

## Two English portraits by Liotard: Lady Anne Somerset and Catherine, Lady Hawke

NEIL JEFFARES<sup>1</sup>



### Jean-Étienne Liotard

Lady Anne Somerset, later  
Countess of NORTHAMPTON  
(1741–1763) [Zoomify](#)

Pastel on vellum, 61 x 47 cm  
1755

Trustees of the Chatsworth Settlement

**PROVENANCE:** Countess of Lichfield, née Dinah Frankland (c.1719–1779), until 1779; given by her executor, Lady Pelham, later Countess of Chichester, née Anne Frankland (1734–1813), to Elizabeth, Duchess of Beaufort (1719–1799), mother of the sitter; bequeathed under the Duchess of Beaufort's will, 1799, to her son, the 5<sup>th</sup> Duke of Beaufort; by descent to David, 11<sup>th</sup> Duke of Beaufort; acquired by James Fairfax, Sydney, 1986; New York, Christie's, 25 January 2012, Lot 134 reproduced, attributed to Liotard; acquired by the Duke of Devonshire for Chatsworth

**EXHIBITED:** *Jean-Étienne Liotard*, Edinburgh, Scottish National Gallery; London, Royal Academy of Arts, 2015–16, no. 45

**LITERATURE:** *Truffle hunt with Sacheverell Sitwell*, London, 1953, p. 7; Catherin Fisher, "James Fairfax: a remarkable collector of old masters", *Apollo*, CXXXVIII/388, .vi.1994, pp. 3–8 ("looking fetching and virginal with her rosebud cheeks"), repr. p. 8; Neil Jeffares, *Dictionary of pastellists before 1800*, London, 2006 ("Jeffares 2006"), p. 349 repr., and online editions; Marcel Roethlisberger & Renée Loche, *Liotard*, Doornspijk, 2008 ("R&L") R49, rejected, fig. 820; Neil Jeffares, review of M. Roethlisberger & R. Loche, *Liotard*, *Burlington magazine*, CLI/1274, .v.2009,

pp. 322–23, "no alternative to Liotard is convincing"; Terry Ingram, "Fairfax portrait yields double the money", *Australian financial review*, 2 February 2012, p. 57; Marcel Roethlisberger, "Liotard mis à jour", *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte*, LXXI/2-3, 2014, p. 187, fig. 2; *Dictionary of pastellists* online, [J.49.2148](#)

**RELATED WORKS:** (I) Jean-Adam Serre, enamel, 4.4x3.6 ov. (Louvre inv. 35742). Lit.: Liotard 1992, no. 84 repr., as by Liotard; R&L R50, fig. 821, as by Serre; (II) Liotard, pastel, traditionally as portrait of Lady Hawke by John Russell

**ICONOGRAPHY OF SITTER:** (I) by Thomas Hudson, oil on canvas, 48x38 cm, c.1747 (Badminton, Duke of Beaufort). Exh.: *Thomas Hudson, 1701–1779, portrait painter and collector: a bicentenary exhibition*, London, GLC, 1979, no. 39; (II) by Francis Cotes, double portrait with Lady Louisa Greville, later Churchill, pastel, 68x60 cm, sd 1756 (Badminton, Duke of Beaufort). Lit.: Jeffares 2006, p. 137 repr.; (III) here attributed to William Hoare, pastel (Compton Place 1904; desc.: Chatsworth Settlement; Compton Place, 18–20.v.1954, Lot 796. PC 2013). Lit.: Lord Hawkesbury, "Catalogues of portraits at Compton Place and at Buxted Park, in Sussex", *Sussex Archaeological Society's collections*, XLVII, 1904, p. 86, no. 18, not reproduced; (IV) version of (III), by or after Hoare, pastel, 60.3x45.1 cm (Badminton, Duke of Beaufort). Lit.: Renée Loche & Marcel Roethlisberger, *L'opera completa di Liotard*, Milan, 1978 ("I&R"), no. 303 repr., as by Liotard, c.1772–74; Jeffares 2006, p. 433 repr., attr. Read; R&L R27, not by Liotard; (V) by Thomas Hudson, oil on canvas, 237x149.5 cm (Newcastle, Laing Art Gallery); (VI) by Sir Joshua Reynolds, oil on canvas,

<sup>1</sup> A version of this article appeared in the *British art journal*, XV/3, 2015, pp. 3–11.

76x63 cm, c.1761–62 (private collection). Lit.: Mannings 2000, no. 399, fig. 589; Mannings lists two studio copies of the Reynolds, nos. 399a, 399b; (VII) by Ozias Humphry, miniature, after Reynolds (Belvoir Castle); (VIII) by Benjamin West, double portrait with daughter, Lady Elizabeth Compton, later Countess of Burlington, oil on canvas, 130x104 cm, 1762 (Miami Beach, Bass Museum)

GENEALOGIES: [Somerset](#); [Compton](#)



### [Jean-Étienne Liotard](#)

Lady HAWKE, née Catharine Brooke (1720–1756) [Zoomify](#)

Pastel on vellum, 56 x 43 cm, made up on two sides to 57 x 45 cm

1753

Private collection

**PROVENANCE:** [?Admiral Lord Hawke (1710–1781), the sitter's widower; bequeathed conditionally to his daughter, Catharine Hawke (1751–1824), but possibly to his granddaughter, Catherine Julia Hawke (1772–1826).] John Rhodes (1814–1898), collector, of Potternewton House, Leeds; his daughter, Lady Carbutt, née Mary Rhodes (–1918); by descent to the present owner

**LITERATURE:** G. C. Williamson, *John Russell*, R.A., 1894, p. 79, 160 n.r., as of Lady Hawke, née Cassandra Turner (1746–1813), by Russell, not reproduced; Marcel Roethlisberger, “Liotard mis à jour”, *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte*, LXXI/2-3, 2014, p. 187, fig. 1; *Dictionary of pastellists* online, [J.49.1627](#)

A version of this article appeared in the *British art journal*, xv/3, 2015, pp. 3–11

**RELATED WORKS:** Liotard, pastel of Lady Anne Somerset

**GENEALOGY:** [Hawke](#)

FRESH FROM HIS SUCCESS in Paris, in 1753, at the invitation of Lord Bessborough, Liotard travelled to London, where he stayed (with one or two breaks) for two years. Despite charges that were more than double those of the best English painters, he enjoyed “vast business at 25 Guineas a head in crayons”, as Reynolds complained,<sup>2</sup> and he is estimated to have made between £6000 and £7000 in one year alone. His celebrity was considerable: Lord Chesterfield, denouncing English women’s overuse of cosmetics, added: “It is even whispered about town of that excellent artist, Mr Liotard, that he lately refused a fine woman to draw her picture, alledging that he never copied any body’s works but his own and GOD ALMIGHTY’S.”<sup>3</sup> His most prestigious commission came from Augusta, Princess of Wales, for a series of eleven pastels of members of the royal family (now in Windsor); an invoice, dated 15 August 1755, shows that four of these pastels cost 108 guineas. But there were many other clients: some drawn from the families who had previously encountered the artist on their Grand Tours, chief among them Lord Bessborough himself; others with an interest in being captured in the latest fashion included both aristocrats and artists such as David Garrick and his wife. Thus portraits of the Spencers, Foxes, Cavendishes, Percys and Hydes are all recorded.

<sup>2</sup> Letter to Joseph Wilton, 5.VI.1753.

<sup>3</sup> Writing in *The World*, 2.I.1755.



Among the most beautiful are the two related portraits discussed in this article. One is of Lady Hawke, which though executed earlier has come to light only very recently, and which we discuss below. The other is the portrait of Lady Anne Somerset as a girl of about 14 years of age, formerly at Badminton and now in a private collection. She is depicted in the simplest of poses, standing, three-quarters to right, her head turned slightly towards the viewer, her eyes meeting directly; her placid expression combines self-possession with the vulnerability of her youth and perhaps a little anxiety, as she appears the exotic dress *à la turque* no doubt suggested by the artist to assist the magic transformation of the child into the fashionable woman. Her hair has caused some comment: but the gorgeous abundance of these loose tresses, the last vestige of her minority, no doubt fascinated Liotard (whose famously long beard expressed, paradoxically, age and masculinity): his Continental and eastern sitters would seldom have required him to depict red hair.

Lady Anne Somerset, the eldest child of Charles Noel, 4<sup>th</sup> Duke of Beaufort (1709–1756) and his wife, née Elizabeth Berkeley (1719–1799), was born on 11 March 1741, nine months after their marriage. An early portrait by Thomas Hudson (fig. 1) shows her as a child of about six wearing antique costume, and is part of a series of portraits of the children still at Badminton.<sup>4</sup> At least five siblings followed, among them Henry (1744–1803; he appears in Vandyke costume in the Hudson series) who succeeded as 5<sup>th</sup> Duke when Lady Anne was only 15. It is clear that she had by then already appeared on the London social scene: in Mrs Delany's correspondence with her sister, she reports from Westminster on 17 May 1755 that "Lady Anne Somerset [was] as well as can be" at dinner at Lord Granville's the night before. This was John, 1<sup>st</sup> Earl Granville, a cousin of Mrs Delany and nephew of John, Lord Granville whom Lady Anne's great-grandmother, Rebecca Child, married after the premature death of the Marquess of Worcester. So Lady Anne was definitely in London at the same time as Liotard.



Fig. 1

were only 15 and 13 years old, and Cotes deliberately leaves ambiguous the subject of the picture they contemplate: is it Lady Anne's own work, or is she inspired by it to compose the cut flowers on the work frame before her? A comparison of the face with Liotard's confirms the basic features and colouring. The fuller cheeks surely put a year or so between the portraits. The nose is different, but its prominence and even its convex profile conform to a pattern found in so many portraits by Cotes (for example, his portraits of the Gunning sisters compared with those of other artists).

The following year she was portrayed by Francis Cotes (fig. 2) in one of his most ambitious (and one assumes expensive) pastels, a double portrait with her friend, Lady Louisa Greville, who later married William Churchill of Henbury.<sup>5</sup> It is necessary to be reminded that these elegant young ladies



Fig. 2

<sup>4</sup> A version of this painting, with Lane Fine Art in 2015, replaces the girl's cap with flowers; the deep brown eyes and reddish hair are apparent.

<sup>5</sup> She was also a precocious amateur artist, being awarded the Society of Artists' first silver medal for drawing in 1757; she was making prints after Salvator Rosa as early as 1759. A miniature of her aged 8, by Gervase Spencer, confirms the features and eye colour. She was also portrayed by Reynolds.

Fairly soon Lady Anne attracted admirers, among them John (Hobart), 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Buckinghamshire (1723–1793), later lord lieutenant of Ireland, whose “passion” for her did not result in matrimony.<sup>6</sup> Horace Walpole, as always, acquaints us with her progress, in a letter to Sir Horace Mann, 1 June 1759: “One of your last friends, Lord Northampton, is going to marry Lady Anne Somerset, the Duke of Beaufort’s sister. She is rather handsome. He seems to have too much of the coldness and dignity of the Comptons.” Such indeed proved to be the case, as Walpole updated Sir Horace, 1 August 1759:

Your Lord Northampton has not acted a much more gallant part by his new mistress than by his fair one at Florence. When it was all agreed, he refused to marry unless she had eighteen thousand pounds. Eight were wanting. It looked as if he was more attached to his old flame than to his new one, but her uncle Norbonne Berkeley has nobly made up the deficiency.



Fig. 3 with detail

The wedding followed, on 13 September 1759, at Audley Chapel, St George’s, Hanover Square, London. A few weeks later, Lady Caroline Fox wrote to her sister,<sup>7</sup> “Talking of brides, I saw a young woman t’other day at Court that pleases me more than any I have seen for years except my own sisters. ’Tis Lady Northampton. She is not a beauty, but so much sense, modesty and air of a woman of fashion both in manner and person make her vastly pleasing. None of the Kitty Fisher style either in dress or manner, which all the young women affect now.” A full length portrait by Thomas Hudson was commissioned (fig. 3),<sup>8</sup> placing the emphasis on the glorious pink silk dress and the grandiose pillared balcony rather than on the somewhat conventional and generic face. The red hair may have darkened over time; the eighteen-year-old bride’s expression is assured.

Her husband, Charles Compton, 7<sup>th</sup> Earl of Northampton (1737–1763), had taken his seat in the House of Lords a few months previously (in succession to his uncle), having just returned from his Grand Tour,<sup>9</sup> where he was recorded in Padua and Venice (1757), Rome and Florence (1758), ordering history paintings and a portrait from Gavin Hamilton and Batoni. Lord Northampton was a sceptre-bearer at the coronation of George III, 22 September 1761. Walpole reported that “Lady Northampton was very magnificent too and looked prettier than I have seen her of late.”<sup>10</sup> When a Venetian embassy came to congratulate George III on his accession, Northampton, whose father had been a diplomat, was a natural choice as a reciprocal ambassador extraordinary to Venice. Named in 1761, it was not until much later, in the following year, that he and the Countess set out for Italy. Their only child, Elizabeth, was born on 25 June 1760 at the family seat, Compton Wynyates, Warwickshire.<sup>11</sup>

There was time for another portrait (fig. 4), this time from Sir Joshua Reynolds, who records sittings in London as



Fig. 4

<sup>6</sup> In 1761 he married instead Mary Anne Drury. His aunt Henrietta, Countess of Suffolk all too soon had the task of reporting to him: “Lord Buckingham’s former passions go off very quickly: poor Lady Northampton is dead at Naples, and it is much feared Lord Northampton is by this time dead at Venice (letter to Lord Buckingham, 12.VI.1763, *Letters to and from Henrietta, Countess of Suffolk*, London, 1824, II, p. 275).

<sup>7</sup> 25.X.1759, *Correspondence of Emily, Duchess of Leinster*, London, 1949, I, p. 262.

<sup>8</sup> A payment of 40 guineas to Thomas Hudson in 1762 recorded in the 4<sup>th</sup> Duke of Beaufort’s papers (Gloucester Archives, D2700/PB3/1) may refer to this painting. It descended in the Compton and Cavendish families until sold at auction in London, 22.VI.1949.

<sup>9</sup> Ingamells 1997.

<sup>10</sup> Walpole, letter to Lady Ailesbury, 27.IX.1761.

<sup>11</sup> She was to marry Lord George Cavendish, Earl of Burlington (1754–1834) in 1782, and died at Compton Place, East Sussex, in 1835.



Fig. 5

Frances, Countess of Northampton, wife of the 6<sup>th</sup> Earl, whose death without issue in 1758 led to the accession as 7<sup>th</sup> Earl of his nephew, Anne's husband. The outdoor background in that painting are echoed in the pastel, unusually in Hoare's smaller works. Most striking however (and in contrast with Cotes's portrait) is the exact match of the sitter's features with the Liotard, with the long, retroussé nose, tight, bowed mouth, eyebrows and hairline; eye and hair colour also conform. The face, with a little more self-assurance than the Liotard, as befits even a new countess, nevertheless retains some of its timorousness.

Lord and Lady Northampton finally reached Venice on 17 October 1762; there the ambassador was obliged to wait for the signal that his opposite number had presented his credentials at the court of St James's before he could make his official entry into La Serenissima. His frustration is evident from a letter her wrote a few days later: "It is astonishing that our ministry don't take more notice of their ministers abroad, they seem to think no more of us as soon as we have left the kingdom."<sup>14</sup> The Countess posed for Benjamin West holding Lady Elizabeth as a Raphael Madonna (fig. 7).<sup>15</sup> However it was not the infant but the mother whose mortality was proximate: she and her husband were suffering from tuberculosis. (It is of course quite possible that her illness led, before their departure for Italy, to a trip to Bath, where Hoare might have executed the



Fig. 6

<sup>12</sup> Two pastels at Compton Place were catalogued in 1904 and sold, having been inherited by the Duke of Devonshire, by the Trustees of the Chatsworth Settlement, on the premises, 18–20.V.1954, Lots 796 and 797. One is of the Countess of Northampton; the other, of her sister, Lady Isabella, later Duchess of Rutland (1756–1831), as a girl of 6. The description of the latter corresponds perfectly to the pastel now in the V&A, inv. P.55-1962, from the Rotch bequest. Formerly attributed to John Russell (who was 17 when it was done), it is reattributed to Katherine Read. The Badminton pastel (fig. 6) is a copy of Lot 796 executed for the Somerset family, possibly by Katherine Read, probably after William Hoare. Although it must have been made several years later, a small pastel of the 6<sup>th</sup> Duke, "small, by Mrs Read" was noted at Badminton by Sir William Musgrave in 1796 (British Library, Add. MSS 6391, f53–56, no. 60). No. 88 is "Lady Anne Somerset afterwards L<sup>y</sup> Northampton & L<sup>y</sup> Louisa Greville by Hoare [Cotes], 3 qrs". Lady Anne also appears in a group portrait with her parents (no. 87) and in another unattributed item, "94. L<sup>y</sup> A Somerset. D<sup>o</sup>"; the ditto repeats "3 qrs" – an ambiguous term which can refer to the size of the picture, the length of the figure or its orientation; none of these fits fig. 6 precisely. The following item, no. 95, her sister Lady Henrietta, is described as "oval, 3 qrs, by Mrs Read"; no. 55 is also of "Lady H. W. Wynne by Mrs Read."

<sup>13</sup> There is a photograph in the Frick Art Reference Library. The painting is similarly inscribed.

<sup>14</sup> Letter, 23 October 1762; BL Stowe 257.

<sup>15</sup> Inscribed "B. West/Venice/1762". A copy of this painting, by May Lancaster Lucas, was at 2 Carlton House Terrace in 1906 (Lord Hawkesbury, "Catalogue of ... portraits... at 2, Carlton House Terrace", *Transactions of the East Riding Antiquarian Society*, XIII/1, 1906, p. 33, no. 2, where it is said to be copied after Lady Northampton's own painting, then in the possession of Henry F. C. Cavendish, her great-great-grandson).



pastels discussed above.) The story is picked up by Sir Horace Mann, writing to Walpole, 30 April 1763:

We have a melancholy scene here which must have the same catastrophe. Lord and Lady Northampton are here; she with an intention to proceed towards Naples but I fear much too late. He ought to go there, and possibly might recover, for he has all the symptoms of the beginning of the same disorder. The separation, I fear, will be a distress to both. I had proposed an apartment for her but she would not accept it. I carry her out twice a day, and, by deceiving her with regard to her own situation and persuading her that my Lord will follow her to Naples as soon as he has made his entry, have brought her to a certain tranquillity on that subject, though in my own opinion their separation will be forever. I don't see how he can go through the ceremony of his entry. He is obliged to be carried upstairs, and even without the least motion has frequently a thickness of breath that indicates the danger of his disorder.

Horace Walpole could only respond to Mann (5 June 1763): "I am much concerned at the melancholy accounts you give me of Lord and Lady Northampton. They are young, handsome and happy, and life was very valuable to them. She has been consumptive for some time; but he seemed healthy and strong." As Mann had predicted, the Countess now embarked on this final journey to Naples without her husband. She reached Naples on 17 May 1763, and died the following day. Lord Northampton completed his embassy at the end of May (news of his wife's death was withheld from him until after the ceremony) and set off for home a week later, intending to consult Dr Tronchin in Geneva (as had so many Liotard sitters);<sup>16</sup> he nevertheless died in Lyon later that year.

No invoice has yet been found for this portrait, whose earliest appearance is some years later, in 1779, when the Countess of Lichfield, née Dinah Frankland (c.1719–1779) died. The Lee and Somerset family connections went back several generations: the 4<sup>th</sup> Duke of Beaufort's aunt, Lady Harriet, married 2<sup>nd</sup> Duke of Grafton, whose aunt, Lady Charlotte Fitzroy, was 1<sup>st</sup> Countess of Lichfield. That the families remained close is evident, art historically, by Wootton's *The Beaufort Hunt* (Tate) and also by the series of five pastels by Hoare of members of the Lichfield Hunt depicted in the "true blue frock and ermine cape" in the Earl of Lichfield's posthumous inventory,<sup>17</sup> including two Dukes of Beaufort (no doubt the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>), as well as Dinah, Lady Lichfield's husband, the 3<sup>rd</sup> Earl. Lord Lichfield, together with Lady Anne's uncle, Norbonne Berkeley (later Lord Botetourt), the trustees of her father's will.<sup>18</sup> These were families who were interested in pastel portraiture, and there is nothing surprising in the Lees having, and probably commissioning, a portrait of Lady Anne. Lady Lichfield's sister-in-law was married to Henry Hyde, Viscount Cornbury, whose pastel by Liotard was recorded at Lord Royston's house in St James's Square in 1761.

Lady Lichfield's principal devisee and executor<sup>19</sup> was her cousin Lady Pelham, later Countess of Chichester, née Anne Frankland (1734–1813), who gave the pastel of Lady Anne to her mother, Elizabeth, Dowager Duchess of Beaufort, although not without some family discussion: the 5<sup>th</sup> Duke wrote to her<sup>20</sup> "If it is



Fig. 7

<sup>16</sup> Sir Horace Mann, letter to Walpole, 11 June 1763.

<sup>17</sup> Ditchley, 1772; it does not include the Liotard (nor does the "Description of Ditchley" published in *The Oxford magazine*, IX, July 1772, p. 91, nor that in the 1764 *Pocket companion for Oxford*, which all list the Hoare pastels), suggesting that it may already have been in the London house at Hill Street.

<sup>18</sup> Gloucester Archives, D2700/P15/3.

<sup>19</sup> The pastel is not explicitly mentioned in her will (records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, PROB 11/1049), although the Lichfield portraits are specifically bequeathed to her nephew, Charles, 12<sup>th</sup> Viscount Dillon (himself the subject of a Liotard pastel), to remain at Ditchley as heirlooms.

<sup>20</sup> 24 January 1779, Gloucester Archives, D2700/QP4/6/3.

your wish to have that picture of Lady Northampton I must undoubtedly resign the desire I had to have it. It is a pretty little picture and I should have been very sorry to have it go into strange hands. I have but one picture of Lady Northampton and that but a bad one.” The “bad” one in the Beaufort collections may refer either to the early Hudson painting or the pastel in fig. 6; it less likely to refer to the Cotes double portrait, although this was recorded at Badminton by Sir William Musgrave during his visit in 1796 (erroneously as by Hoare).<sup>21</sup> That the Liotard did not appear is explained because it remained with the Dowager Duchess, perhaps at the house in Hanover Square where she died in 1799.<sup>22</sup>

Under the Duchess’s will,<sup>23</sup> the 5<sup>th</sup> Duke received “the Picture of my late dear daughter Lady Anne Somerset afterwards Countess of Northampton drawn by Liotard and given me by Lady Pelham out of Lady Lichfield’s collection.” The specific bequest, perhaps in recognition of the earlier correspondence with her son, can only refer to a pastel. The identity of the sitter can hardly be questioned.

The question is whether the picture described in these documents corresponds to the present pastel.<sup>24</sup> The art collections at Badminton had been built up in previous generations, with the 3<sup>rd</sup> Duke an enthusiastic collector. But the “immense load of debt” accrued during his time, exacerbated by the malversation of the receiver-general, which came to light when Lady Anne’s father, the 4<sup>th</sup> Duke, died, precluded further extensive acquisitions. It is highly improbable that the present work would have come to Badminton by later purchase, or that the family would have purchased a pastel of someone who was not a family member. So the only real possibilities for the Duchess’s portrait received from Lady Lichfield are the present work or the one now attributed to Hoare, fig. 6. Despite its inclusion in Loche & Roethlisberger in 1978, it does not seem likely that the Duchess would have regarded that work as a Liotard, particularly when a

real, and very typical, example was at hand, nor that her son would have been so keen to have it; moreover the Hoare seems to date from after her marriage.

As to the variations between the various portraits of the Countess, those problems exist without the Liotard. It is clear that her attractions were difficult to capture, and the differences are as much about the artists as the sitter. Taken as a group the Liotard fits comfortable within the range.

The enamel copy of the pastel, now in the Louvre (fig. 8), is not by Liotard. Slightly coarser in execution, it has been convincingly reattributed<sup>25</sup> to Jean-Adam Serre, a close contemporary and associate of Liotard and one of his most convincing copyists. Serre was in London



Fig. 8

<sup>21</sup> See note 12 above.

<sup>22</sup> A curious reference to this pastel occurs in an essay on “Liotard and Mengs”, *Truffle hunt with Sacheverell Sitwell*, London, 1953, p. 7: “Liotard paid one or two visits to England, and a lovely pastel portrait of a young woman by him is at Badminton. According to legend, this is the young lady for whom the little house in the Great Park was built.” By the time of Osbert Sitwell’s *Queen Mary and others*, London, 1975, p. 33, this had been inflated to “Dowager Duchess, Louisa, a very pretty and exquisite old lady, ... lived at the edge of the park in a cottage filled with pastels by Liotard.” No other Somerset Liotard is known, but the present work may not have been in the main house.

<sup>23</sup> Gloucester Archives, D2700/P18/1, 1799. The will also included a full length picture of Anne, Countess of Northampton, in a gilt frame to Elizabeth, Lady Cavendish, her daughter, whom the Dowager Duchess had brought up after her parents’ death. This may have been the Hudson.

<sup>24</sup> Here one can discount the anonymous pastel reported as at Compton Place in 1904; no longer to be found, it evidently originated from the Compton family, possibly suggesting that it was made after her marriage, and was probably sold in 1954. It is not to be found at Chatsworth where the unsold contents were transferred (Charles Noble, private communication, 3.VI.2011), and there is no obvious path for it to have gone to Badminton.

<sup>25</sup> By Bodo Hofstetter (private communication), followed in R&L; for Serre’s career, see R&L, pp. 709f. To this can be added the advertisements placed by Serre, “Portrait Painter to the Empress Queen”, from the same address as Liotard’s (at the Two Yellow Lamps, Golden Square) in the *Public advertiser*, 15 December 1753 and the two following weeks, offering his *Essais sur les principes de l’harmonie* as well as his pictures of the Austrian and French royal families, Mme de Pompadour, Fontenelle, Cr billon etc.

from 1754 to at least 1756, so the Louvre enamel provides no evidence that the present pastel originated outside England. Certainly the pastel cannot be by Serre: there is no evidence that he worked in the medium, and this example is not the work of a neophyte.

A rather different set of questions is posed by the pastel of Lady Hawke. This first came to light in December 2011 only from a very old unpublished photograph in an album of work by John Russell assembled by his descendant Francis Henry Webb (fig. 9). It belonged to John Rhodes (1814–1898) of Potternewton House, Leeds, at some stage before 1894, when it was mentioned, but not reproduced, by G. C. Williamson<sup>26</sup> as of Cassandra, Lady Hawke by Russell, and it seems Williamson assumed it to have been executed c.1801 when Russell was active in Leeds; Webb annotated his photograph “another doubtful Russell”. The photograph was found by the author just as the January 2012 sale catalogue was going to press,<sup>27</sup> while the pastel itself only came to light some months later.

The photograph raised several complicated questions to which it is only now possible to set out a considered response. As will be immediately clear, the pastel has nothing to do with John Russell and is entirely typical of Liotard. No one else drew faces in this way. But what is its relation to the pastel of Lady Anne? While the faces are totally different, the costumes are virtually identical and it is apparent that one must derive from the other. Lady Hawke, née Cassandra Turner (1746–1813), the author of the novel *Julia de Gramont* (1788), was rather younger than Lady Anne, but looks considerably older in the portrait. But several visual clues

(discussed further below) suggest that Lady Anne is derived from Lady Hawke, whose age would thus imply that the Lady Anne pastel cannot have been done on Liotard’s first trip to England and cannot be correctly identified. But this depends on whether Williamson has correctly identified Lady Hawke.



Fig. 9

Only one other portrait of her is known today with certainty<sup>28</sup> – a full-length oil by Thomas Beach<sup>29</sup> with her son, dating to around 1780: it shows darker colouring, a less-full mouth and a non-cleft chin. Nor can it be said that the sitter corresponds to Fanny Burney’s 1782 description of Lady Hawke as “rather pretty; extremely languishing, delicate, and pathetic.”<sup>30</sup> But several features suggest that this portrait does indeed belong to the 1753–55 trip (and therefore cannot depict the novelist): the face itself is remarkably similar in its conception and execution with a number of the works made then, for

<sup>26</sup> G. C. Williamson, *John Russell R.A.*, London, 1894, pp. 79, 160.

<sup>27</sup> A saleroom notice appeared with the following text: “As the catalogue was going to press, Neil Jeffares discovered an old but unpublished photograph of a pastel, said to be a portrait of Cassandra, Lady Hawke, and traditionally attributed to John Russell. Mr Jeffares considers it to be in all probability an autograph work by Liotard (it is included in his website [www.pastellists.com](http://www.pastellists.com) under Liotard). The pastel is apparently closely related to the present pastel, with an almost identical costume but a different face. Until the pastel itself reappears, it is difficult to determine the precise relationship between the two works.”

<sup>28</sup> *The Connoisseur*, 1937, reports a portrait of her by Reynolds sold for 190 gns, but it is not in Mannings and may not be reliable.

<sup>29</sup> I am most grateful to Greg Page-Turner for drawing this to my attention (email, 24.1.2024).

<sup>30</sup> Letter to Mrs Phillips, *The diary and letters of Madame d'Arblay*, London, 1854, II, p. 91.



example the 1754 portrait of Augusta, Princess of Wales, later Herzogin von Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (1737–1813);<sup>31</sup> note in particular the very feint hatching on the face, as well as the treatment of the hair and its join with the forehead. The second argument concerns the fabric of the dress *à la turque* which is extraordinarily similar to that worn in a portrait engraved around this time as of Maria, Countess of Coventry.<sup>32</sup> A number of Liotard pastels feature identical or similar flower-sprigged white muslin. These seem to originate with the group of “dessins d’après nature faits à Constantinople” some of which were exhibited in Paris in 1751.<sup>33</sup> Among the relevant examples may be cited the inconspicuous appearance on the loose trousers of the standing woman in the various versions of the *Dame et sa servante au bain*, of which Roethlisberger & Loche tentatively date the earlier versions (cat. nos. 67–69) to Liotard’s Constantinople period 1738–42. The full dress with this motif appears in the *Dame de Constantinople assise sur un divan* (Louvre, inv. RF 1374) from the same period.<sup>34</sup> It reappears, without the ermine mantle, in the numerous versions of the *Dame pensive sur un sofa*, known as “Lady Coventry” (cat. 190), which may be dated to 1749. The various versions of the *Dame lisant sur un sofa* (cat. nos. 191–93) probably date from the same period: the dress is similar but not identical, and the feathered turban, albeit more elaborate, is clearly the origin of the simplified feathered cap in a portrait said to be of the vicomtesse de Nettine<sup>35</sup> and which reappears in the Somerset/Hawke pastels. The floral motif reappears on the sofa of an unidentified Effendi (cat. 204) where we agree with Roethlisberger & Loche in preferring to read the signed date as 1751 rather than 1761. It is hard to explain fully the small differences in pattern of the fabric: the costumes were surely studio props rather than the clothing of the sitters themselves, and while there may have been several versions, it seems probable that Liotard varied and simplified the floral motifs rather than copying exactly what was before him.<sup>36</sup>

As to whether the substitution of one face for another does not imply some form of pastiche,



Fig. 10

Liotard’s practice in this regard has been studied by Duncan Bull in regard to the numerous portraits of “Lady Coventry”. There is nothing to preclude this being a further example: as Bull notes, “Liotard’s practice of recycling off-the-peg genre compositions in portraits...may be more common than has hitherto been supposed.”<sup>37</sup>

With the discovery of the pastel itself, a simple explanation is provided as to how Lady Hawke was mistakenly identified as of Cassandra. The label reads “Lady Hawke/By Russell of Guildford” and is clearly not original; it may date to the period of John Rhodes’s

<sup>31</sup> Pastel on vellum, 39x30 cm, Royal Collection RCIN 400896. The resemblance is remarkable, and indicates how far Liotard’s personality intrudes upon his likenesses.

<sup>32</sup> See Duncan Bull, “Princess, countess, lover or wife? Liotard’s ‘lady on a sofa’”, *Burlington magazine*, CL, .IX.2008, pp. 592–602 for a full discussion of the identification of this complicated series of portraits. Both dresses are in white satin, decorated with small flower sprigs in red and green; they are edged in blue, and have small pearl fastenings at the neck.

<sup>33</sup> See R&L, pp. 159–60 for the history of this group.

<sup>34</sup> See Anne de Herdt, *Dessins de Liotard*, exhibition catalogue, Geneva and Paris, 1992, no. 30 reproduced.

<sup>35</sup> Several versions are known: R&L 211, 212, figs. 347, 348.

<sup>36</sup> Aileen Ribeiro (personal communication, April 2012) suggests that Liotard probably brought few full costumes back from Constantinople, but may have had a collection of fabric samples from which to produce the numerous variants that appear in his work. The basic floral motif is found, for example, in Mughal printed cottons from the seventeenth century (an example is in the V&A, inv. IM.69&A-1930).

<sup>37</sup> Bull, *op. cit.*, at p. 599. Another illustration is the portrait of said to be of James Milliken (R&L 425), whose costume and features (but not eye colour) are repeated in a pastel of Mountstuart which appeared at Christie’s, 8.VII.2009, Lot 127.

ownership.<sup>38</sup> While the attribution to Russell is the sort of information that might easily be added to an anonymous pastel, the identification as “Lady Hawke” is not, and can only plausibly have repeated an earlier inscription (or possibly an oral family tradition). The extrapolation from “Lady Hawke” to Cassandra, Lady Hawke is then easily understood and dismissed: Cassandra Turner only became Lady Hawke on her father-in-law’s death in 1781. Williamson, looking for a plausible Russell sitter in Leeds c.1800, may even have been confused by her daughter-in-law, Frances Anne Harvey, Lady Hawke (1771<sup>39</sup>–1810), heir to the Womersley Park estate in Yorkshire. There is a further possible explanation of the confusion: an unpublished John Russell pastel, *The Finding of Moses* (fig. 10), exhibited by him in the Royal Academy in 1789, no. 420 belonged to the Countess of Rosse, née Cassandra Hawke-Harvey (1851–1921), when it was loaned to the Russell exhibition in 1909; by family tradition the figure of Pharaoh’s daughter is considered to be a portrait of Lady Hawke of Womerlsey House. However the woman shown looks older than Frances Anne Harvey (who did not marry into the Hawke family until six years after the picture was exhibited) and is more likely (if of any member of the family) to be of Cassandra, Lady Hawke. To compound the confusions, this pastel is thought to have had a pendant, since lost.

If the sitter mentioned on the inscription on the Liotard is correctly “Lady Hawke” (and there is no reason to doubt it) this must be a portrait of Cassandra’s 33-year-old mother-in-law, Catharine “Kitty” Brooke (1720–1756), wife of Admiral Lord Hawke (1710–1781), the victor of Quiberon Bay; her husband was portrayed, as Sir Edward Hawke, in 1748 by Knapton and much later by Cotes.<sup>40</sup> Knapton of course was familiar with Liotard’s work,<sup>41</sup> and could well have suggested the artist to the admiral if he sought a portraitist for his wife. Little is known of this Yorkshire heiress. Her parents, of whom she was the sole child, were both dead by the time she was three. Her closest relative<sup>42</sup> was her aunt Frances Hammond, Mrs Thomas Pulleyne of Burley; her descendents sold to Lord Hawke their share of Towton, the estate to which his title is attached. When she died, leaving four surviving children, Admiral Hawke erected a memorial at St Nicholas, North Stoneham (near their home at Swaythling), recording that she was “the best wife, the best mother and the best of friends, for truth, engaging tenderness and good nature, the delight of all that knew her.” One of her sons later recalled that “the beauty of [her] person was excelled only by the accomplished elegance of her mind”. Hawke’s biographer<sup>43</sup> notes that “She was, by her own account, of a somewhat reserved disposition; but, despite the disparity of years between herself and her husband, her life with him was marked by complete candour and devotion.”

The circumstances of the commission are not known with certainty, but can be pieced together circumstantially.<sup>44</sup> Following the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748 warfare had ceased; from 1752 Hawke was ashore, on half-pay. He had accumulated sufficient funds from prize money to enable his wife to furnish their London home with luxuries appropriate to his position: a dining table for £65 16s 4d; silver for £337 17s 10d; “a pair of large cluster brilliant 3 drop ear-rings” from Henry Hurst (£235). Other suppliers included Paul de Lamerie and William Linnell. From Spring 1753, Sir Edward and his wife were living at 7 George Street, Hanover Square.<sup>45</sup> In

<sup>38</sup> The handwriting and form of the label closely resemble those on the Adriaen Hanneman portrait (formerly thought to be of Andrew Marvell) now at the Ferens Art Gallery and formerly owned by John Rhodes. I am most grateful to Kirsten Simister for providing me with an image (private communication, 28.V.2012).

<sup>39</sup> Her date of birth is normally omitted from the standard works, but may be inferred from her age at death.

<sup>40</sup> As with many naval heroes, Hawke has an extensive engraved iconography. An early example is a mezzotint by Van Werdlen after G. Hansson from c.1741. Among the others is a plate by Faber which stated life in 1741 as a reproduction of Zincke’s portrait of Sir Chaloner Ogle, but was reissued later with minor alterations to represent Hawke.

<sup>41</sup> See Roethlisberger & Loche, *op. cit.*, p. 267f. Among Liotard’s subjects with naval connections should be mentioned Augustus John Hervey, 3<sup>rd</sup> Earl of Bristol (1724–1779), while the daughter of Lady Anne Conolly married the unfortunate Admiral Byng’s nephew.

<sup>42</sup> Joseph Hunter, *Familiae minorum gentium*, London, 1895, III, (Harleian Society, XXXIX), p. 879. In a letter to *Country Life* (CLXX, 1981, p. 1972), Dr A. L. Rowse noted that “It was through his mother and his wife that Hawke’s branch of the family became connected with Yorkshire.”

<sup>43</sup> Ruddock F. Mackay, *Admiral Hawke*, London, 1965, p. 13.

<sup>44</sup> Mackay, *op. cit.*, pp. 110ff, 120 & *passim*.

<sup>45</sup> He had owned it since 1729 and was to keep it until 1762 when he moved to Bloomsbury Square. In 1765 he purchased a house at Sunbury.



September 1753 Kitty gave birth at Swaythling to her seventh child, a son who died after four days. Hawke left his family in Swaythling to go to London (where was finally invested as a Knight of the Bath on 11 December 1753); Catharine wrote three letters to him from Swaythling<sup>46</sup> that month, in which she makes clear her preference for the country over London: “for I am sure one day here will do you more good than five in London.” In January 1754 Sir Edward was still in London, unable to accept a command offered to him on grounds of his health.<sup>47</sup> He was to remain there until the Admiralty wrote to him on 5 February 1755 to ask if he was now well enough to serve, and he immediately set off for Portsmouth, where he was joined by Kitty on 15 April before he embarked with a squadron for the Bay of Biscay in the preliminary activity leading up to the outbreak of the Seven Years War. Ill-health forced him back to Portsmouth by September 1755, and the family spent Christmas together in London, but by that stage Liotard had left for Holland. He had in fact left London in the summer of 1754, travelling to Lyon (where he executed the pastel many consider his masterpiece, *Le déjeuner Lavergne*), and returned only briefly, according to the advertisement that appeared in the *Public advertiser*, 13 March 1755:

Mr LIOTARD gives Notice that he is come back to London, chiefly in order to finish some Portraits he had begun before he went to France last summer, and therefore does not intend to make here a longer Stay than will be required for that purpose.

It is most probable therefore that the pastel was made in the summer of 1753, before Kitty’s last confinement, months spent with her husband, so that it is unsurprising that no reference to the pastel has been found in the handful of surviving letters from Kitty to her husband.<sup>48</sup>

But the pastel is surely the picture mentioned in Lord Hawke’s will<sup>49</sup> where, amongst several pages of bequests to his unmarried daughter Catharine (1751–1824) itemising her mother’s personal belongings down to the last spoon, he adds “also the pictures in crayons the one of her late Mamma and the other of Miss Polly [?]Folke<sup>50</sup> which are both in the same bed chamber [where Miss Birt<sup>51</sup> lyes at Sunbury]”. (These cannot be the John Russell pendants, since he was far too young to have portrayed the first Lady Hawke.) But there is a heart-rending rider: Catharine, onto whom Hawke has evidently transferred his uxorial affection, is not to receive her bequest unless she recovers from her “present unhappy condition of mind” and is able for the space of twelve calendar months “be and continue in a good and sound state of mind memory and understanding”; failing which the bequest falls to his granddaughter Cassandra Julia (named after her own mother, Kitty’s daughter-in-law, and presumably the heroine of her novel).<sup>52</sup> It is unclear if that the condition was fulfilled, although Catharine was to live another 43 years;<sup>53</sup> but it has not proved possible to trace the immediate fate of the pastels. Cassandra Julia Hawke (1772–

<sup>46</sup> I am most grateful to Pieter van der Merwe and Martin Salmon of the National Maritime Museum for confirming this (private communication, April 2012).

<sup>47</sup> “It is a sensible mortification to me that I am prevented from accepting it by my present state of health”, letter of 21 January 1754, cited Mackay, *op. cit.*, p. 112. Other sources for Hawke’s movements are Mackay’s *The Hawke papers*, London, 1990 and G. H. Jennings, “Father of the English navy”, *Country life*, CLXX, 1981, p. 1406ff.

<sup>48</sup> Apart from the three date 2, 7 and 9 December only one written in 23 February 1756 survives.

<sup>49</sup> Will of The Right Honorable Edward Lord Hawke of South Stoneham, Hampshire, made 5 September 1780; codicil, 5 October 1781, repeats the provisions regarding his daughter’s conditional bequest of her mother’s possessions (PROB 11/1086), folios 181, 190; probate, 2 January 1782.

<sup>50</sup> The writing is not easily legible at this point, but the reference could be to Mary Fowke (1745–1791), the daughter of Rear-Admiral Edmund Thorpe Fowke (1704–1784) who was known to Hawke. If so one wonders if this pastel was also by Liotard, and what may have become of it. Mary Fowke married a James M. Mackay in 1780. Admiral Thorpe Fowke’s father was Lieutenant-General Thomas Fowke, governor of Gibraltar, whom Hawke was sent to arrest (for pusillanimity and disobedience) on the voyage during which Kitty died.

<sup>51</sup> Sally Birt was the sister of Lieutenant John Birt who served under Hawke; she assisted Kitty bring up the children. (Sources suggest this followed Birt’s death, but that did not take place until 31 October 1764, when the *Lapwing* of which he was commander was lost with all hands.) She remained an important part of the household after Hawke’s death, and was charged with looking after Catharine, irrespective of the views of the rest of the executors and family, by complicated provisions in Hawke’s will.

<sup>52</sup> It is easy to have misconceptions about the character of a man responsible for some of the bloodiest conflicts of his day, renowned for the highly aggressive tactic of holding fire until his ship was within “pistol shot” of its target. Wills are normally dry documents: that cannot be said of Lord Hawke’s. It is impossible to read it without being moved by his love for the wife who had died a quarter of a century before, and for the daughter who bore her name onto whom he had transferred that weight; nor can we avoid seeing Liotard’s newly discovered portrait of her in that light.

<sup>53</sup> Her dates, omitted from the standard pedigrees, may be established from the register of burials at St Mary-Le-Bone for 10 November 1824: the Hon<sup>ble</sup> Catherine Hawke of Sunbury, aged 73.

1826) married three times, the last in 1820 to a comic actor, Thomas Frederick Green, who promptly retired from the stage and seems to have been involved in litigation against her family<sup>54</sup> by the time of her death. In her main will she left most of her estate to two sisters whom she seems to have adopted, but she added a final codicil<sup>55</sup> to write them out as they had neglected her during her final illness. Cassandra (who now called herself Julia) no longer lived in the house at Park Street, Grosvenor Square and it seems had fallen on hard times; even if she had inherited the pastels, she may well have disposed of them.

Although the provenance from 1894 is known, it remains unclear how John Rhodes acquired the pastel of Lady Hawke or why it is not in the possession of the Hawke family. Rhodes made his fortune in shipping and stockbroking, but was also a chess enthusiast, orchid grower and a patron and collector of art, owning a fine library (left by his son Colonel Fairfax Rhodes to the Cambridge Union<sup>56</sup>) and an eclectic group pictures ranging from John Martin to Adriaen Hanneman's portrait of Andrew Marvell (given by his son to the Ferens Art Gallery in Hull); the collection was "valued at many thousands of pounds" in 1898.<sup>57</sup> He did own a genuine John Russell pastel, of John Green,<sup>58</sup> founder of the Leeds pottery (ceramics<sup>59</sup> was a particular interest of Rhodes). It seems likely that he acquired the Liotard locally, either from Catharine's relatives at Burley Hall or the Hawke family at Womersley Park, both within 20 miles of Leeds, but no documentation has yet been found to support this. Why would so precious a picture have been disposed of so discreetly? What is striking in comparing the Somerset/Hawke pictures with the earlier ladies on their sofas is the amount of décolletage Liotard shows: at least to modern eyes, this looks adventurous for the young girl and possibly too daring for the young mother. Was it perhaps too much for the Hawke family?

Returning to the relationship between the two Liotard pastels, the biographical facts support the proposition that Lady Hawke (1753) does indeed pre-date Lady Anne (1755). There are also important visual clues that cast some light on the relationship between the pastels. The flower sprig at Lady Anne's left shoulder is absent from both Lady Hawke and the Serre miniature, and seems to have been added to complete an optical void. It cannot have been done from life as the direction contradicts the lower sprig which is on a continuous part of the fabric.<sup>60</sup> The depiction of the sitter's left sleeve fastening seems to make sense in Lady Hawke and to be less coherent in Lady Anne, while the red feather showing below the jewelled fastening on Lady Hawke disappears inexplicably on Lady Anne. Each of these might support the argument that Lady Anne was copied by another hand from Lady Hawke. But (setting aside the connoisseurial judgement of the exceptional quality of Lady Anne) there are two more important changes which can only I think have been made by Liotard himself. The first is the change in scale (even allowing for the slight incursion into the visual space of a fillet and additions to sides of Lady Hawke): Lady Anne occupies far less of the picture space than does Lady Hawke. This dramatic play is pure Liotard, found again in the versions of Lady Coventry. The second change is that of the basic colouration: one of the reasons that Lady Hawke is so unmistakably Liotard is because of its rich palette of ochres and browns, a harmony between the sitter's natural colouring and the background – in Liotard's habitual gingerbread colour that Mariette didn't like ("la couleur tirait

<sup>54</sup> *Green v Hawke*, pleadings in the Court of Chancery, National Archives C13/1475/68 and C13/1788/22, 1826–27.

<sup>55</sup> Will of The Honorable Cassandra Julia otherwise Julia Green, Wife of Park Street Grosvenor Square, Middlesex, PROB 11/1714.

<sup>56</sup> Colonel Fairfax Rhodes of Brockhampton Park inherited many of his father's pictures which were disposed of in sales at Sotheby's in 1930s. However the Liotard passed to John Rhodes's daughter, Mary.

<sup>57</sup> The only substantive obituary appeared in *The British chess magazine*, XVIII, 1898, p. 259f. There is an anonymous oil portrait of him in the Hepworth, Wakefield.

<sup>58</sup> Reproduced in the *Dictionary of pastellists before 1800*, online edition; mentioned without reproduction in Williamson, *op. cit.*

<sup>59</sup> A porcelain dessert dish from the Don Pottery now in the Fitzwilliam Museum (inv. C.10-1952) unites its former owner's interest in English pottery and botany.

<sup>60</sup> Fergus Hall, private communication, 29 January 2012, noticed minor differences in the colour and execution of this flower, and considers that it may have been added later than the rest of the pastel. This is not immediately obvious and eluded my earlier inspection. Even if the argument is rejected, so that Lady Hawke belongs to the second London trip while Lady Anne was done on the first trip: would Lady Lichfield have lent the pastel to the artist to be copied in this way? There is no evidence for a third work from which so close a copy could be derived, and every reason to believe they were made at the same time.



presque toujours sur celle du pain d'épice"<sup>61</sup>). The colouration of Lady Anne is however radically different, tending to a much cooler greenish tint (a feature which in turn exaggerates the visual impact of the scale change). The reason is simple: Liotard had to cope with the sitter's red hair. She may not have had to pose for each strand to be drawn, as Liotard already had the architecture to follow; but he knew he could not change the face without matching Lady Anne's hair colour, and he understood (in a way no copyist could) how radical were the chromatic implications of that change.

One issue remains: was Lady Hawke still in Liotard's studio to serve as model for Lady Anne, or was there a third, as yet undiscovered pastel? It may be that a chalk drawing from Constantinople was used: the absence of colour would more easily account for the misreading of the material immediately below the jewel, the sleeve fastening etc.

Liotard's portraits of Lady Hawke and of Lady Anne Somerset both, in their different ways, display different aspects the hand of the master, revealing both his genius and his idiosyncracies. In both cases he starts with a thin, translucent sheet of vellum (a material eschewed almost entirely by most French pastellists of this period, and employed in England only by a few imitators such as Vispré whose work is far below these in level), which the artist has worked with meticulous attention over the entire figure: the very evenness of that hypnotic attention is one of his characteristics which Paris connoisseurs could not understand (they expected the eye to be guided by subtle changes in the level of detail) but its modernity is a clue to his appeal today. His divergent choices of colouration have driven him to make quite subtle changes to the two portraits which make them, despite apparent similarity, independent works of art, as befits portraits of two such different sitters. Lady Anne's breathtaking freshness contrasts with the quintessentially Liotardesque Lady Hawke. Both deserve to be fully accepted into the œuvre of this unique genius.<sup>62</sup>

Neil Jeffares

<sup>61</sup> Pierre-Jean Mariette, *Abecedario*, ed. P. de Chennevières & Anatole de Montaiglon, *Archives de l'art français*, 1851-60, III, p. 206. A particular quirk in this pastel is the change in the background from a cool grey to copper: while perhaps exacerbated by restoration, this dramatic transition is effected also in Liotard's portrait of Wilhelmine von Bayreuth (R&L 142, c.1745) as well as in the much later, unfinished, pastel of Jacques Paul (R&L 533, 1779).

<sup>62</sup> Marcel Roethlisberger now includes them both in his article "Liotard mis à jour", *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte*, LXXI/2-3, 2014, p. 187.