the variety of poses and settings he used throughout his career in the colonies, they present problems in evaluating the artist’s stylistic development. As mentioned before, many of the Virginia works, like the Lewis double portrait, have suffered greatly at the hands of inexpert restorers. Most of the original ground and secondary painting survives in the Lewis portrait but the strong highlights, so typical of the artist’s
technique, have been completely removed. The remaining effect is muddy, flat, and has been interpreted by art historians as disintegration of style and painting facility. This was generally not the case with Wollaston's work in Virginia. His portrait of Mary Lightfoot (fig. 32) shows the same excellence in paint application and drawing as any done by the artist earlier in the northern colonies.

Careful examination of the surviving Virginia Wollastons reveals little or no evidence of stylistic digression or disintegration. The portraits of Jane Bolling Randolph Walke, Commodore Keppel, and Mrs. Warner Lewis are in excellent condition and the overall quality of each would vie with any of his earlier paintings (figs. 57, 25 and 30).

Wollaston's Virginia portraits have especial interest as documents of eighteenth-century customs and fashion. His repeated use of landscape settings and everyday objects in numerous Virginia examples adds significantly to their splendid decorative effect. This is not often observed in his portraits from other areas. The inclusion of items such as guns, toys, furniture, and baskets of flowers or fruit probably reflects customer preference more than that of the artist, although the skillful rendering of such motifs in pleasing compositions certainly was not uncommon among American artists during the period. Perhaps Virginians, who were known for gracious living during the eighteenth century, were more receptive to these highly fashionable formats. Whatever the cause for his frequent use of these materials in his Virginia portraits, it is clearly evident that Wollaston knew well how to integrate them spatially and compositionally with the figures in...
his portraits and in doing so created works which were pleasant and successful.

One must conclude that Wollaston's painting techniques remained virtually the same throughout his first ten years in the colonies, 1749 through 1759. His Virginia works, as a group, are distinguished only by a greater use of special settings and miscellaneous everyday objects. Any one of his portraits from the colonies of New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, or Virginia adequately documents his painting techniques and general style during these years.

X-ray analysis of five portraits of Philadelphia subjects has helped to determine Wollaston's painting methods. Selected for this study are his portraits of Thomas Gordon (fig. 75), William Peters, the Reverend Richard Peters, Mrs. Samuel Gouverneur (fig. 75), and Peggy Oswald Chew (fig. 76). The male subjects in this group, all bust length portraits, are nearly identical in treatment and the size and position of each figure in space is clearly similar. All are characterized by strong modelling of facial features over a light colored ground. The subjects' heads are boldly delineated as are the shoulders and edges of their coats. The painted ground, as seen in Thomas Gordon's face, is composed of sweeping brush strokes, heavily impasted, which follow the contours of each feature of the face. Wollaston's reliance on line, rather than modelling, for defining form is very evident in these paintings.

In the likenesses of Peggy Oswald Chew and Mrs. Samuel Gouverneur
a similar approach is observed in the treatment of the head. The
development of the figure's neck, hands and dress folds is given less
attention. The same impasted ground is seen throughout these areas but
brushstrokes have no particular pattern. Miss Oswald's neck and
shoulders appear patchy and extremely flat with little attempt to model
for form and three-dimensionality. The outlines of both figures are
characteristically strong. As in the work of most artists of the
period, the face of the figure was of utmost importance. Wollaston was
no exception to the rule and his tendency to develop the face more
fully than other parts of the body or dress at an early stage in the
painting is typical.

It can be further proven that Wollaston never varied his methods
of paint application in his later works in Charleston, South Carolina,
although his drawing, coloration, and formats improved immensely. An
x-ray of his Charleston likeness of John Beale shows the same strong
modelling and wide brush strokes observed earlier (fig. 77).

The absence of documentation for Wollaston's painting activity
just prior to his arrival in Charleston makes an explanation of his
stylistic development during those years nearly impossible and at best
conjectural. It is amazing, if not uncommon, that an artist of this
early period would create his very best work when he was probably in
his late fifties and certainly not in the prime of his career. The
lovely pastel coloration, skillful drawing, and superb modelling of the
subjects in his Charleston paintings prove that Wollaston was serious
in his art and made considerable effort to improve his methods. The
Beale family portraits mentioned earlier (figs. 61 and 62) illustrate Wollaston at his Rococo best.

In considering his Charleston work there is one possible reason for his improvement, a consideration which most art historians tend to overlook in the development of an artist's career. Charleston, even from its early settlements in the seventeenth century, was destined to become a thriving city and a cultural center for the southern colonies. It grew rapidly and the society which emerged demanded and maintained a market for style and fashion. The city supported a number of craftsmen in a wide range of capacities. A glance at the surviving decorative arts from that area will assure the historian that Charlestonians had and demanded the very best. Why then, should their demand have been any less for portrait art? It seems reasonable that Wollaston's Charleston clientele demanded his very best efforts. Perhaps much of the excellence and costume glitter one sees in these late portraits by Wollaston were due to the dictates and customs of Charleston society and not so much to any artistic influence which the artist encountered outside of the colonies.

Whether Wollaston continued to paint after leaving Charleston is not known because later English paintings by the artist have not been found. It is only known through what does survive in America that the portrait style he brought to the colonies in 1759 had by 1767 evolved into a delicate and admirable Rococo. In Charleston, Wollaston, like his father, was "happy in taking likenesses."
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CHAPTER FOUR

WOLLASTON'S INFLUENCE ON ARTISTS WORKING IN AMERICA

Any paper treating the artist John Wollaston must include a discussion of his influence on other artists working in the American colonies during and after his visit(s). Because he was so prolific, working in nearly all major coastal centers south of New York City, and because he worked in a style which was fashionable it was natural for young artists to adopt his techniques and methods of portraiture.

Those who recognized Wollaston's talents and ultimately chose to imitate them included John Greenwood, John Hesselius, Henry Benbridge, and Benjamin West.

John Greenwood, a young provincial Boston painter during the late 1740's and early 1750's was the first of these men to adopt characteristics associated with Wollaston's painting. The late Waldron Phoenix Belknap, Jr., was perhaps the first art historian to observe this fact. In a letter in his files addressed to Bartlett H. Hayes, Jr., he made these comments:

As for the Moffat portraits I believe Mr. Burroughs has overlooked a most interesting influence upon the painter. I suggest that the painter of these portraits had seen some of the earlier New York work of Wollaston. It is most evident in the illustrated portraits of John Moffat and Elizabeth Moffat but it may be detected in the portrait of Mrs. Moffat, though that good lady was not receptive to treatment in the Wollaston formula and the young New England painter could not endow her with the 'Wollaston look' . . . . We can suppose...
that Wollaston's early New York work, . . . must have seemed the very acme of sophistication and elegance to a young provincial painter of Boston accustomed to the rivalry of Badger.2

A look at the Moffat portraits which Belknap discusses will assure the reader of the comparisons he found. The likenesses of Mr. and Mrs. Moffat, and a third portrait of Elizabeth Moffat (fig. 89) all show sitters stiffly posed, tense to the same degree as Wollaston's subjects in figs. 2 and 11.3 The Moffat poses are identical to those used so often by Wollaston. Greenwood made a slight attempt to paint fabrics in the Wollaston manner although he never achieved the same crisply modelled effect as the English artist. There is a hint of Greenwood's adoption of Wollaston's almond-eye characteristic in the portrait of Elizabeth Moffat.

The Greenwood portraits are thought to have been executed just prior to the artist's departure in 1752 for Surinam.4 This seems logical and appropriate when considering the possibility of Wollaston's influence, since the latter did not appear in the northern colonies until 1749. It is not known that Greenwood actually saw any of Wollaston's New York work at this time but it is recalled that there were at least two Wollaston portraits, those of Mr. and Mrs. James Monk and an unknown lady of that family, in Boston during the 1740's.

John Hesselius, son of the Swedish artist Gustavus, fell under Wollaston's spell more completely than any other American-born painter. The younger Hesselius' earliest work appeared in 1750 when apparently he was working for the Gordon family in Virginia.6 Like Wollaston and
others he traveled extensively in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia and possibly New Jersey executing portraits for wealthy, prominent families.\footnote{7}

Richard K. Doud, noted authority on John Hesselius, divides the artist's work into two distinct style periods. From 1750 through 1757 he sought and mimicked the style of Robert Feke, possibly having met Feke when he was working in Philadelphia. From 1758 until his death in 1778 Hesselius worked more in the manner of Wollaston. Doud notes that "there can be little doubt, . . . that by 1758, Hesselius had fixed upon Wollaston as his star, and the influence of Robert Feke (excepting possibly in color) had largely disappeared from his painting."\footnote{8} Doud adds that "the simple background, the more florid flesh tones, the slightly tilted eyes, and the somewhat distorted angularity of features are characteristic of this influence."\footnote{9}

One has only to view the portraits of Samuel Lloyd Chew and those of the Calvert Children to realize what an important role Wollaston played in Hesselius' career (figs. 91, and 90).\footnote{10} Hesselius did not merely imitate, for what he learned from Wollaston he tried to improve. In rendering fabrics he approached reality more nearly than Wollaston although Hesselius' finished products seem tight, minutely polished and rather sharply delineated. It is evident from Hesselius' late works that he was never comfortable with Wollaston's style and eventually modified it to conform to a more personal approach to portraiture. By the mid-1760's Hesselius no longer slaved over fabric renderings, attempting to make his portraits decoratively exciting. Instead he seems to have become more intimately aware of his subjects, painting
them as humans, personalities, people who possess warmth and character. His portrait of Mrs. Thomas Gough, painted in 1777, is an exceptional example of his late work (fig. 92). At the expense of Wollaston's fashionable style of opulent velvets and silks and pretty faces it seems that Hesselius had found, by 1777, another more meaningful approach to American portraiture. 11

Wollaston's influence on Hesselius accounts for much of the artist-attribution problem in many institutions and private collections housing either painter's work. Because their paintings are so close in style and composition art historians have frequently confused their work. A careful examination of the drawing methods of both artists, particularly their handling of anatomical forms, reveals many distinguishing characteristics.

A very general observation is that Wollaston's anatomical forms (heads, hands, torsos) are rounder and fleshier than those of Hesselius. The latter habitually modelled the heads of his subjects so that they appear slightly tilted with the chin protruding and the forehead receding (fig. 91). This technique is not observed in Wollaston's portraits where the sitter's head is usually erect and parallel to the viewer. Hesselius seems to have favored rather elongated foreheads which is not typical of Wollaston's figures. Wollaston had a set way of drawing mouths—slightly turned up at the corners, both lips being pleasantly full and proportionate to each other. Hesselius never mastered this technique and his sitters' lips are rather tight by comparison with the lower one protruding. Any number of comparisons of
this type could be cited here and the conclusions drawn would be, without exception, that Wollaston was more the master of plastic forms than was Hesselius.

The artist Henry Benbridge (1744-1812) was only fourteen years old when Wollaston made his second recorded trip to Philadelphia. Robert G. Stewart, noted Benbridge scholar, has offered an interesting account of how this young artist learned of Wollaston and possibly received instruction from him. Stewart writes: "The year 1758 is significant for Benbridge according to Charles Henry Hart and family tradition because it was at this time that Benbridge received his instruction from John Wollaston..." Wollaston painted a portrait of Thomas Gordon, stepfather of Benbridge during 1758. According to Gordon Saltar, current owner of the Gordon portrait and a descendant of the subject, "Wollaston was commissioned to paint the likeness so that Benbridge could observe." The stepfather's mention of Wollaston in correspondence with Benbridge, some twelve years later, proves Gordon's remembrance and enduring opinion of Wollaston's approach to portrait commissions, humorous or otherwise.

Several good examples of Benbridge's adaptation of Wollaston's style have been pointed out by Stewart. One of these is Benbridge's earliest known paintings—that of his half sister, Rebecca. Little Rebecca is stiffly posed and the almond shape of the eyes as well as the shape and position of the left hand definitely reveal the young Philadelphian's knowledge and use of Wollaston's portrait vocabulary. A far more convincing example of Wollaston's influence is seen in Benbridge's portrait of Mary (Polly) Gordon Thompson (fig. 88). The
shape of Polly's eyes, her mouth, the necklace and bow behind, the overall modelling of the dress and the bow at the sleeve are reminiscent of Wollaston's work.  

Historians of American painting have suggested that Wollaston influenced other painters in the colonies. The late George C. Groce and William Sawitzky felt strongly that Benjamin West (1738-1820) and Matthew Pratt (1734-1805) fell under Wollaston's influence early in their careers. Until there is a critical study and survey of Pratt's work a case for that artist's influence by Wollaston cannot be assessed.

Francis Hopkinson, in his 1758 poem quoted earlier in this paper, urged Benjamin West to follow Wollaston's example. The young artist probably took this advice to heart for at least two of his surviving American paintings reveal some knowledge and dependence on Wollaston's methods. West's portrait of Mary Keen adequately illustrates this point in the drawing of the hands, the elongated neck, the multi-fold dress and in the overall composition and pose. There is little question that West had seen one or more of the numerous female portraits by Wollaston then hanging in Philadelphia.

West's portrait of Thomas Mifflin (at one time attributed to John Wollaston) also shows some reliance on Wollaston's portrait style in the treatment of Mifflin's head and his right hand (fig. 93). The extraordinary composition of the portrait and the distinctive coloration are totally West's innovations and perhaps document his departure from Wollaston's influence.
It is important to note here that Wollaston's influence came late in West's American career, about 1758. It appears that West, in adopting Wollaston's mannerisms, was merely searching for something of the artistic fashions of Europe and England which he, perhaps, knew well from prints. It was a very momentary experiment with West who in 1760 was on his way to Italy where he would study the great masters of his chosen profession. 20

The story of Wollaston's influence in the continuing development of American painting must end rather abruptly here for any association between him and other artists of the times would be highly conjectural. This does not lessen the importance of his influence or its rightful inclusion in studies which heretofore have treated the careers and widespread influence of colonial artists such as John Smibert, Robert Feke and Joseph Blackburn. All of these men left their mark on American artistic development. Wollaston's was just as formidable and indelible. That his influence was not enduring as is clearly seen in the careers of Benbridge and West, is symptomatic of the times. Wollaston was neither a master nor a teacher of his trade. He was very much an example, a secondary source of artistic fashion which was desirable and had its roots in the heart of London.

Wollaston's unquestionable success in the colonies must have been as appealing and inspiring to native-born artists as the style he practiced. It is understandable why young men like Benbridge and West would try to follow his path—not only in imitating his style but in going abroad for further study. This, as they probably knew, was the
milieu from which Wollaston and his success had emerged.

Wollaston was, for these aspiring artists, a tempting realization of what could be accomplished in a painting career, particularly if one had the good fortune to secure training abroad. Benjamin West, the first of these men to make that step, did not take long to confirm that realization. Thereafter, the history of American painting took a new turn and was fashioned not by immigrants like Wollaston, but by those who were born on American soil. It is when we read and study the on-rushing current of artistic events that happened during these later years of the eighteenth century that we should momentarily step back and try to recall the catalytic effect and significant role played by artists like Wollaston in the formation of an American painting school.
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CATALOGUE

This portion of the paper is extensive and contains all the illustrations of portraits referred to in the text. Certain notes are mentioned here as a guide in using the Catalogue.

The Catalogue is divided into four sections: Section I, Virginia Portraits by John Wollaston; Section II, English and Other American Portraits by John Wollaston; Section III, Portraits by English Artists of Wollaston's Period; Section IV, Portraits by American Artists Who Were Influenced by John Wollaston.

Section I, dealing with the Virginia portraits, is the largest and contains formal catalogue entries with genealogical information and art historical comment on the portraits. Each entry is preceded by a heading which gives the sitter's name, size of the painting and the current or last known owner of the painting. The entry text is followed by a listing of bibliographical references and sources consulted for information on the portrait and/or the subject of the portrait. References for entries should be interpreted in the following manner: If a given reference provides genealogical material on the subject and the painting, it is cited with no further explanation. If the given source is for genealogical material only, it is listed "Biographical information from (or courtesy of) . . . ." If the portrait is illustrated in a given source it is cited as "Illustrated in . . . ." Where a portrait is owned by a
public institution and the files of that institution were used for genealogical or logistical information on the portrait the source is listed as "Curatorial files . . . ." An asterisk by the catalogue entry number in Section I portraits indicates that illustrations were not available for the paper.

Sections II, III, IV of the Catalogue do not contain formal or lengthy entries for given portraits. Information for these portraits is contained in the captions.

Three abbreviations appear frequently throughout the Catalogue: CESDA; DAB; CAP. CESDA refers to the Catalogue of Early Southern Decorative Arts, Winston-Salem, North Carolina. DAB refers to the Dictionary of American Biography, published by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. CAP refers to the Catalogue of American Portraits compiled by the National Portrait Gallery, Washington, D.C. These are cited as references according to the guidelines mentioned above. CESDA also made available certain photographs for the Catalogue and is so mentioned in the captions for photographs.

It should be understood that the author is not an expert on Virginia genealogy. The factual content of catalogue entries seemed correct and pertinent to the author at the time this paper was being prepared. In some cases sitter attributions were confusing and the author has made note of these considerations in the entries. Other sitter identification problems may emerge in the future study of Virginia eighteenth-century portraiture which relate to portraits executed there.
by Wollaston, particularly with the large group of Randolph family portraits.
SECTION I

Virginia Portraits by John Wollaston
Figure 1. William Allen. Photograph courtesy of the Brooklyn Museum.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
No. 1. WILLIAM ALLEN (1733-1793)
Oil on canvas. 35 3/4 x 38 inches.

William Allen was born and lived at "Claremont," the family's ancestral home on the James River in Virginia. He married twice, first to Clara Walker (no. 2) and second to Mary Lightfoot (no. 32) on November 9, 1765. He died in 1793.

During his lifetime he was active in the affairs of the Virginia colony as a member of the Convention of 1788 and also as a member of the legislature.

The painting came to the Brooklyn Museum from Mrs. Louis A. Van Gaertner (nee Allen), a descendant of the subject, in August 1919. Mrs. Van Gaertner's family inherited "Claremont" earlier in the nineteenth century and evidently the painting was hanging there at that time.

Bibliography/Source Material: Curatorial files, the Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn, New York.
Figure 2. Mrs. William Allen. Photograph courtesy of the Brooklyn Museum.
No. 2. MRS. WILLIAM ALLEN (Clara Walker, 1737- ?)
Oil on canvas. 35 7/8 x 28 1/4 inches.

Clara Walker Allen was the daughter of John Walker and Catherine Yates of Virginia. Her date of marriage to William Allen (no. 1) is unknown as is her death date. However, she was dead by 1765 when Allen married his second wife, Mary Lightfoot (no. 32).

This is one of three portraits thought to be of Clara Walker Allen. Another, probably a copy of the Wollaston version, is owned by the Detroit Institute of Arts and is attributed to John Hesselius. It bears a striking resemblance to the portrait of this entry. The third portrait, now in the Shelburne Museum in Vermont, is attributed to John Wollaston but bears no relationship to this three-quarter length example (fig. 3).

There is little doubt that the portrait of this entry is the companion portrait to that of William Allen of the preceding entry. It came to the Brooklyn Museum from the same source and has an identical ownership history.

Figure 3. Mrs. William Allen? Photograph courtesy of the Brooklyn Museum.
No. 3. MRS. WILLIAM ALLEN (Clara Walker, 1737- ?)?

Oil on canvas. Original dimensions altered.
Owner: The Shelburne Museum, Vermont.

The subject of this portrait is thought to be the same as that of the preceding entry. Little is known of its ownership history other than the fact that it was given to the museum in 1956 by the late Mr. Edmund Ashley Prentis.

In all Wollaston portraits examined to date none show half or portions of hands as can be seen in this example. This would have been an extremely unacademic method for any artist of Wollaston's period, and it suggests that the painting was cut down in more recent years.

It is of interest that the lady shown here does not resemble the subject in the preceding entry. Until additional documentation can be found the identity of the subject must be held in question although the painting is certainly in the style of John Wollaston.

Figure 4. Thomas Barker. Photograph courtesy of CESDA.
No. 4. THOMAS BARKER (1713-1784)
Oil on canvas. 35 1/4 x 27 3/8 inches.

Thomas Barker was a prominent lawyer and statesman in North Carolina. He came to Edenton as a young man to study law with William Little, his mother's brother. By the time he was twenty-three he was the clerk in two North Carolina Committees of Assembly. In 1746, he was one of four commissioners appointed to revise the statutes of the colony. He was selected Treasurer of the northern counties of North Carolina in 1748 and was reappointed in 1754. From 1742 to 1761 he represented Edenton in the Assembly. He left for England in 1761 where he remained for seventeen years as Colonial Agent to Britain for the North Carolina Assembly. He returned to Edenton in 1778.

Barker married twice. The name of his first wife is unknown, but they had one child, Betsey. After his first wife's death, he married Penelope Padgett in 1756; she was the daughter of Samuel Padgett and Elizabeth Blount. By the second marriage there were three children, all of whom had died by 1760.

Barker's likeness is one of a group of three family portraits attributed to John Wollaston. He is shown in a waist-length pose frequently used by the artist. He wears a blue coat with gold braid and buttons and a white waistcoat. The writer has been unable to determine the title of the book Barker holds, but the use of books in other Virginia portraits by Wollaston is common (nos. 43 and 54).

When Penelope Barker died in 1794 she left all her property to her niece who had been raised by the Barkers. The niece, daughter of John Hodgson and Penelope's older sister, married Samuel Dickinson who owned the Cupola House in Edenton. At Dickinson's death in 1804, the house and its contents were willed to his daughter, Mrs. Penelope Barker Dickinson Bond who left her property to her daughter in 1858. Mrs. Bond's daughter left the same to her niece, Miss Tillie Bond. The portraits of Thomas and Penelope Barker, and Thomas Hodgson were present in the house during Miss Bond's ownership and have remained there since.

These three portraits were probably executed in Virginia. Thomas Barker's first wife, whose name is unknown, was from Williamsburg, Virginia. The child by that marriage, Betsey, after her mother's death went to live with relatives in Williamsburg. A portrait of Betsey exists which bears a close stylistic resemblance to that of her stepmother and is no doubt by Wollaston. It is very likely that all of the portraits were painted by Wollaston while the Barkers were visiting Betsey in Williamsburg. No other portraits of North Carolina subjects can be attributed to Wollaston at this time. Unfortunately, this writer has not been able to locate the Wollaston portrait of Betsey Barker.

Bibliography/Source Material: Biographical information courtesy of Ronald Miller, Natchez, Mississippi.
Figure 5. Mrs. Thomas Barker. Photograph courtesy of CESDA.
No. 5. MRS. THOMAS BARKER (Penelope Padgett, 1728-1794)
Oil on canvas. 35 1/4 x 27 1/4 inches

Penelope was born June 17, 1728, the second daughter of Samuel Padgett and Elizabeth Blount of North Carolina. She married John Hodgson, a prominent lawyer who in 1739, 1741, and 1743 served as Speaker of the North Carolina Assembly. He died in 1747 leaving two sons: Samuel, 1745-1752; and Thomas Craven, 1746-1772. In 1752, Penelope married James Craven but was again widowed when Craven died in 1755. In 1756, she sold her property to Thomas Barker and married him. She had three children by this marriage but all died in infancy.

There is little doubt that this portrait is by John Wollaston. It compares in every detail with his Virginia portraits in pose, treatment of the hands, face and dress fabric. The sitter wears a pink dress with white lace sleeves and trim at the neck line.

The portrait's ownership history is identical to that of the preceding entry.

Bibliography/Source Material: Biographical information courtesy of Ronald Miller, Natchez, Mississippi.
No. 6. JUDITH CAREY BELL (1726-1798)
Oil on canvas. 34 x 28 1/2 inches.
Owner: In 1931 Bolton and Binsse gave Gist Blair as the owner's name, location unknown. At the time George C. Groce compiled his list, about 1956, he noted that Montgomery Blair of Washington, D.C. was the owner. The present location and the validity of the attribution remain questionable.

No. 7. ROBERT BOLLING (1738—before 1775)
Oil on canvas. Dimensions unknown.
Owner: Unknown.

Unfortunately the location of this portrait has not been discovered although it is referred to in several publications (cited below).

Bolling was the son of John and Elizabeth Lewis Bolling. On July 24, 1751, he left the colonies for London to begin six years of education. He returned to Virginia in April, 1756, about the time that Wollaston was working in that colony. Bolling later studied law under Benjamin Waller of Williamsburg and in 1763 he married Mary Burton, daughter of William Burton of Northampton, Virginia.

Figure 8. George Braxton, III. Photograph courtesy of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.
No. 8. GEORGE BRAXTON, III (1734-1761)
Oil on canvas. 35 x 28 inches.

George Braxton, III, was the son of George Braxton, Jr., of King and Queen County, Virginia. Like his father, George became a wealthy planter and served as a member of the House of Burgesses and later as President of the Colonial Council. He married Mary Blair (no. 9), sister of John Blair, a signer of the Constitution.

The younger Braxton owned "Newington" and two other important Virginia plantations during his lifetime. He was also a Colonel in the Virginia Militia, but his promising career in colonial affairs was never realized due to his death at the age of twenty-seven in 1761.

This portrait ranks among the finest of Wollaston's work in the Virginia colony. Although it was restored in 1956 by Sheldon Keck, it retains all of the surface highlights which are characteristic of the very best of Wollaston's work. The sitter wears a blue coat with gold braid and white waistcoat similar to Thomas Barker's attire (no. 4).

Mrs. Parker Campbell Wyeth of St. Joseph's, Missouri, was the former owner of this portrait. Braxton was Mrs. Campbell's great-great-great grandfather.

Figure 9. Mrs. George Braxton, III.
Photograph courtesy of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.
No. 9. MRS. GEORGE BRAXTON, III (Mary Blair, 1734-1799)
Oil on canvas. 35 x 28 inches.

Mary Blair was the daughter of John Blair, Sr., (1687-1771) of Williamsburg, Virginia. Her first marriage was to George Braxton, III, (no. 8). After his death in 1761 she married Robert Burrell of Virginia. In 1792, after Burrell's death, she married R. Prescott of Philadelphia.

Mrs. Braxton wears a white dress with pink bow and is posed identically to Penelope Barker (no. 5). The similarities between the portraits of these women and those of their husbands (figs. 4 and 8) suggest that one of the couples saw the portraits of the other and requested Wollaston to produce similar ones.

The ownership history for this entry is the same as that for the preceding entry.

Figure 10. Colonel William Brent. Photograph courtesy of Georgetown University.
No. 10. COLONEL WILLIAM BRENT (1733-1782)
Oil on canvas. 29 1/2 x 25 inches.
Owner: Georgetown University, Washington, C.C.

No biographical information on Brent has been found except that he lived at "Richland" in Stafford County, Virginia, during the period that Wollaston was working in Virginia.

The portrait descended from Miss Emily Brent and/or Miss Ellen Daingerfield who bequeathed it to the College. It was restored by Art Restorers Association, New York, in 1950.

Figure 11. Mrs. William Brent. Photograph courtesy of Georgetown University.
No. 11. MRS. WILLIAM BRENT (Eleanor Carroll, ?-1756)
Oil on canvas. 29 1/2 x 25 inches.
Owner: Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

The subject was the wife of Colonel William Brent (no. 10) and
the sister of Archbishop John Carroll, founder of Georgetown College
(now Georgetown University).

The ownership history for the portrait is identical to that
given for no. 10.

Bibliography/Source Material: Unpublished notes of the late
George C. Groce, Library, the National Portrait Gallery, Washington, D.C.
Figure 12. John Carter Byrd. Photograph courtesy of the Frick Art Reference Library.
No. 12. JOHN CARTER BYRD (1751-?)
Oil on canvas. Dimensions unknown.
Owner: William Byrd, location unknown.

The little boy shown in this portrait was the second child of William Byrd, III, and his first wife Elizabeth Hill Carter (no. 14). He was the brother of Thomas Taylor Byrd (no. 13). The family lived at "Westover".

This portrait and the likeness of Thomas Taylor Byrd were bequeathed by their step-mother, Mary Willing Byrd, to Thomas Taylor Byrd in her Will of 1813. The two portraits have remained in the Byrd family over the years.

The Byrd children's portraits are exceptional in both quality and format for Wollaston's Virginia period. John Carter is shown pointing, appropriately so, to a bird's nest containing a small bird. One wonders if this pictorial play on words was intentional and if so whether it was a device chosen by the children's parents or the artist. It seems very possible that the use of the motif was intentional since it is not seen in any other known portraits by Wollaston.

Figure 13. **Thomas Taylor Byrd.** Photograph courtesy of the Frick Art Reference Library.
No. 13. THOMAS TAYLOR BYRD (1752-?)
Oil on canvas. Dimensions unknown.
Owner: William Byrd, location unknown.

The subject of this portrait was the third child of William Byrd, III, and his first wife Elizabeth Hill Carter (no. 14). He was the brother of John Carter Byrd (no. 12).

Thomas Taylor served as a Captain in the British Army during part of his career. He married Mary, the daughter of William Armistead of "Hesse" in Gloucester County, Virginia.

The portrait was bequeathed to the subject by his step-mother in 1813 and has remained in the Byrd family since that time. The boy wears a costume virtually identical to his brother's (fig. 12). It seems likely from the pose of the sitters, one facing right and one facing left, that the paintings were meant as companion pieces.

Figure 14. Mrs. William Byrd, III.
Photograph courtesy of the Frick Art Reference Library.
No. 14. MRS. WILLIAM BYRD, III (Elizabeth Hill Carter, 1731-1760)
Oil on canvas. 36 x 28 inches.
Owner: Charles Hill Carter, "Shirley," Charles City County, Virginia.

The sitter was the daughter of John and Elizabeth Hill Carter of "Shirley." She was the first wife of William Byrd, III of "Westover."

This portrait holds particular interest in any survey of Wollaston's work for it is one of two known pictures of women wearing large hats of this type. The inclusion of the hat adds interest to the overall composition and effect. The painting is also exceptional in coloration of soft shades of blue for the dress and pink for the hat. Lace and cuffs are typically white. The portrait is one of Wollaston's finest Virginia works in both composition and execution.

Mrs. Byrd was possibly living at "Shirley" when Wollaston recorded her likeness. It descended in the Carter family at "Shirley" to the present owner and received minimal restoration in 1973.

Figure 15. Charles Carter. Photograph courtesy of CESDA.
No. 15. CHARLES CARTER (1732-1806)
Oil on canvas. 29 1/2 x 24 3/8 inches.
Owner: Charles Hill Carter, "Shirley," Charles City County, Virginia.

Charles Carter of "Corotoman," Lancaster County and "Shirley," Charles City County, Virginia, was born in 1732. His parents were John and Elizabeth Carter. He was the brother of Mrs. William Byrd, III, (no. 14).

Carter served as a Burgess from Lancaster County from 1758 through 1775. He was a member of the Convention and First State Council in 1776. He married first Mary Carter, daughter of Colonel Charles and Mary Walker Carter of "Cleve," King George County, Virginia. After her death he married Anne Butler Moore (no. 16), daughter of Bernard and Anne Catherine Spottswood Moore of Virginia.

Carter's likeness is waist-length. The figure is placed against a light brown background and is framed by dark brown spandrels at all corners. He wears a red-orange coat, white stock and his brown hair is tied with a black ribbon at the neck. No hands are showing and his eyes are brown. The portrait is conservative and drab by comparison with Wollaston's known Virginia oeuvre. It seems ironic, though it must have been the case, that a man of Carter's wealth and prominence would prefer this rather indifferent and totally undecorative portrait formula.

The portrait descended through the Carter family to the present owner at "Shirley."

Figure 16. Mrs. Charles Carter. Photograph courtesy of CESDA.
No. 16. MRS. CHARLES CARTER (Anne Butler Moore?, c. 1740-1809)
Oil on canvas. 29 3/8 x 24 3/8 inches.
Owner: Charles Hill Carter, "Shirley," Charles City County, Virginia.

Anne Butler Moore was the daughter of Bernard and Anne Catherine Spottswood Moore. She married Charles Carter (no. 14) sometime after 1767 and before 1771.

Stylistically this portrait can be attributed to John Wollaston. However, there is some question as to the correct identity of the subject. The portrait is the same size as that of Charles Carter and is probably its companion portrait. Anne Butler Moore did not marry Carter until after 1767, the year his first wife bore her last child. Wollaston's Virginia dates are 1754-1757 or 1758. This portrait shows a woman of about thirty-five or forty years of age. Anne Butler Moore would have been no older than fifteen or seventeen when Wollaston was in Virginia. The likeness could be of Carter's first wife, Mary Walker Carter, the daughter of Colonel Charles and Mary Walker Carter of "Cleve."

Mrs. Carter wears a light brown and white dress with white lace collar and cuffs. Her eyes and hair are brown and the background is light brown. The figure is framed by dark brown spandrels as in no. 14.

Figure 17. Landon Carter. Photograph courtesy of CESDA.
No. 17. Landon Carter (1710-1778)
Oil on canvas. 46 3/4 x 37 3/4 inches.
Owner: Mr. and Mrs. Robert Carter Wellford, "Sabine Hall," Warsaw, Virginia.

Landon was the son of Robert "King" Carter and his third wife, Elizabeth Landon Willis. His father was perhaps the wealthiest planter in Virginia at the time of Landon's birth. Landon, like his four brothers who were born before him, was well educated and received a generous inheritance.

After his studies at the College of William and Mary he resided with his father at the family mansion, "Corotoman." At this time he managed his father's lands in Northumberland County and continued in this capacity until his father's death in 1732. At the age of twenty-two Landon married Elizabeth, daughter of John Worsley and sister of Ralph Worsley, IV (no. 58). Of the eight fully operable plantations his father left to him, Landon chose to live at "Landsdowne" in Richmond County. Like his father and brothers he became involved in colonial politics.

Figure 18. Mrs. Robert Carter, III.  
Photograph courtesy of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.
No. 18. MRS. ROBERT CARTER, III (Frances Ann Tasker, c. 1734-1789)
Oil on canvas. 50 x 39 1/2 inches.

The subject of this entry was the youngest daughter of the Honorable Benjamin Tasker of Annapolis and "Belair," Prince George County, Maryland, and his wife Ann Bladen. She married Robert Carter, III, in 1754 and they made their home at his estate, "Nomini Hall," Westmoreland County, Virginia. Carter was a distinguished member of the King's Council and known by his contemporaries as "Councillor Carter." He was the son of Robert Carter, II, builder of "Nomini Hall."

With the exception of the position of the raised hand, the pose used for this sitter is identical to nos. 21 and 30. A portrait of Frances Ann's father, Benjamin Tasker, is also attributable to Wollaston and is listed with the Maryland subjects in Appendix F.

Figure 19. Mrs. John Chiswell. Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society.
No. 19. MRS. JOHN CHISWELL (Elizabeth Randolph, 1722-1776)
Oil on canvas. 35 x 29 inches.
Owner: The Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

The subject of this portrait was the daughter of William, II and
Elizabeth Randolph. She married Colonel John Chiswell of Hanover County
and Williamsburg about 1740.

The pose and costume here are similar to no. 26, and with minor
variations was used frequently by Wollaston in Virginia.

The portrait was given to the Virginia Historical Society in 1927
with a group of eight other Randolph family portraits which are thought
to have hung at "Wilton" in the eighteenth century. "Wilton" was owned
by the Randolphs until 1860 when Kate Randolph married Edward Carrington
Mayo of Richmond. The nine portraits were bequeathed to her, and she
bequeathed them to her son E. C. Mayo, Jr., who married Katharine Harris
of Richmond. After E. C. Mayo, Jr.'s death his wife married Commander
Grey Skipwith and the couple gave the nine portraits to the Virginia
Historical Society in 1927. They have been on loan to "Wilton" since
1954 when the house was moved to Richmond and restored as the head­
quar ters of the Colonial Dames of Virginia.

Bibliography/Source Material: Curatorial files, the Virginia
Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.
Figure 20. Daniel Parke Custis. Photograph courtesy of the Washington-Custis-Lee Collection, Washington and Lee University.
No. 20. DANIEL PARKE CUSTIS (1711-1757)
Oil on canvas. 50 x 42 inches.

Daniel Parke was the son of Colonel John Custis, IV, and Francis Parke, daughter of Colonel Daniel Parke who served as aide-de-camp for the Duke of Marlborough. This portrait, along with others of the Custis family (nos. 21, 22) originally hung in the sitter's home in New Kent County, Virginia. A receipt to Mrs. Custis from Wollaston for these paintings survives in the manuscript collection of the Virginia Historical Society and is dated October 21, 1757.

Mrs. Custis' maiden name was Martha Dandridge. After Daniel's death in 1757 she married George Washington some two years later. Two of the portraits, (nos. 21, 22) are known to have accompanied Mrs. Washington to "Mount Vernon." Where the portrait of Daniel was at this time is unknown, although it may have been kept in storage at "Mount Vernon" or it may have stayed at the Custis' home in New Kent County. When Mrs. Washington died in 1802 the family collection of portraits passed to her grandson, George Washington Parke Custis. The latter moved the collection to "Arlington House" in Arlington, Virginia and sometime during his lifetime he reunited the portrait of Daniel with those of his children and wife. When G. W. P. Custis died in 1857 the collection was left to his daughter, Mary, the wife of Robert E. Lee. The paintings remained at Arlington until the Civil War closed. After the war, General Lee became the President of Washington College (now Washington and Lee University) and the portraits were hung in the President's house at the College. After the death of Mrs. Robert E. Lee in 1873, the portraits passed to her eldest son, George Washington Custis Lee. At this son's death in 1913 the portraits went to his sister, Mary Custis Lee. They were bequeathed by her in 1918 to the University.

Figure 21. Mrs. Daniel Parke Custis.
Photograph courtesy of the Washington-Custis-Lee Collection, Washington and Lee University.
No. 21. MRS. DANIEL PARKE CUSTIS (Martha Dandridge, 1731-1802)
Oil on canvas. 50 x 41 inches.

The subject was the daughter of Colonel John Dandridge and Frances Jones of Virginia. She married first Daniel Parke Custis (no. 20) in 1749. They had four children and of these two survived infancy: John Parke Custis and Martha Dandridge Custis (no. 22).

After the death of Daniel Parke Custis in 1757 the subject married George Washington on January 6, 1759. There were no children from this marriage.

The portrait represents the finest of Wollaston's Virginia work in terms of drawing and composition. Only a few of his large canvases in Virginia approach the complexity of this example in the use of landscape vistas, particularly in physically relating the subject to the background as seen here in Mrs. Custis's hand gesture towards the flowers.

The ownership history for this portrait is identical to that given for no. 21.

Figure 22. John Parke Custis and Martha Dandridge Custis. Photograph courtesy of the Washington-Custis-Lee Collection, Washington and Lee University.
No. 22. JOHN PARKE CUSTIS AND MARTHA DANDRIDGE CUSTIS
Oil on canvas. 49 x 36 inches.

These were the children of Daniel and Martha Custis. The little girl died at the age of 16 with consumption. The son survived and served as Washington's aide during the Revolution, dying in 1781. He married Eleanor Calvert of Maryland and after his death and his mother's second marriage to George Washington his children were adopted by the Washingtons at "Mount Vernon."

The ownership history for this double likeness is the same as no. 21. This painting, as well as nos. 20 and 21, was restored by Mr. and Mrs. Russell Quandt in 1969.

Figure 23. *Thomas Craven Hodgson*. Photograph courtesy of CESDA.
No. 23. THOMAS CRAVEN HODGSON (1746-1772)

Oil on canvas. 29 x 24 1/4 inches.

Hodgson is pictured as a boy of about eleven years of age in this portrait. He was the second son of John and Penelope Hodgson. He evidently was named for a family friend, Thomas Craven, who later became his step-father. Hodgson was admitted to the Bar in November, 1768. He made his will in 1772 and died in March of that year.

The colors in this portrait are particularly pleasing. A light blue was used for the waistcoat, soft gray for the coat, and silver for the buttons and the trim on the hat. The contrasting darker shades for the hat, tie at neck and ribbon at the neck add balance to the muted shades for the costume. The hair, eyes and spandrels are dark brown and the background is painted in complementary tones of gray.

The family ownership history for this entry is the same as that given for the portraits of Thomas and Penelope Barker (nos. 4, 5). The boy is shown in half-length as are the Barkers. His apparent age agrees with the period of Wollaston's activity in Virginia.

No. 24. EDMUND JENNINGS (1659-1727)?
Oil on canvas. 24 x 30 inches.

Edmund Jennings was born at Ripon, in Yorkshire, England, the son of Sir Edmund Jennings and Margaret Barham. After immigrating to Virginia he became Attorney General of the Colony from 1684-1691. He died in Virginia in December of 1727. His home, "Ripon," stood on the south bank of the York River in York County.

This painting is either a copy by Wollaston of an earlier likeness of Jennings or the subject has been incorrectly identified for Jennings was dead some thirty years before Wollaston worked in Virginia.

The portrait was offered for sale at Sotheby's in London on May 15, 1929, by a Mrs. Jenings (sic) of "Gladswood," England, who claimed to be a descendant of the subject. Its current location is unknown.

Figure 25. Commandore Augustus Keppel.  
Photograph courtesy of the Bayou Bend Collection.
No. 25. COMMANDORE AUGUSTUS KEPPEL (dates unknown)
Oil on canvas. 50 x 40 inches.
Owner: The Bayou Bend Collection, Houston, Texas.

The subject of this painting was identified some years ago by
Sabin Galleries of London as Commandore Augustus Keppel of the British
Navy. The officer shown here bears a resemblance in the style of hair
and age to the 1753 portrait of Keppel by his friend, Sir Joshua Reynolds
(National Maritime Museum, Greenwich).

Keppel sailed for America late in December of 1754 and arrived at
Hampton Roads, Virginia on February 20, 1755. His ship, the Centurian,
is probably the one illustrated in this painting. Keppel's stay in
Virginia lasted until the middle of April, 1755 and would have given him
ample opportunity to visit the Williamsburg area where Wollaston was
working. The portrait does not compare with Wollaston's work before 1749
in England and other than the 1754-1755 period of Keppel's stay in
Virginia the artist would have had no other opportunity to record his
likeness.

This very fine example must be considered unique to Wollaston's
production in Virginia. No other known Virginia portraits by him show
this pose or an officer in naval uniform. The inclusion of the ship in
the background and the general format of the painting were probably taken
from Michael Dahl's portrait of Admiral Sir Cloudesley Shovell. John
Smibert used this same format earlier for his portrait of Sir William
Pepperrell.

Keppel is dressed in a deep blue coat with silver braid and a
white waistcoat. The background is in varying shades of gray.

The painting was given to the Bayou Bend Collection by Mr. and
Mrs. Harris Masterson who purchased it from Sabin Galleries.

Bibliography/Source Material: Biographical information courtesy
of Barry A. Greenlaw, Curator, the Bayou Bend Collection, Houston,
Texas.
Figure 26. Lettice Lee. Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society.
No. 26. LETTICE LEE
Oil on canvas. 50 x 40 inches.
Owner: The Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

There seems to be considerable confusion as to the identity of the subject of this portrait. She was at one time called Lettice Lee (1731-1811), the daughter of Richard Lee of Northumberland County and Judith Steptoe of Lancaster County, Virginia. This Miss Lee married Colonel James Ball of "Bendley," Lancaster County, circa 1754.

The records of the Virginia Historical Society identify the sitter as Lettice Lee, daughter of Philip Lee of Maryland. This Lettice Lee married two and possibly three times: first, to James Wardropp, of "Ampthill," Chesterfield County, Virginia; second, to Dr. Adam Thompson; and possibly a third marriage to Colonel Joseph Sims.

The portrait was presented to the Society in 1940 by relatives of Lettice Lee, daughter of Philip Lee. There remains some question, however, as to her life dates and the possibility of the portrait having been painted about the time of her marriage to James Wardropp of "Ampthill" in Virginia.

Until further genealogical research is found to clarify the matter there is a strong possibility that the portrait was executed by Wollaston in Virginia, regardless of which Lettice Lee she may be.

Bibliography/Source Material: Biographical information courtesy of Virginius C. Hall, Jr., former Assistant Director, the Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.
Figure 27. Colonel Fielding Lewis. Photograph courtesy of the Frick Art Reference Library.
No. 27. COLONEL FIELDING LEWIS (1725-1781)
Oil on canvas. 50 x 40 inches.
Owner: The Kenmore Association, Incorporated, Fredericksburg, Virginia.

Fielding Lewis was the son of Colonel John and Frances Fielding Lewis of "Warner Hall," Gloucester County, Virginia. He was the brother of Warner Lewis (no. 29) whose likeness by Wollaston is remarkably similar in pose and figure size. Fielding married Catherine Washington, daughter of Major John Washington, in 1746. After her death he married Betty Washington, sister of General George Washington. An entry in the Lewis family Bible by Colonel Fielding reads: I was married to Miss Betty Washington, sister of General George Washington, 7th day of May, 1750." Fielding established the family estate, "Kenmore," in Spottsylvania County, Virginia, prior to his marriage to Betty (no. 28). Colonel Lewis wears a gray coat and waistcoat with white cuffs and stock. There is a copy of this portrait by Ellen Dickinson, dated 1876, and owned privately in Suitland, Maryland.

Bibliography/Source Material: Biographical information courtesy of P. Russell Bastedo, Director, the Kenmore Association, Incorporated, Fredericksburg, Virginia.
Figure 28. Mrs. Fielding Lewis. Photograph courtesy of the Frick Art Reference Library.
No. 28. MRS. FIELDING LEWIS (Betty Washington, 1735-1797)
Oil on canvas. 50 x 40 inches.

Betty Washington was the daughter of Augustine Washington and Mary Ball of "Wakefield." She married Colonel Fielding Lewis (no. 27) of "Kenmore" on May 7, 1750. She was the only surviving sister of General George Washington.

The portrait has been on permanent loan to the Kenmore Association, Incorporated, since 1929 and hangs near Wollaston's likeness of her husband. It was purchased by the owner in 1914 from the Lewis family of "Marmion." At the time of its acquisition the portrait was described as "in bad condition and not so attractive." Restoration was performed in 1916 by Professor Farina of Philadelphia. Its current condition is stabile, although there is considerable restoration in the dress which is very noticeable and the canvas support is weak.

Mrs. Lewis is depicted in a three-quarter length pose, seated, and holds a small bouquet of flowers in her right hand. Her dress is blue and cream in color and is trimmed with white lace cuffs and a ribbon.

Figure 29. Colonel Warner Lewis. Photograph courtesy of the College of William and Mary.
No. 29. COLONEL WARNER LEWIS (1720-?)
Oil on canvas. 49 x 39 inches.
Owner: Mrs. Nellie Taylor Greaves.

Warner Lewis was born at "Warner Hall" in Gloucester County, Virginia. He was the son of Colonel John Lewis, a member of the Colonial Council, and Frances Fielding. His brother, Colonel Fielding Lewis (no. 27) of "Kenmore" married first, Catharine, an aunt of General Washington, and second, Betty (no. 28), the sister of George Washington.

In 1746 Warner married Eleanor Bowles Gooch, widow of William Gooch. Warner was listed among the prominent officers who led the revolutionary forces of Gloucester County during the war.

Portraits of Eleanor and two Lewis children by Wollaston are also in the collections of the College of William and Mary (nos. 30, 31). They originally hung at "Warner Hall" but were taken to "Belle Farm" another Lewis family estate, when "Warner Hall" was sold in 1825. They remained at "Belle Farm" in the possession of William F. Taylor until his death in 1924. Taylor's only surviving child, Mrs. Nellie Taylor Greaves, inherited the portraits and placed them on deposit at the College of William and Mary. "Belle Farm" was located on the Severn River, as were the other family estates of "Severn Hall" and "Lewiston."

The three-quarter length pose illustrated by this portrait was used frequently by Wollaston in Virginia. A portrait of Ralph Wormeley (no. 58) shows the same pose in reverse.

Colonel Warner Lewis wears a brown velvet coat, white waistcoat, white stock and a full brown wig. His right arm rests on a table with the hand draped over the table edge and his left hand is placed just above the pocket of the waistcoat.

Figure 30. Mrs. Warner Lewis. Photograph courtesy of the College of William and Mary.
No. 30. MRS. WARNER LEWIS (Eleanor Bowles Gooch, dates unknown)
Oil on canvas. 49 x 39 inches.
Owner: Mrs. Nellie Taylor Greaves.

Eleanor was the daughter of James Bowles, Esquire, of Virginia
and married first William Gooch, the son of Governor Sir William Gooch
of Virginia. In 1746, after the death of her first husband, she married
Warner Lewis of "Warner Hall," Gloucester County, Virginia.

Mrs. Lewis is shown in a three-quarter length pose, standing to
the right of a window with landscape beyond. The incorporation of back­
ground devices similar to this occur in one other Virginia portrait
attributable to Wollaston (fig. 17). Mrs. Lewis's hand rests on a marble
top table similar to the table shown in the portrait of Mrs. Anthony
Walke (fig. 57), and she holds a dark blue scarf in her hand. She wears
a mauve colored dress with white lace at the neck and cuffs. The dress
is very similar to others seen in Wollaston's portraits of Virginia
ladies (figs. 18, 25).

The ownership history for this portrait is the same as given for
no. 29.

Bibliography/Source Material: Curatorial files, the College of
William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia. Illustrated in Alexander W.
Weddell, A Memorial Volume of Virginia Historical Portraiture, 1585-
Figure 31. Warner Lewis, II, and Rebecca Lewis. Photograph courtesy of the College of William and Mary.
No. 31. WARNER LEWIS, II, (1749-1791) AND REBECCA LEWIS (1750-?)  
Oil on canvas. 49 x 39 inches.  
Owner: Mrs. Nellie Taylor Greaves.  

The subjects of this double portrait were the children of  
Warner (no. 29) and Eleanor Bowles Gooch Lewis (no. 30) of "Warner Hall,"  
Gloucester County, Virginia. Warner, II, was the eldest son of the  
family and ultimately inherited the house from his father. He married  
first Mary Chiswell, the daughter of Colonel John and Elizabeth Chiswell  
(no. 19) of Williamsburg, and second Mary Fleming. He attended the  
College of William and Mary from 1761 to 1763 and served later in  
various political capacities for the Virginia colony.  

Rebecca married Dr. Robert Innes of Virginia. The ages of the  
children agree with the years of Wollaston's activity in Virginia.  
Rebecca would have been about five or six years of age and Warner, II,  
about ten years old. While the double portrait is not unknown in  
American painting of this period, Wollaston used it only on rare  
occasions and usually for children's portraits.  
The ownership history for this portrait is the same as that given  
for nos. 29, 30.  

Bibliography/Source Material: Curatorial files, the College of  
William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia. Illustrated in Virgil Barker,  
American Painting: History and Interpretation (New York: MacMillan  
Figure 32. Mary Lightfoot. Photograph courtesy of CESDA.
No. 32. MARY LIGHTFOOT (1750-1789)
Oil on canvas. 29 3/4 x 25 inches.
Owner: The Daughters of the American Revolution Museum, Washington, D.C.

The subject was the daughter of William Lightfoot of
"Teddington," Charles City County, Virginia. At the early age of
fifteen she became the second wife of William Allen (no. 1) of
"Claremont" on the James River. They were married on November 9, 1765.

This portrait exemplifies Wollaston's understanding of delicate
Rococo coloration in the use of soft shades of pink for the dress and
ochre for the doll's dress. The modelling of the face here is among the
finest of his attempts in careful painting of facial features. The
highlights are well placed and the artist seems to have taken particular
care with the shading of the left side of the little girl's face.

The portrait was sold out of the Lightfoot family in 1919 to
Herbert Lee Pratt who later gave it to the DAR Museum. It bears the
inscribed date of 1760, undoubtedly added to the canvas some years later
after Wollaston's departure since he left the colony in 1758 or 1759.

Bibliography/Source Material: Curatorial files, the Daughters of
the American Revolution Museum, Washington, D.C. Illustrated in
No. 33.* WILLIAM LIGHTFOOT (1724-1764)
Oil on canvas. 59 x 49 inches.
Owner: Mrs. M. T. Winchester, New York City (1950).

The subject was the son of Philip Lightfoot of Charles City
County and York County, Virginia. He served as High Sheriff of York
County in 1766 and married Mildred Howell, circa 1745. He was probably
the father of no. 32.

This author has not been able to locate the painting. The late
George C. Groce felt particularly certain of its attribution to
Wollaston and mentioned it several times in his unpublished notes.
Since it is very probable that Wollaston painted other members of the
William Lightfoot family when he did the portrait of little Mary (no.
32), there is sufficient reason to believe this currently unlocated
likeness is by him.

Bibliography/Source Material: Unpublished notes of the late
George C. Groce, Library, the National Portrait Gallery, Washington,
D.C. Biographical information from T. A. Glenn, Some Colonial Families
No. 34.* UNKNOWN MAN OF THE LIGHTFOOT FAMILY
Oil on canvas. Dimensions unknown.
Owner: Mrs. ? Patterson, New York City (1950).

Both Bolton and Binsse and the late Dr. Groce saw this portrait and attributed it to Wollaston without question, but this author has not been able to locate the painting or an illustration of it.

Figure 35. Colonel David Meade. Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society.
No. 35. COLONEL DAVID MEADE (1710-1757)
Oil on canvas. 35 3/4 x 28 inches.
Owner: The Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

Colonel Meade held properties in both Nasemond and Suffolk Counties, Virginia. He was active in the Virginia militia from 1745-1757, and supplemented his plantation income during these years by mercantile and shipping businesses.

In 1729/30 he married Susannah Everard (no. 36), daughter of Sir Richard Everard of North Carolina.

Colonel Meade wears a dark brown coat and a grey wig. He holds an unidentified paper or parchment in his hands.

The painting was given to the Virginia Historical Society in 1966 by Mrs. Charles A. Penick of South Boston, Virginia. William James Hubbard, portrait artist, made a copy of this portrait about 1835 for Bishop Meade of Virginia. The Hubbard version was owned by Henry Meade Cadot, Greenville, Delaware at the time of Bolton and Binsse's article in 1931.

Bibliography/Source Material: Curatorial files, the Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Figure 36. Mrs. David Meade. Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society.
No. 36. MRS. DAVID MEADE (Susannah Everard, c. 1710-1770)
Oil on canvas. 35 3/4 x 28 inches.
Owner: The Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

Susannah Everard, daughter of Sir Richard Everard, married David Meade (no. 35) in 1729/30. Her father had served as a colonial Governor or North Carolina.

The portrait has the same ownership history as no. 35.

Bibliography/Source Material: Curatorial files, the Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.
Figure 37. John Page. Photograph courtesy of the College of William and Mary.
No. 37. JOHN PAGE (1720-1774)
Oil on canvas. 43 x 33 inches.
Owner: The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

John Page was born at "Rosewell," Gloucester County, Virginia, the second son of Mann Page, I, and Judith Carter. He established his home, "North End," in Gloucester County (now part of Matthews County). His brother Mann, II, was the heir to "Rosewell" and another brother Robert built "Broad Neck."

About 1740/41 John married Jane Byrd, daughter of William Byrd, II, and Maria Taylor. John and his wife had fifteen children, four of whom died in infancy. Like other members of his family, John was active in the affairs of the colony, serving as a member of the Colonial Council and later as a Visitor of the College of William and Mary.

Page wears a brown coat and a darker brown waistcoat. The landscape background in this portrait has darkened through age and inadequate cleaning and does not present the typical appearance of landscape backgrounds in Wollaston's Virginia work.

The portrait was presented to the College of William and Mary about 1895 by Dr. R. C. M. Page, a descendant of the sitter.

Figure 38. John Page, II, and Elizabeth Page.
Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society.
No. 38. JOHN PAGE, II, (1744-1808) AND ELIZABETH PAGE?
Oil on canvas. Dimensions unknown.
Owner: The Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

There is some question as to the identity of the boy in this portrait as he has been referred to as John Page, II, in previous publications and is currently identified by the Virginia Historical Society as Mann Page, III. Both of these men were sons of Mann Page, II, of "Rosewell" and nephews of John Page (fig. 37).

John Page, II, served in numerous public capacities during his lifetime as President of the Society for the Advancement of Useful Knowledge, member of the House of Burgesses, Member of the Governor's Council, member of the Convention which wrote the state constitution in 1776, Lieutenant Governor under Patrick Henry, Delegate to Congress in 1802, and Governor of Virginia in 1805. He was the last member of the Page family to own "Rosewell."

The author has been unable to locate any significant biographical information on either Mann Page, III, or Elizabeth Page. The portrait was privately owned and unknown to the author before coming to the Virginia Historical Society in very recent months. Unfortunately, additional research could not be undertaken before submitting this manuscript and the entry remains incomplete for these reasons.

Figure 39. Mrs. Mann Page, II. Photograph courtesy of CESDA.
No. 39. MRS. MANN PAGE, II (Anne Corbin Tayloe, 1730-living in 1764)
Oil on canvas. 29 x 24 1/2 inches.

The subject of this entry was the daughter of John Tayloe, I, of Richmond County, Virginia and the brother of John Tayloe, II (fig. 55). After her marriage to Mann Page, II, in 1748, she lived at "Rosewell" in Gloucester County, Virginia. She was Page's second wife and not the mother of the children shown in fig. 33.

The ownership history for this portrait is unknown excepting that the current owner inherited the portrait from someone in her family. According to Mrs. Labouisse there is a companion portrait of Mann Page, II, owned by Mrs. Douglas Crocker of Fitchburg, Massachusetts. Efforts to locate and examine the portrait of Mann, II, were unsuccessful at the time this catalogue was prepared.

Mrs. Page's dress is brown and white with white lace at the neck and cuffs and white for the dress ribbon. The background is grey. The portrait has suffered greatly in recent years at the hands of an incompetent restorer, accounting for the blotchy appearance of the entire surface and the muddy quality of the highlights in the dress fabric.

Figure 40. Matthew Page?

Photograph courtesy of the College of William and Mary.
No. 40. **MATTHEW PAGE (1659-1703)**?

Oil on canvas. 46 x 36 inches.

Owner: The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

By comparative stylistic analysis this portrait is clearly by John Wollaston whose period of activity in Virginia was 1754-1758. Since Matthew Page died in 1703 the portrait could not have been painted from life. The costume and full wig suggest a date of 1740-45 and compare with Wollaston's portrait copies of Richard Randolph and Colonel William Randolph, II, (nos. 50 and 53). Either Wollaston took the liberty of updating Matthew Page's costume or the likeness is of some other member of the Page family. The portrait descended through the family with a companion portrait of Matthew's wife, Mary Mann Page, which is not by Wollaston but of the same size.

Matthew Page was born in Middle Plantation (now Williamsburg), the son of John and Alice Luckin Page. He married Mary Mann in 1689 and they probably lived at her ancestral home, "Timberneck," in Gloucester County until the first "Rosewell" house was built. The "Rosewell" lands were originally a part of the "Timberneck" tract and were given to Mary Mann about the time of her marriage. The first "Rosewell" house was begun about 1700 and the larger Palladian mansion was begun by Matthew's son, Mann Page, about 1721.

During his lifetime Matthew maintained an interest in the educational affairs of the colony. He was a member of the Board of Visitors for the College and one of its founding Trustees.

The gentleman in this portrait is seated in a blue round-back chair and wears a maroon coat with a white stock and lace cuffs. His left hand is placed inside the coat at chest height, a common pose for Wollaston's sitters, and his right arm rests on the arm of the chair. The wig is grey and the background shows a wall, presumably on the interior of a dwelling.

The portrait was presented to the college along with others by Wollaston about 1895 by Dr. R. C. M. Page, a descendant of the "Rosewell" Pages.

Figure 41. Beverley Randolph? Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society.
No. 41. BEVERLEY RANDOLPH (1706-175?)?
Oil on canvas. 36 x 29 inches.
Owner: The Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

Like other members of the large Randolph family in Virginia, Beverley was a plantation owner and a farmer; he was also a member of the Legislature from 1744-1749. He owned houses in both Henrico County and in Williamsburg, Virginia. He married Elizabeth Lightfoot about 1731.

The sitter attribution for this entry is questionable, as are a number of the Randolph family portraits by Wollaston. Beverley Randolph would have been no younger than forty-eight years when Wollaston worked in Virginia. This portrait is of a younger man, certainly no older than thirty-five years. This may be Peyton Randolph of "Wilton" since the portrait descended through that branch of the family and because Peyton would have been about twenty-seven years old at the time it was executed.

The colors for this portrait are unknown to the author. The pose is very similar to fig. 8 and variations of the same are seen throughout Wollaston's Virginia portraits. The ownership history is the same as that given for no. 19.

Figure 42. Colonel Peter Randolph. Photograph courtesy of CESDA.
No. 42. COLONEL PETER RANDOLPH (c. 1717-1767)
Oil on canvas. 49 1/2 x 39 1/4 inches.
Owner: Charles Hill Carter, "Shirley," Charles City County, Virginia.

Randolph was born in Henrico County, Virginia. He married Lucy Bolling (no. 43) in 1738. As a planter and civil servant he was active in political and economic affairs of the Virginia colony, serving as a member of the legislature from 1749 to his death and as Surveyor General of customs for the middle district of the colonies from 1752-1767.

The Colonel is shown in a standing, knee-length pose and wears a brown coat with white cuffs, and stock and ruffles. His wig is brown. The background consists of a dark green interior with a landscape view opening off to the right.

The painting has been in the Carter family's possession and at "Shirley" for over one hundred years. Its descent from the Randolphins to the Carters probably occurred in the early nineteenth century when Peter Randolph's granddaughter, Mary Randolph, married the "Shirley" heir, Charles Carter.

Figure 43. Mrs. Peter Randolph. Photograph courtesy of CESDA.
No. 43. MRS. PETER RANDOLPH (Lucy Bolling, dates unknown)
Oil on canvas. 49 1/4 x 39 5/8 inches.
Owner: Charles Hill Carter, "Shirley," Charles City County, Virginia.

According to family history this portrait is a larger version of the one listed in the next entry. However, the two ladies do not bear any resemblance to each other. The pose and size of this entry make it a suitable companion portrait for Colonel Peter Randolph (no. 42). The history of ownership for both portraits (this entry and no. 42) is identical. The sitter attribution for no. 44 is probably incorrect.

Mrs. Randolph is seated with her left arm resting on a marble-top table. She holds an orange music book in her lap. Her dress is light blue and white with white cuffs and trim at the neck. She sits in front of a dark brown interior with light brown drapery.

Figure 44. Mrs. Peter Randolph? Photograph courtesy of the College of William and Mary.
No. 44. MRS. PETER RANDOLPH (Jane Bolling, dates unknown)?
Oil on canvas. 36 x 29 inches.
Owner: The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

The notes of the preceding entry suggest that the sitter attribution for this portrait is incorrect. This author has no additional information or suggestions for the identity of the subject. The book she holds has no legible inscriptions.

The general pose and costume used here are reminiscent of Wollaston's New York work although they were used by the artist on at least one other occasion in Virginia (fig. 3).

Bibliography/Source Material: Curatorial Files, the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.
Figure 45. Peyton Randolph. Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society.
No. 45. PEYTON RANDOLPH (1721-1775)
Oil on canvas. 36 x 29 inches.
Owner: The Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

Peyton was the son of Sir John Randolph and Susanna Beverley of "Tazewell Hall," Williamsburg, Virginia. He entered law early in life and after being called to the bar in 1744 he soon became a leading figure in colonial affairs. He served as a member of the House of Burgesses on numerous occasions and after the death of John Robinson (no. 54) he was elected speaker of the House. He also served as first president of the Continental Congress.

He married Elizabeth Harrison (no. 46) on March 8, 1745/46. There were no children from this marriage.

Peyton wears a dark brown coat and waistcoat with white stock and ruffles. His cuffs are of white lace and his full wig is grey.

The ownership history for this entry is the same as that given for no. 19.

Figure 46. Mrs. Peyton Randolph. Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society.
No. 46. MRS. PEYTON RANDOLPH (Elizabeth Harrison, 1724-1783)
Oil on canvas. 28 1/2 x 35 1/2 inches.
Owner: The Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

The subject was the daughter of Colonel Benjamin Harrison, IV, of "Berkeley," Charles City County, Virginia. She married Peyton on March 8, 1745/46 and they had no children. She inherited Peyton's large estate at his death in 1775 and did not remarry.

Mrs. Randolph holds a folded fan in her hand similar to the one in fig. 52. Wollaston frequently used this pose or variations of the same in Virginia (figs. 2, 5, 9, 19, and 47). The position of Mrs. Randolph's right hand is unusually complex for Wollaston and commendably executed.

Figure 47. Mrs. Peyton Randolph? Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society.
No. 47. MRS. PETTON RANDOLPH (Lucy Harrison, c. 1758-1809) ?
Oil on canvas. 36 x 30 inches.
Owner: The Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

The donor of this portrait to the Virginia Historical Society identified the subject as the wife of Peyton Randolph of "Wilton." The identity is obviously incorrect since Lucy Harrison, who married Peyton of "Wilton," was born about 1758 when Wollaston was completing his commissions in Virginia.

The lady could be any one of a number of Randolph women who lived in Virginia during the mid-eighteenth century. The portrait descended through the Randolph family and came to the Society with six other Wollaston portraits of members of the Randolph family (see no. 19).

Bibliography/Source Material: Curatorial Files, the Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.
Figure 48. Elizabeth Randolph? Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society.
No. 48. ELIZABETH RANDOLPH (1742-1773)
Oil on canvas. 35 x 29 inches.
Owner: The Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

This author has been unable to determine who the parents were of the subject for this entry and the next. Elizabeth married Philip Ludwell Grymes in 1762 and lived in Middlesex County, Virginia. She died without issue.

This is one of several portraits of little girls that Wollaston executed in Virginia in which he incorporated the toy doll. The horizontal format is quite unusual and remains unexplained.

Ownership history for the portrait is the same as that given for no. 19.

Bibliography/Source Material: Curatorial Files, the Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.
Figure 49. **Anne Randolph**? Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society.
No. 49. ANNE RANDOLPH (1740-1760)?

Oil on canvas. 28 1/2 x 36 inches.

Owner: The Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

This is the companion portrait to fig. 48 and the only known "window" portrait by Wollaston.

For ownership history see no. 19.

Bibliography/Source Material: Curatorial files, the Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.
Figure 50. Richard Randolph. Photograph courtesy of the College of William and Mary.
Richard Randolph was the fourth son of William Randolph and Mary Isham of "Turkey Island." Richard established his plantation, "Curles," on the James River like so many of his brothers did. He married Jane Bowling of Virginia about 1705. Their son, Richard, II (no. 51), may have commissioned this copy after an earlier portrait. There is certainly no question that this version is by Wollaston.

Randolph wears a dark brown coat with white for other areas of the shirt and a full grey wig.

The ownership history for this portrait prior to coming to the college is unknown.

Bibliography/Source Material: Curatorial Files, the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.
Figure 51. Richard Randolph, II. Photograph courtesy of the College of William and Mary.
No. 51. RICHARD RANDOLPH, II (1715-1786)
Oil on canvas. 36 x 28 inches.
Owner: The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Richard Randolph, II, was the eldest son of Richard Randolph of "Curles" (no. 50) and his wife Jane Bowling. He married Anne Meade of Virginia (no. 52) about 1735.

It is worth noting that the younger Richard selected a pose similar to the one used for his father's likeness. Only the position of the right hand varies.

The ownership history for this portrait before coming to the college is unknown.

Bibliography/Source Material: Curatorial Files, the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.
Figure 52. Mrs. Richard Randolph, II. Photograph courtesy of the College of William and Mary.
No. 52. MRS. RICHARD RANDOLPH, II (Ann Meade, dates unknown)
Oil on canvas. 36 x 28 inches.
Owner: The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Ann Meade was the wife of Richard Randolph, II (no. 51), at the
time this likeness was made. Her early life and parentage are unknown.
She wears a blue dress with white lace at the neck and cuffs.
Jewelry, like the beaded ornament on the front of her dress, is fre­
quently seen in Wollaston's South Carolina portraits and rarely in
Virginia. The same beaded embellishment is seen in another Virginia
example by Wollaston, fig. 59.

Bibliography/Source Material: Curatorial Files, the College of
William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.
Figure 53. Colonel William Randolph, II.
Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society.
No. 53. COLONEL WILLIAM RANDOLPH, II (1681-1741)
Oil on canvas. 35 x 29 inches.
Owner: The Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

William Randolph, II, lived at his estate, "Turkey Island," on the James River in Henrico County, Virginia, until his death. He was the son of William Randolph and Mary Isham. William, II, was prominent in the political affairs of Virginia, serving as Magistrate, Burgess, and as a Member of the Governor's Council. Around 1700 he married Elizabeth, the daughter of Peter and Elizabeth Beverley.

The portrait is signed on the back of the canvas "1755, J. Woollaston." There is little reason to doubt this signature or that Woollaston made this portrait copy after an earlier likeness of William, II, for one of his many Randolph descendants living in Virginia during the mid-eighteenth century. The shape of the left hand and the modeling of the figure are certainly characteristic of Woollaston's style.

Figure 54. John Robinson. Photograph courtesy of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.
No. 54. JOHN HOBINSON (1704-1766)
Oil on canvas. 36 x 29 inches.

Robinson was born in Middlesex County, Virginia. His father was
John Robinson, a member of the King's Council and its President. His
mother, Catherine Beverley, was the daughter of Major Robert Beverley of
Virginia.

Robinson received his education at the College of William and
Mary and at the age of twenty-one was elected to the House of Burgesses
to represent King and Queen County. He served in the House until his
death. He was selected Speaker of the House on November 1, 1738 and
continued in that position until 1766.

Speaker Robinson married Mary Storey of Middlesex on November 8,
1723. After the death of his first wife he married Lucy Moore,
daughter of Augustine Moore of "Chelsea" in King William County. He
was married a third time, to Susan Chiswell, the daughter of Colonel
John Chiswell of Williamsburg. Of the second marriage two children
survived, John and Lucy. By his third marriage he had two children,
John, who died young, and Susan, who married Robert Nelson of Henrico
County. Speaker Robinson made his home at "Mount Pleasant," King and
Queen County.

Before coming to Colonial Williamsburg the portrait was always in
the possession of the Robinson family. The last owner, James Taylor
Robinson of Richmond, Virginia, made the following notes on the
portrait's history:

Speaker Robinson's daughter Susanze, married Robert Nelson of
"Malvern Hill." Their daughter, Ann Fitzhugh Nelson, married
Andrew Leiper Moore of "Chelsea." The only daughter of this
marriage, Lucy Heaberl Moore, married Benjamin Needler Robinson
of "Benville," King and Queen County, a descendant of Speaker
Robinson's uncle. Benjamin Needler Robinson, Jr., a son of this
marriage inherited the portrait, and from him it was passed on
to his son, James Taylor Robinson, the present owner.

Bibliography/Source Material: Illustrated in Alexander W.
Weddell, A Memorial Volume of Virginia Historical Portraiture, 1585-
Figure 55. Colonel John Tayloe, II. Photograph courtesy of CESDA.
No. 55. COLONEL JOHN TAYLOE, II (1721-1779)
Oil on canvas. 49 1/2 x 39 1/2 inches.

Tayloe was the son of John Tayloe and Elizabeth Gwyn Lyde of Virginia. He was a Member of Council of Virginia before the Revolution and afterwards was elected to the House of Burgesses.

He married Rebecca Plater, daughter of Governor George Plater of Maryland in 1747. They had twelve children, nine of whom survived. Tayloe was the builder of "Mount Airy," and the portraits of him and his wife (fig. 56) have descended through the family at that house to the present day.

Tayloe wears a blue coat and silver (or white) vest, with black pants. His eyes are blue and his hair is brown. The painting was cleaned in 1967 by H. H. Hoeltzer of New York.

Figure 56. Mrs. John Tayloe and Mary Tayloe. Photograph courtesy of CESDA.
No. 56. MRS. JOHN TAYLOE (Rebecca Plater, ?-1787) AND MARY TAYLOE (dates unknown)
Oil on canvas. 50 x 40 inches.

This is the companion portrait to fig. 55, one of only a few surviving double portraits by Wollaston executed in Virginia. The ownership history is the same as that given for no. 55.

Figure 57. Mrs. Anthony Walke, II. Photograph courtesy of the College of William and Mary.
No. 57. MRS. ANTHONY WALKE, II (Jane Randolph, c. 1729-1756)
Oil on canvas. 35 1/2 x 27 1/2 inches.
Owner: The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

The subject was the daughter of Richard Randolph (no. 50) and his wife Jane Bolling Randolph. She married Anthony Walke, II, of Princess Anne County, Virginia, in 1750.

Mrs. Walke wears a blue dress with white lace at the neck and sleeves. Her left arm rests on a marble-top table. The background is brown.

The portrait was presented to the college in June, 1963, by Mr. and Mrs. O. W. June of New York. Its ownership history before this is unknown. The college also owns a copy of this portrait by Thomas Sully.

Bibliography/Source Material: Curatorial Files, the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.
Figure 58. Ralph Wormeley, IV. Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
No. 58. RALPH WORMELEY, IV (1715-1790)
Oil on canvas. 49 1/2 x 39 inches.
Owner: The Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

The subject of this portrait was the son of John Wormeley and Elizabeth (?) of "Rosegill," the family estate in Middlesex County, Virginia. He was the nephew of Ralph Wormeley who left the estate to John Wormeley. Ralph, IV, was probably educated in England. He served as a member of the House of Burgesses for Middlesex County from 1742 to 1764.

The subject married in 1736 Sarah Berkeley. After her death in 1741 he married Jane Bowles of Maryland (fig. 59). There are bust-length copies of this portrait and the likeness of Mrs. Wormeley in the collections of the Virginia Historical Society. The author was unable to examine these versions during the months of her research in Richmond. They may be eighteenth-century copies by Wollaston or another artist.

Figure 59. Mrs. Ralph Wormley, IV. Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society.
No. 59. MRS. RALPH WORMELEY, IV (Jane Bowles, dates unknown)
Oil on canvas. 50 x 39 1/2 inches.
Owner: The Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

The subject of this entry was the wife of Ralph Wormeley, IV, of
"Rosegill," (no. 58) and lived in Maryland before her marriage. No
other biographical information on the subject has been found.

Bibliography/Source Material: The Virginia Magazine of History
and Biography, XXXVI (October, 1928), pp. 287, 385.
Figure 60. Ralph Wormeley, V. Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society.
No. 60. RALPH WORMELEY, V (1744-1806)
Oil on canvas. 26 x 25 inches.
Owner: The Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

The subject of this portrait was the son of Ralph Wormeley, IV, and Jane Bowles (nos. 58, 59) of "Rosegill" in Middlesex County, Virginia. He was educated at Eton beginning in September of 1757 and later at Trinity Hall in Cambridge, England.

During his adult life he maintained the great wealth that his family had amassed in previous years and was involved in various political activities in the Virginia colony. He married Eleanor Tayloe, daughter of John Tayloe, II, of "Mount Airy" in 1772 (no. 55).
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SECTION II

English and Other American Portraits

by John Wollaston
Figure 61. John Wollaston: John Beale (1730-1771) of Charleston, South Carolina. Oil on canvas, 30 x 25 inches. Owned by the Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts, Winston-Salem, North Carolina. Photograph courtesy of MESDA.
Figure 62. John Wollaston: Mrs. John Beale (??-1771) of Charleston, South Carolina. Oil on canvas, 30 x 25 inches. Owned by the Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts, Winston-Salem, North Carolina. Photograph courtesy of MESDA.
Figure 63. John Wollaston: Daniel Carroll, II (1730-1796) of "Upper Marlboro," Maryland. Oil on canvas, 49 1/2 x 39 1/4 inches. Owned by the Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, Maryland. Photograph courtesy of the Maryland Historical Society.
Figure 65. John Wollaston: Mrs. Samuel Gouverneur (Experience Johnson, dates unknown) of Newark, New Jersey. Oil on canvas. 48 1/2 x 39 1/2 inches. Owned by the Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Photograph courtesy of the Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum.
Figure 68. John Wollaston: James Monk (dates unknown) of England. Signed "J. Wollaston/Plnx: 1733." Oil on canvas, 36 x 28 inches. Owned by Mr. John L. Russell, Montreal, Canada. Photograph courtesy of the owner.
Figure 70. John Wollaston: Mrs. Lucy Perry (dates unknown) of England and the Leeward Islands. Oil on canvas, 50 x 40 3/4 inches. Owned by the National Collection of Fine Arts, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C. Photograph courtesy of the National Collection of Fine Arts.
Figure 71. John Wollaston: The Reverend George Whitefield in an Attitude of Preaching (dates unknown) of England. Oil on canvas, 31 1/2 x 25 inches. Owned by the National Portrait Gallery, London. Photograph courtesy of the National Portrait Gallery.
Figure 72. John Wollaston: Unknown Family Group (dates and origin unknown). Oil on canvas, 51 1/4 x 71 1/8 inches. Owned by the Newark Museum, New Jersey. Photograph courtesy of the Newark Museum.
Figure 73. John Wollaston: Dr. Thomas Sydenham (dates unknown) of England. Oil on canvas, 30 x 25 inches. Owned by the Bodleian Library, Oxford, England. Photograph courtesy of the Bodleian Library.
Figure 74. John Wollaston: X-ray of Thomas Gordon (fig. 64). Photograph courtesy of the Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum.
Figure 75. John Wollaston: X-ray of Mrs. Samuel Gouverneur (fig. 65). Photograph courtesy of the Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum.
Figure 77. John Wollaston: X-ray of John Beale (fig. 61). Photograph courtesy of CESDA.
SECTION III

Portraits by English Artists of Wollaston's Period
Figure 79. Bartholomew Dandridge: The Price Family (c. 1728). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, New York.
Figure 80. Bartholomew Dandridge: Unknown Lady (date unknown). Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon.
Figure 81. Thomas Hudson: *Sir John and Lady Pole*, 1755. Sir John Carew Pole, Bt., Antony House, Devon, England.
Figure 82. Sir Godfrey Kneller: **Princess Anne** (Mezzotint by Smith after Kneller), c. 1692. Waldron Phoenix Belknap, Jr., Research Library of American Painting.
Figure 83. John B. Medina: Ann Roydhouse (Mezzotint by Smith after Medina), 1701. New York Public Library, New York City.
Figure 84. Richard Wilson: The Maid of Honour, date unknown. The National Museum of Wales, Wales.
Figure 85. Richard Wilson: Prince Edward (Mezzotint by J. Faber after Wilson), date unknown. Owner unknown.
Figure 86. William Wissing: **Princess Anne** (Mezzotint by Beckett after Wissing), c. 1683. Waldron Phoenix Belknap, Jr., Research Library of American Painting.
Figure 87. Artist unknown: Unknown Little Girl with Doll. Owner unknown. Photograph courtesy CESDA.
SECTION IV

Portraits by American Artists

Who Were Influenced by John Wollaston
Figure 89. John Greenwood: Elizabeth Moffat of Boston, Massachusetts, c. 1751-1752. Owned by Mrs. John A. Reidy.
Figure 90. John Hesselius: *Eleanor Calvert* of Maryland, c. 1761. Owned by the Baltimore Museum of Art. Photograph courtesy of the Baltimore Museum of Art.
Figure 91. John Hesselius: Samuel Lloyd Chew of Maryland, dated 1762. Owned by the Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts. Photograph courtesy of CESDA.
Figure 92. John Hesselius: Mrs. Thomas Gough of Maryland, c. 1770. Owned by the Washington County Museum of Fine Arts, Hagerstown, Maryland. Photograph courtesy of the Washington County Museum of Fine Arts.
APPENDIX A
CORRESPONDENCE TO THE AUTHOR FROM JOHN LAUREL RUSSELL

September 10, 1970

"Dear Sirs:

"Please be advised that I have in my possession a pair of portraits by Wollaston. The Gentleman sitter is James Monk, of Boston, who moved to Nova Scotia in the 1750's. I have the deed of sale for his effects and other information on him. The portrait is signed J. Wollaston 1733. The companion portrait is of a lady but it is unlikely to be Mrs. Monk, but perhaps a sister . . . .

"p.s. The date is of course much earlier than usually given for Wollaston's arrival in America. However, there is no doubt about the signature and date being original."

September 29th, 1970

"Dear Miss Weekley:

"The portrait of James Monk has had some restoration, i.e., one of the eyes and forefinger on the left hand. Otherwise it is pretty much original.

"As I am a collector of early Canadian material I purchased most of the things from the Monk estate some fifteen years ago. Since then I have sold a Copley portrait of Elizabeth Wentworth, but have retained any that have a Canadian interest.

"The companion portrait to James Monk had no information on the frame, and from the portrait list done in 1887, it would have to be (if the list is correct) either Anne Dering or Mary Molesworth. As Anne Dering was born in 1724, it seems unlikely that this could be she, and I have never been able to find out Mary Molesworth's connection with the family.

"Because of this lack of information, I entrusted this portrait to a friend in Boston for sale. He, in turn, had it over-cleaned and consequently the signature and date now obliterated . . . .

"James Monk seems to have been born in London around the year 1710. He is recorded having married Anne Dering, Jan. 20, 1741 in Boston. In 1744 he sold his household things in Boston to Thomas Derring and the inventory suggests a rather affluent situation. There is a commission appointing him 'commissary General of the musters for Garrison of Louisbourg' signed by William Shirley, Louisbourg Nov. 24, 1745."
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"His wife or rather, his mother-in-law was a Wentworth—and his son George Henry Monk married Elizabeth Gould . . . .

The portraits were stored in the attic of a commercial building owned by the family. They had been placed there during the 1930's when the family moved. The name Wollaston meant nothing to any member of the family.

"The signature on portrait of James Monk reads 'J Wollaston/Pinx. 1733.' The same signature and date was on the portrait of the companion portrait but unfortunately was removed by a too ardent picture cleaner."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
APPENDIX B

CHECKLIST OF JOHN WOLLASTON PORTRAITS EXECUTED IN ENGLAND


James Hozier, signed and dated 1740. Mrs. Peggy Jones, St. Michaels, Maryland.


James Monk, signed and dated 1733. John Laurel Russell, Montreal, Canada.


Unknown Lady of the Monk Family, before restoration signed and dated 1733. John Laurel Russell, Montreal, Canada.

Unknown Little Girl with Dog in Landscape, reportedly signed and dated 1736. Location unknown.
APPENDIX C.

CHECKLIST OF JOHN WOLLASTON PORTRAITS EXECUTED IN PENNSYLVANIA.


Elizabeth Oswald Chew. Chester County Historical Society, Pennsylvania.


Mrs. Samuel Gouverneur. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum, Wilmington, Delaware.

Thomas Lawrence. Robert Hull Fleming Library, Burlington, Vermont.


Thomas Ritchie. Privately owned, Virginia.


APPENDIX D

CHECKLIST OF JOHN WOLLASTON PORTRAITS EXECUTED IN
SOUTH CAROLINA


Mrs. Daniel Blake. Mrs. Frederick Rutledge, Asheville, North Carolina.

Anne Gibbes, signed and dated 1767. Worcester Museum, Massachusetts.

John Gibbes. Mrs. Henry S. Holmes, Charleston, South Carolina. Another version of this portrait, probably a copy by another artist, is owned by Miss Isabel Ladson of Charleston.

Mary Golightly. Mrs. Thomas G. Sumter, Sumter, South Carolina.

Polly Golightly. Mrs. ? Hanson, Charleston, South Carolina.

Mrs. Isaac Holmes. Location unknown.

Rebecca Bee Holmes. Amherst College, Massachusetts.


Martha Laurens. Mrs. Martha Laurens Patterson, Charleston, South Carolina.

Harriet Pinckney. Location unknown.

Judith Wragg Smith. Gibbes Art Gallery, Charleston, South Carolina.


APPENDIX E
CHECKLIST OF JOHN WOLLASTON PORTRAITS EXECUTED IN NEW YORK

Reverend Samuel Auchmuty. Trinity Church, New York City.
Reverend Henry Barkley. Trinity Church, New York City.
Mrs. Sidney Breese. Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.
Major John Dies. Location Unknown.
Mrs. John Dies. Location unknown.

Robert R. Livingston. Location unknown.

Mrs. Robert R. Livingston. Location unknown.


Lady McCloud. Mrs. John Wilcoxen, San Francisco, California.


Margaret (Mary ?) Marston. Museum of the City of New York, New York.


Staats Long Morris (bust length). Location unknown.


Margaret Nicholls. Bayou Bend Collection, Houston, Texas.


Mrs. Johannes Panet. Location unknown.


William Smith, labeled on back "Johannes Wollaston Londoniensis" and dated 1751. Location unknown.

William Smith, Jr., labeled on back "Johannes Wollaston Londoniensis" and dated 1751. Location unknown.


APPENDIX F

CHECKLIST OF JOHN WOLLASTON PORTRAITS EXECUTED IN MARYLAND


Benedict Calvert. Baltimore Museum of Art, Maryland.


Elizabeth Calvert. Baltimore Museum of Art, Maryland.

Governor George Calvert. Location unknown.

Rebecca Calvert, dated 1754. Baltimore Museum of Art, Maryland.


Mrs. Charles Carroll. Detroit Institute of Art, Michigan.

Daniel Carroll, II, of Rock Creek. Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore.

Mrs. Daniel Carroll, II, of Rock Creek. Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore.

Ignatius Digges. Location unknown.


Mary Digges. Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore.

Daniel Dulany. Mrs. A. C. Randolph, Upperville, Virginia.


Francis Key. Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore.

Mrs. Francis Key. Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore.


John Ross. Adams, Davidson & co., Washington, D. C.

Mrs. John Ross. Adams, Davidson & co., Washington, D. C.

Benjamin Tasker. Mr. C. M. Oddie, San Francisco, California, about 1950. Current location unknown.

Unknown Lady of the Dulany Family. Mrs. W. Morrison, Upperville, Virginia.
APPENDIX G

CHECKLIST OF KNOWN JOHN WOLLASTON PORTRAITS WITH QUESTIONABLE OR UNKNOWN PROVENANCES


Sir Charles Hardy.  Brooklyn Museum, New York City.


Mrs. William Peartree Smith.  Princeton University, New Jersey.

Unknown Lady.  Weschler Gallery, New York City.


An attempt has been made to include in these checklists all portraits by John Wollaston which have either been examined by the author or documented through existing reproductions or photographs. For this reason total counts for the various colonies and England do not coincide with previous figures quoted by former art historians. In many cases portraits have changed hands and neither photographic evidence nor published illustrations were known to this writer.
APPENDIX H

SIGNED AND/OR DATED PORTRAITS BY JOHN WOLLASTON

James Monk, inscribed on back "J. Wollaston / Pinx. 1733." John Laurel Russell, Montreal, Canada.

Unknown Lady of the Monk Family, before restoration inscribed on the front and dated 1733. John Laurel Russell, Montreal, Canada.


Unknown Little Girl with Dog in Landscape, reportedly signed and dated, "John Wollaston 1736."


Mr. Brandt Schuyler, reportedly signed and dated 1750. Location unknown.

Mrs. Brandt Schuyler, reportedly signed and dated 1750. Location unknown.

William Smith, labeled on the back "Johannes Wollaston Londoniensis" and dated 1751. Location unknown.

William Smith, Jr., labeled on the back "Johannes Wollaston Londoniensis" and dated 1751. Location unknown.


Rebecca Calvert, dated 1754. Baltimore Museum of Art, Maryland.


APPENDIX I

MAP ILLUSTRATING WOLLASTON'S TRAVELS THROUGH VIRGINIA

The fold-out map at the back of this paper was prepared by the author and based on "A Map of the most Inhabited Part of Virginia Containing the Whole Province of Maryland with Part of Pensilvania, New Jersey and North Carolina," by Joshua Fry and Peter Jefferson, printed by Robert Sayer in London in 1775. Although many engravings of this map survive in other collections, the author used the one owned by the Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts, Winston-Salem, North Carolina for the basis of the drawing.

The map is keyed by numbers which indicate various family seats in Virginia and Maryland where Wollaston painted portraits. A list is provided with the names of families represented by the numbers on the map.
APPENDIX J

CUSTIS RECEIPT TO JOHN WOLLASTON

The original document is owned by the Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia. The photograph is courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society.
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