36. Portrait of John Sudan, 1830
35. Portrait of Philip Hone, 1827
34. Portrait of Judge Henry Brockholst Livingston, c. 1820

37. Portrait of William Denning, 1831
38. Portrait of Zachary Taylor, 1850
39. Portrait of George Washington, 1832-34
Not in Exhibition
4. NIAGARA FALLS AND VERSAILLES:

providential projects that failed

Vanderlyn made two efforts to emancipate himself from financial worry. In each instance he tried to reach a different kind of public than had been his wont: the larger public which could afford engravings but not paintings; and the yet larger public which loved spectacles such as panoramas. If all went well, profits from these low price high volume enterprises would continue, providing thereby security like an annual income. However, such projects succeed only if the timing is right and if public taste is satisfied as it changes.

If Vanderlyn was the first American to paint Niagara Falls, we ought to be sure when he did it. Everyone mistakenly agrees that Vanderlyn traveled to the Falls in the autumn of 1802. The most impressive evidence for this date can be found in the special study Frank H. Severence made on Vanderlyn's trip: he based his date upon the Gosman manuscript which he considered an impeccable source. But if Vanderlyn left in the autumn of 1802 to begin his work on the Falls, he could not have discussed its completion during the early spring of that year: in his March 25, 1802 letter to Aaron Burr he wrote:

(I will) return to this city (New York) to finish my engagement and pass the heat of the Summer in the country, retired and wholly devoted to the completing of my Niagaras... 2

The case for mid-September of 1801 as Vanderlyn's true date of departure can be based on Aaron Burr's letter of September 18. After requesting advice and protection for the young artist, Burr said that "he is now on his way through your country to Niagara." 3 Possibly the idea of painting the Falls came from Theodosia Burr, for she had traveled to Niagara with her new husband during the preceding month. 4

Vanderlyn took almost two years to finish the paintings. By the end of July, 1803 they were ready to be taken to London in search of an engraver. 5 Completed in 1804, the two engravings (Figs. 40 and 46) yielded far smaller profits than expected. Thereafter the artist returned to the Falls twice to make new paintings of the subject.

It is difficult to know when these later paintings were made. They have to be fitted in, with Vanderlyn's correspondence as sole guide of how to do
so. This is not easy for the two dates he gives for revisiting the Falls (1827 and 1837), and the vague references of small, large, or raffle paintings of Niagara cannot be associated with certainty with this or that extant work. I would guess that the Senate House Niagra (Fig. 45) was painted in the early 1840's and was based on the oil sketch of 1827 (Fig. 42). The Albany oil (Fig. 41) must have been made after the engravings of 1804 for the fir tree in the foreground has not grown. The Kingston two-part study (Fig. 44) could be either an adaption from the engraving or the sketch which he said was made "on the spot in oil colours" in 1827.

Whatever the historical facts may be, Vanderlyn's Niagara Falls did not satisfy the clamor for sensational viewpoints or the stress on power which taste began to demand of the Falls after 1830. Yet he did make a solid statement of objective fact and, before Barbizon, sketched in oils from nature.

We should not overlook the way Vanderlyn interjected human and animal activity into the large Kingston canvas (Fig. 45). At the left a farmer leads his ox and cart. A small village is seen at the right. While a romantic bird perches on an appropriately dead tree, a dog forages below. An Indian family, at peace with the environment and the white settlers, observes the expansive scene. These additions show how Vanderlyn tried to respond to the emerging Hudson River aesthetic of "painting as poem."

Vanderlyn also approached the painting of Versailles with objective practicality. The early printed brochures for Versailles asserted that

The original sketches of which were taken on the spot by him in Autumn of 1815, supposed time of day, from 4:00 to 5:00 p.m.

This unusual awareness of the specificity of time was developed into systematic methodology fifty years later by the Impressionists.

The claim that Vanderlyn introduced panoramas to America is not true. The old records of the New York art world around 1800 are full of notices concerning this new form of spectacle. The circular view of Charleston, South Carolina, advertised on February 4, 1797 in the Weekly Museum, was 110 feet long and 20 feet high. The view of the Cities of London and Westminster was even larger (2,400 square feet). As this was announced in the American Minerva on August 21, 1795 Vanderlyn could have seen it before he left for Europe.

Vanderlyn first thought about making a panorama during his stay in Rome. By the time he returned to America in 1815 the panorama idea
was “well established in New York.” The artist’s talent for being behind the times was matched by his obtuseness to changing tastes. He was almost deaf to the excellent advice given in *The National Advocate* on April 21, 1818:

Although it was not to have been expected that Mr. Vanderlyn would have left the high department of historical painting, in which he is so eminent, to devote his time to the more humble, though more profitable, pursuit of painting cities and landscapes—yet, in a new country, taste for the arts must be graduated according to the scale of intellect and education, and where only the scientific connoisseur would admire his *Marius* and *Ariadne*, hundreds will flock to his panorama to visit Paris, Rome and Naples. This is to ‘catch the manners living as they rise,’ and with them catch the means to promote a taste for the fine arts. We suggest to Mr. Vanderlyn now, for fear we should forget it, that panorama views of our battles, such as Chippewa, Erie, New Orleans, Lake Champlain, etc., with the likeness of officers engaged on those occasions, would not only be highly national and popular, but exceedingly profitable.

He responded to this advice with a proposition to paint the battles of General Jackson during the War of 1812. Easily discouraged when the City of New Orleans did not accept the idea, Vanderlyn ceased painting panoramas and depended thereafter on European imports purchased at great expense from the successful Robert Burford of England.

1. Frank H. Severence, “John Vanderlyn’s visit to Niagara Falls in 1802,” *Buffalo History Society Publications*, XV (Buffalo, 1911), pp. 159-173.
5. Letter to Nicholas Vanderlyn July 1, and July 30, 1803.
6. Description of the Falls written by Vanderlyn in 1843; and a letter of April 20, 1843 to Levi E. Vanderlyn. The artist also gave 1826 as a date in a published handbill: “A general view of the Falls & Rapids of Niagara from a highly finished sketch painted on the spot by John Vanderlyn in 1826.”
8. See Donald A. Ringe, "Painting as Poem in The Hudson River Aesthetic," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 12 (1960) pp. 71-83. Ringe succinctly describes the general situation which confronted American artists: "Once the artists accepted the principle of suggestiveness as the foundation of their aesthetic theory and sought to challenge the expressiveness of poetry, they were confronted with a dilemma. Faced on the one hand with the necessity for accurate representation of the external world so that they might communicate the truths of nature, they believed on the other hand, that such imitation—or even representation—was in reality an inferior form of art. Since they could not break away from accurate, though perhaps idealized, representation, their only recourse was to try to instill in their works as much thematic meaning as their subjects would bear. Only by such means could they achieve the 'content' deemed essential in any serious work."


40. Niagara Falls (engraved by J. Merigot), 1804

41. View of Niagara Falls, either 1827 or 1837
43. Niagara Falls (engraved by F. D. Lewis), 1804

44. Double View Oil Study of Niagara Falls, c. 1827
45. Niagara Falls, c. 1842-43

42. Oil Study of Niagara Falls, c. 1827
46. Study of Allegorical Figure Poëma Lyricum, for Versailles Panorama, c. 1814-15
47. Study for Versailles Panorama: Basin, Left, No. 8, c. 1814-15
48. Study for Versailles Panorama: Basin, Right, No. 2, c. 1814-15
49. Perspective Grid Sketch for Versailles Panorama (by Jenner)
50. Oil Sketch for Versailles Panorama: View to West, c. 1814-18
5. FOUR HISTORY PAINTINGS

Vanderlyn’s history paintings can be placed in two groups: the Marius and Ariadne which were painted under William McClure’s enlightened patronage; and the Jane McCrea and Landing of Columbus which were painted in response to commissions, one private and the other public. The Marius and Ariadne were by far the more successful. Clearly Vanderlyn worked gracefully in the spirit of 18th century patronage. He found it easy to begin a letter with, “My dear Patron.”

The Marius is a painting which satisfied the standards of the early 19th century for a heroic subject monumentally treated. If we find it difficult to respond to this kind of painting, it may be because we are not used to reading the thoughts of a classical hero. Jules Prown has accurately described the demand the picture makes upon the spectator in his observation that the Marius

is neo-classical in subject and treatment, although atypical in that no action occurs. Marius is not doing anything; he just sits and broods. The picture cannot simply be read as a story. The viewer must, if he is to approach the essence of the painting, try to imagine what is going on in the mind of Marius. The empathetic participation required of each individual perceiver of the painting is a step beyond Neo-classicism in the direction of Romanticism.¹

Vanderlyn himself told us what was going on in the mind of Marius. On January 2, 1807 he wrote his brother, Nicholas

I have just begun a picture of C. Marius sitting on the ruins of Carthagena, in sombre melancholy, reflecting the mutability of Fortune...

With this picture he wanted to test his “full powers.” Later in the month (January 25) he wrote J. R. Murray, explaining that the picture would take a year to paint and that it was a means “to gain a reputation, which is all I am persuaded a real artist should aspire to.” By December 10th, when the work was completed, he expanded upon his description in a letter to D. B. Warden:

My picture of C. Marius in the ruins of Carthage: in size about 5 by 8 feet. I thought that subject a picturesque one on account of the ruins which might be properly introduced in the background, and the figure no less so, requiring the strongest, most masculine characteristics. I thought the man and position combined, was capable of showing in two great instances the instability of human grandeur—a city in ruins and a fallen general. I endeavoured to express in the countenance of Marius the bitterness of disappointed ambitions mixed with the meditation of revenge.
Why should Vanderlyn be attracted by the "instability of human grandeur?" Gosman claims that Washington Allston suggested the topic. Even if Gosman is correct it does no more for the question than broaden its base: why should two young American painters find this topic congenial?

The English of the 18th century were made aware of Marius by way of Thomas Otway's play, *The History and Fall of Caius Marius* (1680). John Hamilton Mortimer quoted this play when he exhibited his *Caius Marius on the Ruins of Carthage* in the 1774 exhibition of the Society of Artists.² Benjamin West depicted an earlier part of the story in his drawing, *The Slave and Caius Marius.*³

The Marius theme was kept alive in France by several minor artists. A *Marius à Carthage* was exhibited in the Salons of 1793, 1795, and 1798, painted respectively by Schell, A. C. Caraffe, and Jacques Taurel.⁴ Even Chateauaubriand in 1797 recommended the subject to painters.⁵

Possibly we will never know why Vanderlyn selected Marius for his first venture into monumental history painting. But circumstantial evidence hints of a possible relationship to the fallen American Vice-President, Aaron Burr.

The fortunes of the talented Burr began to crumble during the summer of 1804 after he killed Alexander Hamilton in a duel. In March of 1805 Burr gave his farewell to the Senate. When in 1806 he solicited the patronage of Matthew Lyon for a congressional seat from Kentucky, Plumer observed: "Burr to be raised to office by the patronage of Matthew Lyon! How are the mighty fallen!"⁶

It would not be surprising if Vanderlyn associated the fallen Burr with the ancient hero because educated Americans of the early Republic were steeped in classical lore; cities were given classical names, enemies were called "Catiline," heroes were hailed as "Leonidas." Burr himself thought in these terms. On the eve of his trial for treason he wrote to his daughter:

April 26, 1807

You have read to very little purpose if you have not remarked that such things happen in all democratic governments. Was there in Greece or Rome a man of virtue and independence, and supposed to possess great talents, who was not the object of vindictive and unrelenting persecution? Now, madame, I pray you to amuse yourself by collecting and collating all the instances to be found in ancient history, which you may connect together, if you please, in an essay, with reflections, comments, and applications. This I may hope to receive about the 22nd of May. I promise myself great pleasure in the perusal, and I promise you great satisfaction and consolation in the composition.⁷

Phrases like "amuse yourself" and "promise myself great pleasure"
might give the impression that Burr was simply continuing his role as Theodosia’s mentor. But the date he specified for receiving her answer proves that his request was a cry for help: the trial began on May 22nd.8

There is no record that Theodosia obliged this parental request. Ironically, however, an emblematic answer was slowly forming on Vanderlyn’s canvas in Rome.

With Ariadne Vanderlyn wanted to depict, as he said, “female beauty.” He succeeded so well that questions of image history, financial motivation, and influences dim before the figure’s glowing radiance.

The Murder of Jane McCrea is one of the few Vanderlyn works depicting a well-known, authenticated page of history. A Miss McCrea of New Jersey was travelling north towards Fort Edward, New York, in order to rendezvous with her sweetheart, David Jones, an officer in Burgoyne’s army. She made the final leg of her journey on July 27, 1777 under the protection of Indian escorts. On the way they encountered a second group of Indians who shot Jane and took her scalp to the English camp for reward. The massacre quickly became grist for the propaganda mills: General Gates used it effectively to dissuade Tory sympathizers; Edmund Burke used it in parliament to “rail against the policies of the crown…”9

Joel Barlow’s poem, the Columbiad, which Vanderlyn was commissioned to illustrate, served as the intermediary between the actual event and the final painting. The poem suggested the additional motif of the lover vainly rushing up to save his beloved. When reading the poem it becomes clear how Vanderlyn turned word images into visual projections. Thus

She starts with eyes upturned and fleeting breath,
In their raised axes views her instant death,
Spreads her white hands to heaven in frantic prayer,
Then runs to grasp their knees and crouches there.
Her hair, half lost along the shrubs she pass’d
Rolls in loose tangles round her lovely waist;
Her kerchief torn betrays the globes of snow
That heave responsive to her weight of woe.
Does all this eloquence suspend the knife?
Does no superior bribe contest her life?
There does: the scalps by British gold are paid;
A long-hair’d scalp adorns that heavenly head;
And comes the sacred spoil from friend or foe,
No marks distinguish and no man can know.
With calculating pause and demon grin,
They seize her hands and thro her face divine
Drive the descending ax…10
Vanderlyn had no difficulty depicting Indians when he was in France because his earlier experience with the Sons of Tammany gave him an opportunity to observe Indian costume down to the last detail of leather stocking (see Fig. 65).

Indian motifs appeared in Vanderlyn’s picture world as adjuncts to the story, not as central features with programmatic bias. His attitude toward the Indian was pragmatically social rather than moral. In the Penmanship Award the Indian is admired for his costumes, beliefs, and practices; in Jane McCrea he becomes a ferocious mercenary for the English cause; in the large Niagara he and his family live with the white men in peace with the Great Spirit; and finally, in the Landing of Columbus (Fig. 66), he is an awestruck child of the dark forest.

Most people do not notice the symbolism of light in the Landing of Columbus and the way this symbolism ties in with the compositional thrust. The illuminating glow of civilization is seen to the left behind the boats which have brought it to these faraway shores. Naked natives peer from the shadows of their forest culture. In the connecting group of figures a variety of gestures and poses leads up to the climactic figure of Columbus. The figural gestalt he makes with flag and sword commands with authority the vast space of the Rotunda, where the picture is hung.

These compositional features had not yet emerged when Vanderlyn made the large oil sketch (Fig. 67). But after he had settled on the final composition, each figure was visually examined with an exhaustiveness that more than honored his old academic training under Vincent. As the data of the drawing studies do not and should not obtrude in the final painting, the act of making them must have been partly ritualistic.

The greed motif to the left is a case in point. Two sailors from the “continent of enlightenment” are inattentive to the solemn moment at hand; they push each other aside as they grab for treasures on the beach (Fig. 72). If Vanderlyn was trying to tell us that civilization brings greed in tow he was right; but why did he make multiple studies of a simple image that is hardly discernable in the final painting?

As far as I know only the engraver of the 1893 U. S. Postage Stamp noticed the greed motif (Fig. 66c). Disliking the motif’s unseemly truth, he eliminated it from the design. Whereas Vanderlyn candidly recorded this factor of civilization, and the first postage stamp adaptation of 1869 (Fig. 66b) and the banknote of 1875 (Fig. 95) respected his truth, America
of the 1890’s—of Arthur B. Davies’ Unicorns, the Robber Barons, and The Spanish-American War—preferred a glossing over. So did the 1,464,588,750 people who licked this 1893 stamp issue down.


8. See J. J. Coombs, *The Trial of Aaron Burr*, Washington, 1864. Burr was arrested February 19, 1807 in Alabama. He arrived in Richmond March 26th and on April 1 the Chief Justice delivered his opinion: “I am required on the part of the attorney for the U. S. to commit the accused on two charges: 1st—For setting on foot and providing the means for an expedition against the territory of a nation at peace with the United States; 2nd—For committing high treason against the U. S.” The verdict delivered by jury September 1, 1807, found Burr “not proved guilty.”


53. Marius Amid the Ruins of Carthage (replica, reduced), 1832
54. Marius Amid the Ruins of Carthage (unfinished and reduced replica), 1834-38
55. Drawing for Ariadne: Study for Head and Bust, c. 1809

Not in Exhibition

56. Drawing for Ariadne: Study of Torso and Legs, c. 1809
58. Watercolor Study for Ariadne, 1809-10
59. Ariadne (engraving after Vanderlyn by Asher Brown Durand), 1835

60. Ariadne (unfinished copy by Vanderlyn, completed by Asher Brown Durand), 1831–34
61. Ariadne, 1825-26

62. Ariadne: Half Length, 1837

Not in Exhibition
63. Death of Jane McCrea, 1804
64. The Murder of Jane McCrea (copy by unidentified artist), 1839
THE GRAND SACHEM
Sachems—Warriors—Hunters—and Members
OF THE THIRTEEN TRIBES OF THE
Hon'ble and Valiant Sons of Tammany.

The Columbian Order
OF
The City of New York.

This Specimen of Penmanship is presented by
that much devoted humble Servant,
John Vanderlyn.

65. Penmanship Specimen, c. 1795

65a. Penmanship (detail)
66. The Landing of Columbus on San Salvador, October 12, 1492, Date: 1839-46

67. Preliminary Oil Study for Landing of Columbus, early 1840's
68. Vegetation Study for Landing of Columbus, early 1840's
70. Costume Study for Pinzon in Landing of Columbus (by Vanderlyn's assistant), early 1840's

69. Costume Studies for Landing of Columbus (by Vanderlyn's assistant), early 1840's
Study of Wheel-Lock Gun for Landing of Columbus, early 1840’s

Drawing of Figures at Left for Landing of Columbus, early 1840’s
74. Study of Sleeve for Landing of Columbus, early 1840’s

Drawing for Landing of Columbus:
Soldier Looking Towards Woods, early 1840’s
75. Drawings for the Landing of Columbus:
Study for the Figure of Columbus -- Nude Study, early 1840's
76. Drawings for the Landing of Columbus:
Study for the Figure of Columbus — Standing Figure, early 1840's
77. Drawings for the Landing of Columbus:
   Study for the Figure of Columbus -- Standing Figure, early 1840’s
78. Drawings for the Landing of Columbus:
Study for the Figure of Columbus—Costume Detail, early 1840's
80. Drawings for the Landing of Columbus:
Study for the Figure of Columbus — Clothed Torso, early 1840's
81. Oil Study of Columbus Figure, 1840's
79. Drawings for the Landing of Columbus:
   Study for the Figure of Columbus — Study for Face, early 1840's
82. Drawings for the Landing of Columbus:
Study for the Figure of Columbus – Study of Sleeves, early 1840's
6. PROBLEM PICTURES

There are eight portraits, one double portrait, one copy, and three landscapes in this group of problem pictures. Questions of subject, authorship or style justify keeping them together, set apart from the preceding five clusters of pictures. Admittedly there are several paintings in the earlier groups which are problematic in one way or another; but it was more meaningful to keep them in the other settings.

This exhibition will give the viewer the unique opportunity to see the problem pictures within whatever atmosphere of certainty the other pictures can generate. In order to keep the spectator's first contact with the works as immediate as possible, my opinions and auxilliary visual material have been kept in the "Catalogue of Works."

Suffice it to say that problems of this kind will stand a better chance of resolution if brought out into the open. The audience today should know what is not known and generally become more involved in decision-making issues. The first item, the Portrait of Samuel Bard (Fig. 83), will demonstrate how some progress was made the week prior to the time this catalogue went to press.
83. Portrait of Samuel Bard (after Vanderlyn by Thomas McClelland), 1821
85. Portrait of Robert Fulton (?) by Rembrandt Peale (?), c. 1803-04
86. Portrait of Mrs. Ann Hivlyn
90. A Lady and her Son, 1800 (August)
87. Portrait of B. Thompson
88. Portrait of Joseph Reade
89. Portrait of an Unknown Man
91. Drawing of a Classical Landscape, 1805
92. View in Rome, c. 1805
93. Landscape of Kingston, c. 1818-20
94. Bacchante and Satyr (after Annibale Carracci), c. 1805-07
CATALOGUE
OF WORKS
CATALOGUE OF WORKS

The information given in this catalogue is a composite of available sources. When rare printed sources like old newspapers and small local exhibitions were unavailable, I used references as they were given. This will explain certain variations in bibliographical form. When I was uncertain of the date of a work and estimates of others were unconvincing, I used the expression, “date unknown.” Measurements are in inches, with height preceding width. The following works are unpublished: Nos. 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12, 15, 20, 29, 32, 41, 44, 46, 47, 48, 50, 58, 64, 65, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 78, 81, 83, 87, 88, 89, 92, 93, 94.

1 PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST

Oil on canvas
25-1/4 x 20-7/8
Signed at lower right: “Vander(lyn) by him(s)el(f)/Pinxit.”
1800
Lent by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Bequest of Ann S. Stephens, in the name of her mother, Mrs. Ann S. Stephens

Provenance: Aaron Burr, New York (until 1836); to Mrs. Joshua Webb, New York (1836-c.1860); Mrs. Ann S. Stephens, New York (1860-94); to her daughter, Miss Ann S. Stephens, New York (1894-18) to the present owners in 1918. (This information is derived in part from Stillwell, 1928, pp. 85-87.)


Comment: This self portrait has been given dates ranging from 1800 to 1816. I agree with the date given by Averill 1949, 23, even while admitting that her evidence is not conclusive. She merely points to the Paris Salon catalogue of 1800 where Vanderlyn exhibited “Plusiers portraits, sous le meme numero, parmi lesquels se trouve celui de l’auteur.” To my knowledge Vanderlyn made only two references to his self portrait. One is a letter written from Paris on November 12, 1800 to his brother Peter, which was published in The Kingston Freeman (December 28, 1893): “I have a couple of my portraits in oil in the exhibition in Paris which is now open, one of which is the portrait of myself and is thought a very strong likeness. If an opportunity shall offer, I shall send it home...” The other is a letter written from New York on June 19, 1802, to his brother Nicholas, wherein Vanderlyn writes: “I requested you to send down my Portrait by the first sloop and I daily expect it.” The only other contender is a now lost painting which appeared on the art market in 1936 and which has an inscription on the back “Portrait of an artist painted by himself./J.V./October 27, 1799.” However, it does not resemble the known self portrait and the style of the work is implausible for Vanderlyn.

2 DRAWING OF HARBOR SCENE

Pen and wash, bistre and touche
6-3/4 x 8-1/2
Inscription below: “Drawn by John Vander Lyn when he was 14 years.”
1789
Lent by Mildred Burchard, Elmira, New York

Provenance: This drawing came to the present owner directly through the family line (see family tree).

Comment: There are several early copy drawings like this extant. Presumably they were based upon engravings and would indicate Vanderlyn’s contact with the art world prior to his first sojourn to New York City.
3 DRAWING BOOK (Albany)

Pen and ink on paper
14-3/8 x 10
Signed and dated inside cover
1791 and 1792
Lent by the Albany Institute of History and Art

Provenance: Purchased from The Old Print Shop

Comment: Four drawings are included in the book of seven pages: 1) Admiration; 2) Attention (dated 1791); 3) Hatred or Jealousy; and 4) Horror. On the reverse of drawing No. 3 is a formula for making a painter's varnish. These physiognomic studies were based upon one of the several engraved editions of Charles Le Brun's original drawings. The plate of Admiration illustrated here was listed as "L'étonnement" in Jean Guiffrey's and Pierre Marcel's Inventaire general des Dessins du Musee du Louvre, VIII, p. 69, item 6464. It was listed as "L'admiration avec étonnement" more recently: cf. "Exposition Charles Le Brun," Chateau de Versailles, July-October, 1963, p. 303, item 130.

4 PORTRAIT OF NICHOLAS VANDERLYN

Oil on canvas
30 x 25-1/2
1794
Lent by the Senate House Museum, Kingston, New York

Provenance: Received by the State of New York from the estate of Catherine Vanderlyn.

References: Stillwell, 1928, p. 90; Averill, 1949, cat. No. 90 (dated there 1794-96).


Comment: This work gives evidence of some repainting.

5 JUDGE EGBERT BENSON: after Stuart

Oil on canvas
29-3/4 x 23-7/8
Signed on back: "John Vanderlyn, Pinxt."
1794-95
Lent by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Bequest of Alphonso T. Clearwater

Provenance: John Sudam, Kingston; his son, H. Sudam (cf. letter of A. Schoonmaker to Rev. R. Hoos, July 2, 1890); Judge A. T. Clearwater, Kingston; to present owners in 1933.


Comment: Egbert Benson (1746-1833) played an important role in the founding of this country and in the history of New York State. He was a revolutionary leader in Dutchess County, a delegate to the Congress of the Confederation (1781-84), congressman for two terms, the first attorney general of the state of New York, trustee of Columbia College (1804-15), president of the New-York Historical Society (1805-15), and author of several books. The Stuart prototype (Fig. 96) for this copy is owned by the descendants of William J. Iselin and is not to be confused with the later Stuart portrait of Benson in the New-York Historical Society.

96. Portrait of Judge Egbert Benson
(by Gilbert Stuart) Not in Exhibition

124
6 PORTRAIT OF HENRY VANDERLYN AS A YOUNG BOY

Oil on canvas
25-1/2 x 18-3/4
1794
Lent by Rodman C. Rockefeller, New York


Comments: Mr. William Voelkle, Assistant Curator of Manuscripts at the Pierpont Morgan Library and a former student of mine, drew my attention to the existence of this hitherto unknown work a few years ago. The compelling earnestness of this painting persuaded me then that a re-examination of Vanderlyn's achievement was very much in order. Henry Vanderlyn kept a fascinating diary over the years in which he transcribed letters received from his uncle and countless details concerning the development of Oxford. One volume is in the library at Cornell University; the other five have recently been given to the New-York Historical Society by Mr. Rockefeller.

Comment: The subject later became a prominent lawyer in Kingston. The paper on the table includes the work "oration."

8 PORTRAIT OF MARIA MASTEN VANDERLYN

Oil on canvas
23-3/4 x 23-1/2
1796
Lent by Mrs. Helen Burchard Hoose, Binghamton, New York

Provenance: This painting came to the present owner directly through the family line (see the family tree).

9 DRAWING OF STANDING MALE NUDE

Pencil
27-5/8 x 12-1/6

Verso: 3/4 view of front right side of same figure with drapery lightly drawn suspended from left arm.

C. 1797-99
Lent by the Detroit Institute of Arts, Gift of Robert H. Tannahill

Provenance: Estate of artist; Catherine Vanderlyn; Marius Schoonmaker; Maynard Walker Gallery, New York; purchased by Robert T. Tannahill and given to present owners in 1967.

10 STUDY FOR THE BAPTISM OF CHRIST (After Poussin)

Charcoal on blue paper
8-1/2 x 11
Date unknown
Lent by Kennedy Galleries, New York

Provenance: Catherine Vanderlyn; to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; Mr. Fred Johnston; present owners.


Comments: This study is derived from the second series of Poussin's "The Seven Sacraments. See Anthony Blunt, The Paintings of Nicholas Poussin, Phaidon; London, 1966, item 112.
SENATE HOUSE SKETCHBOOK
Page illustrated shows a drawing of Charity.

Various drawing media
Leather bound book, 9-3/4 x 14 x 2-1/2
Inscription at beginning: “Scraps or extracts collected together.”
Prior to 1815
Lent by the Senate House Museum, Kingston

Comments: The sketchbook contains 45 drawings, one engraving, and pages of handwritten notes and newspaper clippings. As most of the sketches are copies of antique sculpture and renaissance paintings I suspect that it was primarily used by Vanderlyn during his stay in Rome. The drawing illustrated is related to the drawing of Abundance (Fig. 13).

ALLEGORICAL FIGURE: ABUNDANCE
Charcoal on grey green paper
11 x 8-3/8
Signed lower right: “V. D. Lyn”
Date unknown
Lent by Kennedy Galleries, New York

Provenance: Catherine Vanderlyn; to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; Mr. Fred Johnston; present owners.

Comments: See the related figure of Charity (Fig. 12)

ANTIOPE: Copy after Correggio

Oil on canvas
27 x 23
1843-44
Gibbes Memorial Art Gallery, Charleston
South Carolina

Provenance: John V. Cogdall, Charleston; Mrs. Leger Mitchell, Charleston; Carolina Art Association, Gibbes Memorial Art Gallery.

References: Letters from John Cogdall to Vanderlyn in Paris (Dec. 20, 1843 and April, 1844); Averill, 1949, Cat. No. 109.

THE CALUMNY OF APELLES: After Raphael

Oil on canvas, with added strip, 1-1/2 in. of oil on paper at right.
22-1/2 x 28-1/2
Inscribed (on a strip of paper attached at the bottom of the canvas):
“After a drawing in bistre by Raphael composed from the description given by Lucien of a picture painted by Apelles representing Calumny, on the occasion of a false accusation brought against the painter, Apelles.”
Canvas stamp: PREPARED/BY/EDW. DECHAUX/
NEW YORK.
After 1835
Lent by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Gift of the Family of General George H. Sharpe

Provenance: In artist’s possession in 1852 (Vanderlyn letter to Captain Van Gaasbeek, July 23, 1852): “I depend principally upon this and proceeds of the little picture Calumny to maintain me here...”; Catherine Vanderlyn (1852-92) (?); George Sharpe (1892-1924); to present owner as gift of the Family of General George H. Sharpe.

Comments: As the inscription states, the source for this exact copy was a bister drawing. This source drawing is found in the Louvre (cf. Gabriel Rouchés, Musée National du Louvre, Collection de Reproductions de Dessins, Paris, 1938, II, No. 14); Raphael in turn freely adapted Botticelli's famous painting in the Uffizi. Gardner in 1965 rejected his earlier view of 1956 (see Reference above) that the source was a line engraving by Normand published by C. P. Landon in 1808. The literary source for the subject was Lucian. (cf. tr. by A.M. Harmon, Loeb Classical Library, 1913, vol. 1, pp. 365f). The date I have given is based upon the fact that Edward Dechaux did not become independent from his partner in New York until 1835 (cf. Longworth's City Directory). It seems plausible that Vanderlyn made the copy (with the Dechaux canvas taken with him from New York), when he was involved with copying in Paris, 1839-45, and perhaps in 1845-46 when he felt "abused and slandered owing to malice and envy" (letter in the Hoes Collection dated 1845 or 46). Summarizing Lucian, it is possible that the young man praying to the gods to witness his innocence is Apelles. The others, reading from right to left are: Suspicion, Man with large ears, Ignorance, Envy, Slander, Treachery, Deceit, Repentance, and Truth.

17 PORTRAIT DRAWING OF ROBERT FULTON

Graphite with highlights of Chinese white
Oval, 8-1/2 x 6-1/2
Inscription right lower edge: "Vanderlyn." Under drawing: "Fulton."
1798
Lent by Randall J. Le Boeuf, Jr.

Provenance: The Barlow Family; sold by Samuel Latham Mitchell Barlow to Dr. Maury A. Bromsen; sold by him to present owner in 1960.


18 PORTRAIT DRAWING OF GOVERNOR ELBRIDGE GERRY, SR.

Black chalk
8 x 6-1/2
On back of the frame: "Taken at Paris the beginning of July 1798 by Mr. Vanderlyn, a young gentleman of N. Y."
1798
Lent by the Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University; Louise E. Bettens Fund

Provenance: Subject's daughter, Emily L. Gerry; inherited by Elbridge Gerry Greene, Boston; Vose Galleries, Boston; purchased from them in 1943 by the Fogg Art Museum.

References: Averill, 1949, Cat. No. 55.

Comment: Gerry (1744-1814) was a member of the Continental Congress (1776-80 and 1783-85); delegate to the Constitutional Convention (1787); member of Congress from Massachusetts (1789-93); Commissioner to France for the X. Y. Z. Mission (1797-98); Governor of Massachusetts (1810-12); and Vice President (1813-14). In a letter of July 13, 1798 which Vanderlyn wrote to his brother, Peter, he mentioned using black chalk for "a few little portraits" and went on to say: "I have made Mr. Gerry a present of his likeness (small) which he takes home with him. Already there is one of my doing in Boston (in or on the way, at least) as you see I ran the chance of being known before I am seen." The drawing was engraved by John R. Smith on 1811 and by J. B. Longacre (published as a frontispiece in James T. Austin, The Life of Elbridge Gerry, Boston, 1828). Four oil copies exist, one being made by Nathaniel Jocelyn.

19 SARAH RUSSELL CHURCH

Crayon on paper
8-7/16 x 6-3/8
Signed, L. L.: "Vanderlyn 1799."
1799
Lent by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Bequest of Ella Church Strobell

Provenance: The Church family; Bequest of Ella Church Strobell, 1917.

20 MRS. EDWARD CHURCH AND CHILD

Crayon on paper
8-3/8 x 6-3/8
Signed on chair at right: "J. Vanderlyn. Fect."
1799
Lent by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Bequest of Ella Church Strobell

Provenance: The Church family; Ella Strobell, 1917.

References: Averill, 1949, Cat. No. 41; Hatch, 1959, pp. 505f. Cf. Mrs. Marinus Willett and Her Son, Marius, Jr. (Fig. 21).

21 MRS. MARINUS WILLET AND HER SON, MARINUS, JR.

Oil on canvas
36-7/8 x 28-1/8
1802
Lent by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Bequest of George Willett Van Nest

Provenance: Descendants of Mrs. Willett; Bequest of George Willett Van Nest, 1917.


Comment: Mrs. Willett, born Margaret Bancker (d. 1867/8), married Col. Willett, who was sheriff of the city and county of New York, around 1799. Marinus Willett, Jr. the first of their five children, was born in 1801. His size in the painting provides evidence for dating the work about 1802. Note the similarity of arrangement to the drawing of Mrs. Edward Church and Child (Fig. 20).

22 PORTRAIT OF AARON BURR

Oil on canvas
28-9/16 x 22
1802-03
Lent by Yale University Art Gallery, Bequest of Oliver Burr Jennings, B. A. 1917, in memory of Miss Annie Burr Jennings

Provenance: Aaron Burr; taken over by Anthony Bowrowson, the family cook and coachman after Burr's trial; went to Bowrowson's daughter, Theodosia Shelb- burg in New Jersey; obtained by Judge Ogden Edwards of New York City (a relative of Aaron Burr on his mother's side); seen in the Edwards' home in Stratford, Connecticut by Dr. Stillwell in 1883; to Miss Laura Jay Edwards, granddaughter of Judge Edwards; purchased from her in 1919 by Mr. Walter Jennings of New York City: to Mrs. Walter Jennings: to Oliver Burr Jennings: to present owner.


23 PORTRAIT OF THEODOSIA BURR

Oil on canvas
21-1/2 x 16-1/2
1802-03
Lent by Yale University Art Gallery, Gift of Oliver Burr Jennings, B. A. 1917, in memory of Annie Burr Jennings

Provenance: Aaron Burr to Miss Theodosia Prevost (d. 1865), daughter of John Bartow Prevost (Burr's stepson); then it went in an unclear fashion to Rodgers, the owner of a pawnshop; purchased by Aaron Columbus Burr for $50; to his widow, Amelia Middleton Burr; to her niece, Mrs. Robert H. Horsey (born Florence Middleton) in New Jersey (seen there in 1882 by Dr. John E. Stillwell); then to the MacBeth Gallery, New York, on consignment; to Miss Annie Burr Jennings; to Mr. Oliver Burr Jennings, New York City; to present owner.
References: Stillwell, 1928, pp. 51-55; Averill, 1949, Cat. No. 36 (1802-03); Art News, XXXV (November, 1936), cover.

Comments: For information concerning the Burr Portraits we are indebted to and burdened by the basic study of Dr. Stillwell. The data he obtained from people living in the 1880's is valuable, indeed, it is the sole source of information for some of the Burr portraits; but his conclusions are sometimes insupportable. For example, he claims that the original painting of Theodosia, which he never found, was almost a half length, and that the Yale work and another like it were cut-off replicas. Apparently his argument is based upon engravings made from the lost original and published as early as 1837 (see the frontispiece in vol. II of Matthew L. Davis' Memoirs of Aaron Burr). However, Parker's engraving in that publication is identical in format to the Yale painting. Thus, as his argument falters, the possibility emerges that the Yale painting is the original. Averill's suggestion that the Yale painting was a companion piece to the New-York Historical Society portrait of Aaron Burr bolsters this possibility as the two paintings were the same size and, if hung side by side, "would show father and daughter gazing directly into each other's eyes." (Averill, 1949, p. 42).

24 PORTRAIT OF ROGER STRONG

Oil on canvas
28-3/4 x 22
1802-03
Lent by The New-York State Historical Society

Provenance: Presented by Miss Frances E. Mankin, granddaughter of sitter, to present owners in 1885.


Comments: Roger Strong was a lawyer and Alderman of New York City. Between 1802 and 1814 he served as Vanderlyn's financial and business advisor.

25 PORTRAIT OF SAMPSON VRYLING STODDARD WILDER

Oil on canvas
35-3/4 x 28-1/2
Subject's name on envelope
1805
Lent by Mr. Wilder H. Haines, Cambridge, Mass.

Provenance: Subject, to his daughter, to her son, to present owner.

Exhibitions: Paris Salon, 1805; Brooklyn, 1917; on loan to the Cleveland Museum of Art, 1920's; "Exhibition of the Work of John Vanderlyn," Senate House Museum, May 6-20, 1938 (11); currently on loan to the Fogg Art Museum.

References: Averill, 1949, Cat. No. 88; Pageant of America Series, The American Spirit in Art, XII, Yale University Press, 1927, p. 29; Louis Réau, Histoire de l'Expansion de l'Art Français, Paris, 1931, p. 37; and, on p. 244: "Son portrait de Sampson Wilder au musée de Cleveland montre mieux encore que ses grandes toiles historiques ou mythologiques à quel point il s'était imprégné de la manière de David."

Comment: Wilder (b. 1780) was a merchant-banker in Boston and Paris. The portrait is said to have painted in his country house in 1805. In 1824 Wilder entertained Lafayette at his country house in Bolton, Mass.

26 PORTRAIT OF WASHINGTON IRVING

Pencil on board
9-9/16 x 7-3/8
1805
Lent by the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston


Comment: In Pierre M. Irving's, The Life and Letters of Washington Irving, New York, 1863, I, pp. 147-151, we have a record of the author's contact with the artist in Paris. On June 6th, 1805, they dined together and on June 8th attended the theater of Port St. Martin. In a letter to his brother Peter Irving, July 15, 1805, the writer explains Vanderlyn's credit difficulties brought about by the death of Wm. H. Seton, and requests his brother to find out the disposition and intention of the Academy toward Vanderlyn. In his memorandum book Irving records an entry of payment on August 12th to "Vanderlyn for Portrait." Peter Irving's study included a frontispiece engraving made by H. R. Hull in 1808 after the Karolik drawing.

27 PORTRAIT STUDY OF AARON BURR

Oil on canvas
9-1/2 x 7-1/2
1809
Lent by Dr. and Mrs. Irving F. Burton, Huntington Woods, Michigan
**Provenance**: W. K. Bixby to Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri in 1910; sold through the Kennedy Gallery in 1962 to present owners.

**Exhibitions**: “Exhibition of Early American Portraits,” City Art Museum, St. Louis, November 1930 (39).

**References**: Averill, 1949, Cat. No. 34.

**Comments**: This work is probably a study for the finished portrait of about the same size (10 x 8) in the New-York Historical Society (1941 Catalogue, No. 102).

---

**PORTRAIT OF ZACHARIAH SCHOONMAKER**

Oil on canvas
26-1/2 x 22-1/2
1816
Lent by the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D. C.

**Provenance**: Marius Schoonmaker (1811-94), son of the sitter; Ella Schoonmaker Darrow, St. Louis, his daughter; Thomas B. Clarke, New York, 1923; to present owners, 1942.


**Comment**: According to a newspaper article on Vanderlyn appearing in the *Daily Freeman*, Oct. 11, 1886, Marius Schoonmaker recalled 1817 as the date when his father's portrait was painted. Zachariah Schoonmaker was born July 8, 1785 and died August 26, 1818. Graduate of Union College and corporal in the 3rd Ulster Regiment, he began law practice in Ulster County in 1807.

---

**PORTRAIT OF JAMES MONROE (replica)**

Oil on canvas
27-1/4 x 23-1/2
c. 1816
Lent by Colonial Williamsburg

**Provenance**: President James Madison; Mrs. James (Dolly) Madison; Judge Edward B. Coles; his son, Edward Coles (1837-1906); his daughter, Mary R. Coles; her nephews, George, Edward, James and Oliver Robbins.

**Comments**: This portrait was auctioned as a Vanderlyn with the other effects of Mrs. Madison in Washington, D. C. on March 1, 1851 (cf. notice in the *Daily Intelligencer*, March 1, 1851). Judge Coles, the purchaser, was the former secretary to President Madison and at one time the Governor of Illinois. According to Vanderlyn's letters, his original portrait of Monroe was painted in 1803 when he had travelled with him to England. Several replicas exist and are not to be confused with the later state portrait Vanderlyn painted for City Hall in New York.

---

**PORTRAIT OF PRESIDENT MADISON**

(Not in exhibition)

Oil on canvas
26 x 22
1816
The White House Collection, Washington, D. C.

**Provenance**: James Monroe to his youngest daughter, Mrs. Maria Hester Monroe Gouverneur; to her husband, Samuel Lawrence Gouverneur, Sr.; to his son, Samuel L. Gouverneur, Jr.; to his widow, Mrs. Marian Campbell Gouverneur; to her daughter, Mrs. Rose Gouverneur Hoes; to her son Laurence Gouverneur Hoes, Washington, D. C.; to present owners.


**Comment**: As Monroe owned this portrait of Madison, and Madison owned the Williamsburg portrait of Monroe (see Fig. 29), the question of what is replica and what is original becomes more interesting.

---

**PORTRAIT DRAWING OF PRESIDENT MADISON**

Charcoal on colored paper
10-3/4 x 8 (face size through mat)
Signed on lower right: "John Vanderlyn"
1816
Lent by Denver Art Museum Collection; Gift of Mrs. Tullah Hanley

Provenance: The Hanley Collection of Bradford, Pennsylvania to present owner.


32 PORTRAIT DRAWING OF MARTIN VAN BUREN

Pencil and watercolor on cardboard
8-6/16 x 6-15/16
Signed LR: "JVL"—inscribed LL: "M. Van Buren"
Date unknown
Lent by Yale University Art Gallery, The John Hill Morgan Collection

Provenance: W. L. Burdick, N.Y., to John Hill Morgan, N. Y.; to present owner.

Comment: Van Buren (1782-1862) led an active life in the politics of New York State where he was acquainted with Vanderlyn's friends such as Aaron Burr and Rufus King. He resigned the governorship to become Jackson's Secretary of State, became Jackson's Vice-President in 1832, and then the eighth President (1837-41). E. Everston's letter from New York to Vanderlyn in Washington on January 22, 1834, suggesting he portray Van Buren, is inconclusive for dating the portrait since the person represented does not seem to be in his fifties.

33 DRAWING:
STANDING FIGURES AND STUDY OF HEAD

Charcoal and black ink on blue paper
11 x 8-1/8
1824
Lent by the Munson-Williams-Proctor Institute

Provenance: Catherine Vanderlyn; to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; Mr. Fred Johnston; Kennedy Galleries; present owners.


34 PORTRAIT OF JUDGE HENRY BROCKHOLST LIVINGSTON

Oil on canvas
26-1/4 x 21-3/8
C. 1820
Lent by The New-York State Historical Society


Portait of Philip Hone

Oil on canvas
36 x 30
1827
Lent by the Art Commission, City of New York

References: Tuckerman, 1867, p. 131; Catalogue of Works of Art Owned by the City of New York, New York, 1909, p. 17; Averill, 1949, Cat. No. 62.

Comment: Vanderlyn was paid $750 for this portrait (together with the full-length portrait of Governor Joseph C. Yates), by the City of New York, as is recorded July 2 and 30, 1827, Minutes of the Common Council, XVI, p. 366, 427 (cf. Averill, 1949, p. 141). Philip Hone (1780-1851) was a successful businessman who retired at the age of 41 with a fortune of a half million. He traveled, was well-known in the cultural circles of New York, and was elected mayor for one year (1826). Between 1828 and his death he kept a secret diary. This manuscript, containing about two million words, is preserved by the New-York Historical Society. The part of it which has been published contains one reference to Vanderlyn—a favorable comment on The Landing of Columbus—made on Oct. 20, 1846 (cf. Allan Nevins, ed., The Diary of Philip Hone, New York, 1936, pp. 775f).

Portait of William Denning

Oil on canvas
38 x 28
1831
Lent by the New York Chamber of Commerce

Provenance: Presented by the subject’s great-granddaughter, Mrs. M. King Van Rensselaer, to present owners in September, 1899.


Comments: This painting is hung in the middle row of the Great Hall of the Chamber of Commerce. Peter Grey states that Denning “had the repute of being a true gentleman of this city,” and was known for his literary tastes.

Portait of John Sudam

Oil on canvas
30 x 21
1830
Lent by the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.

Provenance: Mary H. S. Ingraham, Kingston, granddaughter of the subject; Thomas B. Clarke, New York, 1913; to present owners, 1947.


Comment: John Sudam (1782-1835) was a lawyer and native of Kingston. In 1823 he was elected to the State Senate. Vanderlyn wrote Sudam Dec. 30, 1829 and told him the portrait would be ready in a few days. It was at this time that Sudam was helping the artist regain the Marius from mortgage. In 1835 Vanderlyn thought of having the portrait lithographed. The copy (or replica) at the Senate House Museum is a leathery work of inferior quality.

Portait of Zachary Taylor

Oil on canvas
96 x 62
1850
Signed and dated: “J. Vanderlyn Pinxt 1850.”
Lent by the Art Commission, City of New York


References: Catalogue of Works of Art Owned by the City of New York, New York, 1909, p. 31; Averill, 1949, Cat. No. 82.

Comment: Vanderlyn wanted to paint a portrait of General Taylor as early as October of 1848. Apparently his first attempt to negotiate the commission failed (letter of March 22, 1849 to C.F. Leaster). Even after he had received the assignment from The Corporation of the City and was, as he put it, “now engaged” in the work, he complained to Alderman Chapman (Chairman of the Finance Committee) about his fee of $500, pointing out that it was only half that Morse and Inman
had received for similar assignments. At the same time he asked for an advance, justifying his request by explaining to the Alderman how the national government had functioned during the painting of his *Columbus*. We can see that even at the end of his career Vanderlyn had learned very little about the value of fashioning a thoughtful contract before receipt of commission. It is unclear why the city paid the artist $100 on June 4, 1851 "to cover expenses on going to Washington to paint the portrait of General Taylor, late president of the United States" if the picture had been completed the year before (this payment is recorded in I. N. Phelps Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island*, New York, 1926, vol. V, p. 1833). Of course Vanderlyn did paint a bust-length portrait (now in the Corcoran Gallery) based upon his full-length version. This was the basis for the copy in the White House which was painted in 1879 by Eliphalet F. Andrews. Averill, 1949, p. 177, makes the interesting observation that the City Hall version reflects the influence of the photographic approach, an influence felt by the artist as he was himself sitting for a daguerreotype when in the process of painting the 1850 portrait.

39 PORTRAIT OF GEORGE WASHINGTON
(Not in Exhibition)

Oil on canvas
1832-34
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.


Comments: With few exceptions the debate carried on in the House of Representatives about the commissioning of this painting sounds as if it could happen today. Washington Allston had laid down a background of support when he recommended Vanderlyn's skill to Gullian C. Verplanck in 1830 for the Rotunda Commission (Flagg, p. 235 and 238). Vanderlyn, with the Tammany spirit of practicality, painted John C. Calhoun "for the purpose of courting favor," (Mondello, p. 180). On February 14, 1832, Mr. Jarvis from the Committee on the Public Buildings submitted a resolution which would have Vanderlyn paint a portrait of Washington with Stuart's head as the basis. Jarvis, from Ellsworth, Maine, was an old friend of the artist. 1832 being the centennial year of Washington's birth, a second resolution was submitted, which commissioned Horatio Greenough to make a statue of Washington (using Houdin's head). A third resolution proposed placing the remains of Washington and his wife in a place selected for that purpose. With the birthday of Washington approaching, the action took place on February 16th. Mr. Watmough of Pennsylvania made an amendment to strike out the name of the artist. Mr. Ward disagreed on the basis that this would put the burden of decision upon one man—the Clerk of the House. He reminded Mr. Watmough that the selection Committee was made up of a panel of seven "gentlemen of great respectability and acknowledged talents." Mr. Bates suggested a competition. Mentioning the success of Vanderlyn with the *Maritius and Ariadne*, Mr. Cambrell maintained that striking out Vanderlyn's name would be indecorous. Mr. Mercer did not think Stuart's likeness was as good as Peale's, and said he would be sorry if the artist were compelled to adhere closely to the Stuart. Mr. Drayton thought Sully would do well and observed that Vanderlyn was not at his best with portraiture. Then Mr. Jarvis of the Select Committee argued that Sully, Inman, Allston and Harding had all been considered; and that it should be noted the work was to be a copy, not from life. He observed that Vanderlyn's copy of *Antiope* was said to be as good as the original. Mr. Taylor reminded his colleagues that during January of 1826 the House had adopted a resolution that Stuart's painting was the standard likeness of Washington. Finally, Mr. Verplanck, who was well-known for his contribution in art and letters, realistically acknowledged that the members of the Select Committee were from different parts of the country and of course attached to their friends and constituents; but that Allston's endorsement of Vanderlyn should hold weight. The resolution then came to a vote and passed with 96 yeas. The commissioning of Greenough passed, 114 yeas, 50 noes, and with a far less interesting discussion. Five days later Verplanck wrote Allston telling him the good news (Flagg, p. 253).

40 NIAGARA FALLS (engraved by J. Merigot)

Steel engraving
20-3/4 x 29-1/2
Inscription: "A distant view of the falls of Niagara including both branches of The Island and Adjacent Shores, taken from the vicinity of Indian Ladder To the Society of Fine Arts of New York this print is
resspectively inscribed by their most obedient humble servant, John Vanderlyn."
August 1804
Lent by the Senate House Museum


Comment: Merigot was a landscape artist and engraver who worked in both Paris and London. His dates are unknown.

41 VIEW OF NIAGARA FALLS

Oil on canvas
23-1/2 x 39-1/4
Either 1827 or 1837
Lent by the Albany Institute of History and Art


References: Averill, 1949, Cat. No. 19.

Comment: When purchased, this painting was attributed to Trumbull. The attribution to Vanderlyn was first made by John Davis Hatch, Jr. and has generally been accepted.

42 OIL STUDY OF NIAGARA FALLS

Oil on canvas
17-3/8 x 26
C. 1827
Lent by the Senate House Museum, Kingston

Provenance: From the Catherine Vanderlyn estate.


References: Averill, 1949, Cat. No. 18 (dated 1826 or 1837).

Comment: The view here looks like a zoom lens close-up of the large Niagara in the Senate House Museum (Fig. 45).

43 NIAGARA FALLS (engraved by F. C. Lewis)

Steel engraving
20-1/2 x 29-3/8
Inscription: "A view of the Westerly branch of the Falls of Niagara taken from the Table Rock, looking up the River, over the Rapids."
August 1804
Lent by the Senate House Museum, Kingston


Comment: The engraver, Frederick Christian Lewis (1779–1856), came from an English family of artists. The Karolik collection has an oil version of this print which is ascribed to S. F. B. Morse. The Morse version is an exact copy; it is assigned to Morse by virtue of an inscription on the back of the canvas: "To Nath Jocelyn Sam. F. B. Morse New Haven 1835." Karolik Collection of American Paintings, Harvard Univ. Press, 1949, pp. 430ff. However, if the inscription on the back of the painting was simply a gift inscription, then the Karolik painting could qualify as one of the long lost paintings on Niagara Vanderlyn made in 1801 (after which the engraving was then made).

44 DOUBLE VIEW OIL STUDY OF NIAGARA FALLS

Oil on canvas
18-7/8 x 26-1/2
C. 1827
Lent by the Senate House Museum, Kingston

Provenance: From the Catherine Vanderlyn estate.

References: Averill, 1949, Cat. No. 17, (dated 1826 or 1837).

Comment: The view is from the Table Rock area. When the top section is added to that below, the resemblance to the Lewis engraving becomes apparent (Fig. 43).

45 NIAGARA FALLS

Oil on canvas
54-1/2 x 90-1/2
C. 1842–43
Lent by the Senate House Museum, Kingston
Provenance: Given to the present owners in 1938 by Mr. Louis B. Hasbrouck in memory of his father, Mr. Jansen Hasbrouck.


46 STUDY OF ALLEGORICAL FIGURE, POÉMA LYRICUM, FOR VERSAILLES PANORAMA

Pencil drawing with grid lines
9-7/16 x 4
C. 1814-15
Lent by the Senate House Museum

Provenance: Catherine Vanderlyn to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; purchased by Mr. Fred Johnston who gave it to present owners in 1965.

Comment: This figure representing Lyric Poetry is situated with a large number of other statues around Latona’s Pond. It should not be confused with a niche figure bearing the same title (repro. in Edouard Guillou, Versailles, Plon, 1963, plate 75). The drapery on the original statue drew away from the waist, exposing bare legs and thighs; cf., Simon Thomassim, Fürstellung der jenigen Statuen, Groupen, Bäder, Brunnen, Vasen... in dem unvergleichlichen Königt. Schloss und in dem fürtrefflichen Garten zu Versailles zu sehen... Augsburg, 1720, plate 108 (the original edition of this book appeared in French in 1694). Vanderlyn prudishly covered the right leg with a thin undercloth which works to the drawing’s disadvantage and is contrary to tradition (cf., The Muse Etrato in George Richardson’s Iconology, London, 1779, Fig. 82).

47 STUDY FOR VERSAILLES PANORAMA: BASIN, LEFT, NO. 8

Drawing, pen and wash, black ink on green paper
5-1/4 x 4 (visible area)
C. 1814-15
Lent by Fred J. Johnston, Kingston, New York

Provenance: John Vanderlyn, Jr.; Catherine Vanderlyn; Judge Augustus Schoonmaker, executor of the Catherine Vanderlyn estate; Lizzy Rioggen Lawton, daughter of Judge Schoonmaker; William Lawton; purchased by present owner.

Comment: This work was one of six groups called “Groppa Puerorum” by Simon Thomassim (op. cit., Cat. No. 46), plate 171. Situated by the pond in front of the palace, the original metal statue was made by Corneille van Clève of Paris (1645-1732).

48 STUDY FOR VERSAILLES PANORAMA: BASIN, RIGHT, NO. 2

Drawing, charcoal heightened with white on brown paper
7 x 4 3/4 (visible area)
C. 1814-15
Lent by Fred J. Johnston, Kingston, New York

Provenance: John Vanderlyn, Jr.; Catherine Vanderlyn; Judge A. Schoonmaker; to Lizzy Rioggen Lawton, his daughter; William Lawton; purchased by present owner.

Comment: The original metal statue was made by Pierre Legros I of Paris (1629-1714), and is reproduced by Simon Thomassim (op. cit., Cat. No. 46), plate 170. Edouard Guillou, Versailles, Plon, 1963, pls. 23-24, is a more readily available source for a photographic detail view of Basin No. 2 and 8.

49 PERSPECTIVE GRID SKETCH FOR VERSAILLES PANORAMA by Jenner (Not in Exhibition)

Collection of the Senate House Museum, Kingston

Comments: It has been assumed that the grid sketches for the Versailles Panorama were made by Vanderlyn (cf. Albert TenEyck Gardner and Laurence J. Majewski, John Vanderlyn’s Panoramic View of the Palace and Gardens of Versailles, New York, 1956, n.p. illus.). They are exhibited as Vanderlyn’s work at the Senate House Museum. Such an attribution is impossible on two grounds: one, the quality of drawing is crude and cursory; two, one of the drawings bears the signature of Jenner, Vanderlyn’s assistant in the preparation of Versailles.
50 OIL SKETCH FOR VERSAILLES PANORAMA: VIEW TO WEST

Oil on paper (restored and mounted on cardboard)
11 x 15-1/2
C. 1814-18
Lent by Fred J. Johnston, Kingston, New York

Provenance: John Vanderlyn, Jr.; Catherine Vanderlyn; Judge A. Schoonmaker; to Lizzy Rioggen Lawton, his daughter; William Lawton; purchased by present owner.

Comment: The quality of this work would justify placing it with Section VI called, "Problem Pictures." It would be interesting to know why the dimensions of the parts of the oil are almost identical to the dimensions in Jenner's perspective drawing, and why some of the statues have been eliminated. There is a pedantry of method here that matches the quality of execution.

51 MARIUS AMID THE RUINS OF CARTHAGE

Oil on canvas
87 x 68-1/2
Signed: "J. Vanderlyn fec. Roma 1807"
1807
Lent by M. H. DeYoung Memorial Museum, San Francisco, California

Provenance: Courtroom of the Ulster County Court House, June 1, 1830 with the expectation that it would be purchased by the Board of Supervisors (Kingston Weekly Freeman and Journal, Oct. 14, 1886, “Interesting facts on reference to a famous picture,” with the information coming from Marius Schoonmaker); also letter from Vanderlyn to J. Sudam; held in mortgage for $300 by Mr. J. Goodhue; redeemed by John Sudam Dec. 25, 1830; held in safe keeping by Rubens Peale on Jan. 6, 1831 for $75 (receipt in SHM); Leonard Kip unsuccessfully tried to sell the painting to A. B. Durand for $500; Kip purchased the painting for $350 in 1834 and placed it in his home in Hartford, Connecticut; inherited by William Ingraham Kip, his son, in 1847 (letters in Frederick Darrow collection, New York State Library); brought by him to California in 1853-54 when he became the first Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in California; to Mrs. Edward Searles, c. 1883; to her husband, Edward Searles in 1891; given by him to Mark Hopkins Institute (San Francisco Art Institute) in 1893; purchased c. 1917-20 by M. H. DeYoung Museum.


Comment: There is a sketch after the Marius made by M. H. Jovett; and a tapestry copy that was exhibited by E. Winter at his store on John Street (Kingston Weekly Leader, July 19, 1902).

52 MARIUS AMID THE RUINS OF CARTHAGE:
(Eng. by S. A. Schoff)

Steel engraving
15-1/2 x 11-1/2
1842
Lent by the Senate House Museum
Provenance: Catherine Vanderlyn; to present owners.


Comment: The inscription at the base of the engraving plate states that the print was made exclusively "for the members of the year" of the Apollo Association, New York (founded 1839). The engraver was Stephen Alonzo Schoff (1818–1905). Schoff studied in Paris with Paul Delaroche during 1840-42, and upon his return met Durand who aided him in the Marius project. Schoff considered this "his best plate:" cf. D. M. Stauffer, *American Engravers upon Copper and Steel*, New York, 1907, Part I, pp. 240f. The engraving is based upon the 1807 painting.

53 MARIUS AMID THE RUINS OF CARTHAGE:
Replica, reduced

Oil on wood panel
32 x 25-3/8
Lower right: "J. Vanderlyn (Pinxt 1832) New York"
1832
Lent by the Albany Institute of History and Art


Comment: Vanderlyn began making replicas of his large paintings after losing the Rotunda. This was a prudent move, for without the Rotunda's ample exhibition space it was difficult to hang the large originals. With the income from the Rotunda gone the originals became his negotiable reserve.

54 MARIUS AMID THE RUINS OF CARTHAGE:
Unfinished and reduced replica

Oil on canvas (sepia and blue)
32-3/4 x 26-1/2
1834-38
Lent by the Senate House Museum, Kingston, New York

Provenance: Sarah Maria and Catherine Vanderlyn; purchased by Dr. Stillwell in 1882; presented to the SHM by him and delivered from New York by Beers Brothers, July 1, 1896.

Exhibitions: New Paltz College, 1959

References: Stillwell, 1928, p. 89

Comment: This work is based upon the reduced replica, not the original. The story is still current in Kingston that Vanderlyn planned this work for the City of Kingston but, when something went wrong with the arrangements, in anger he left it unfinished. The painting is interesting from a technical standpoint for it illustrates what Vanderlyn meant when he spoke of putting in the "dead coloring" of a picture.

55 DRAWING FOR ARIADNE:
STUDY FOR HEAD AND BUST: (Not in Exhibition)

Charcoal and white on cream paper
18-1/2 x 23
C. 1809
Collection of the IBM Corporation

Provenance: Catherine Vanderlyn; to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Lawton; Mr. Fred Johnston; Kennedy Galleries; present owner.


56 DRAWING FOR ARIADNE:
STUDY OF TORSO AND LEGS

Charcoal and white on gray paper
11 x 22-1/2
C. 1809
Lent by Kennedy Galleries, New York

Provenance: Catherine Vanderlyn, to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; Mr. Fred Johnston; present owners.

ARIADNE ASLEEP ON THE ISLAND OF NAXOS

Oil on canvas
68 x 87
Signed and dated at lower left: “J. Vanderlyn fecit/ Parisiis 1814”
1812
The Pennsylvania Academy of The Fine Arts

Provenance: Sold by Vanderlyn to A. B. Durand in 1831 for $600; purchased at auction by Mr. Joseph Harrison of Philadelphia for $5,000; presented by his widow to present owners in 1878.

References: Catalogue, Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, Philadelphia, 1897, p. 52 (A153); Samuel Isham, History of American Painting, 1905, fig. 26; Averill, 1949, Cat. No. 5 (dated 1812); and in other references too numerous to list.


Comment: The circumstances of the painting’s early exhibition history and Vanderlyn’s letters, which tell us he was bringing the painting to completion in 1811, make it pointless to date this painting 1814. Moreover, the pigment of the last digit is partially lost. While many of the 19th century descriptions of this painting were excessive or sentimental, none of them can match the flippancy, if not fatuousness, of some contemporary criticism (e.g., Gabriel Laderman, “19th century American Art at the Met: on the hanging of the show,” Art Forum, Vol. VIII, No. 10, June, 1970, pp. 78-80. A detailed analysis of the painting lies beyond the range and purpose of this catalogue. At a later date and in a different context I plan to present my opinions.

WATERCOLOR STUDY FOR ARIADNE

Watercolor, stipple, on paper
4-1/8 x 5-1/2

Inscription on back in Vanderlyn’s hand: “This sketch, after the Printer has done with it, is presented to Mr. E. M. Ely, if the printer does not soil it and make it unfit to be presented to any one. If it is put into a small frame under glass that may be prevented.” (See Fig. 58a)
1809–10
Lent by Yale University Art Gallery, Gift of Albro N. Dana, B. A. 1920, in memory of his father, Arnold Guyot Dana, B. A. 1883

Provenance: Given to Elisha Mills Ely (1787–1832) before Vanderlyn returned to America in 1815. A letter from Ely in Paris to Vanderlyn in New York, dated July 30, 1816, mentions sending “a few Ariadnes” by Mr. Wilder (Fig. 25). This suggests that the watercolor was engraved. Ely left his belongings to Augustus Lucas Hillhouse, a friend with whom he lived in Paris during the last eight years of his life. After the death of A. L. Hillhouse it came to the Hillhouse family in New Haven, Connecticut. Found in the garret of the Hillhouse mansion, it was purchased from the late James Hillhouse in 1936 by Carroll Alton Means, an art dealer and appraiser of New Haven. He sold it to
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Mrs. Arnold Guyot Dana, who gave it to her husband Arnold Guyot Dana, who gave it to his son, Albro N. Dana of Coventry Center, Rhode Island, who gave it to the present owner in 1953.

**Exhibitions:** The work was once borrowed for an exhibition at the Lyman Allyn Museum in New London, Connecticut, as a work of John Trumbull. The Director, William Douglas, subsequently identified the work as Vanderlyn’s.

**References:** Averill, 1949, Cat. No. 6 (dated 1812-18).

**ARIADNE (after Vanderlyn by Asher Brown Durand)**

Engraving
14-3/16 x 17-3/4
Open letter proof: “Painted by J. Vanderlyn — Engraved by A. B. Durand./Ariadne./ Published by A. B. Durand, Hodgson, Bogs and Graves, London, and Rittner and Gousset à Paris 1835/(Copyright)/Printed by A. King.”
The etched state: “J. Vanderlyn pt. — A. B. Durand Ag.”
1835
Lent by the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

**References:** *American Collector*, vol. 16, Summer 1947, p. 18; *Art in America*, vol. 39, December, 1951, pp. 176f.

**Comment:** John Durand, son of Asher Brown Durand (1796-1886), writes that his father “did not begin the work until he had made a reduced copy of it [Vanderlyn’s painting] in colours of the size of the intended engraving . . . ;” *Life & Times of Asher Brown Durand*, New York,
1894, p. 76. It should be noted that the size of the "copy" in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (Fig. 60) is almost identical in size. John Durand maintains that the print was undertaken "solely for the love of art" and was, "commercially speaking, a failure." Amateurs of engravings bought it while the public was not appreciative. The writer of the *Album of Reproductions of Selected Works in the Permanent Collection of the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts*, Philadelphia, 1892, considered it the "finest line engraving ever produced in this country, and quite the equal of any produced abroad contemporaneously with it." The *Ariadne* was also engraved by F. Girard (cf. auction sale of the *J. Henry Clay Collection of Portraits and Engravings*, Dec. 1895, Philadelphia.)

if Durand was willing to pay $50 for this small work. Moreover, in his letter to John Sudam of Dec. 17, 1829, Vanderlyn spoke of a small copy of the *Ariadne* which he was "now finishing," and which he planned to send to London in the spring.

ARIADNE

Oil on panel
26 x 42
1825-26
Lent by the Senate House Museum

Provenance: Col. James A. Stevens, Hoboken; to his son John G. Stevens, Trenton; to Miss Stevens who offered it for sale through Gebbie and Co., Philadelphia in December, 1889, for $1,500; it then appeared at the Haseltine Gallery, Philadelphia, and in 1913, at the Macbeth Gallery in New York; Edward Coykendall presented the work to the present owners in 1949.

Exhibition: "Exhibition of the works of John Vanderlyn," Senate House Museum, May 6-20, 1938 (13).

References: Evening Bulletin (Phil.), December 17, 1889; Philadelphia Inquirer, December 18, 1889; Philadelphia Ledger, April 14, 1890; Argus, January 30, 1913; Art News, October 18, 1913; Stillwell, 1928, p. 91; Averill, 1949, Cat. No. 4 (dated there, 1810); New York Times, February 18, 1949.

Comment: According to the article in Argus, Col. Stevens commissioned this work for the main salon of steamer Albany. The boat was built in 1825/6 and was considered "The finest thing afloat" in that day. Works of eleven other artists also graced the Albany (including Doughty, Cole, Lawrence, Sully, Morse). About 1828 Col. Stevens put the Ariadne in his home and replaced it with Weirs' Landscape of Lake George. Charles Henry Hart did not care for the work. In a letter of May 29, 1890 to R. R. Hoes, he wrote: "It is a poor affair and the drapery ruins it as a work of art. If Vanderlyn did paint it he evidently gave no care, thinking that anything was good enough for a Steamboat." The newspapers in Philadelphia assessed the work positively: "It is an admirable example of Vanderlyn's best work. In coloring, drawing and general effect, it contains all the positive characteristics of the better known painting at the Academy of the Fine Arts." (Evening Bulletin).
ARIA DNE: HALF LENGTH (Not in Exhibition)

Oil on canvas
30 x 39
1837
Neville Public Museum, Green Bay, Wisconsin

Provenance: Purchased from artist in Washington, D.C., 1837 by Morgan L. Martin; to his daughters Deborah and Sarah; purchased from them in 1929 by A.C. Neville; presented by him to present owners.


Comments: The Neville Public Museum possesses a sworn statement by Morgan Martin (October 28, 1871) that he was in Washington in 1836 (winter) and 1837, at which time he became acquainted with Vanderlyn who had just finished his Rotunda painting (sic); the Ariadne, though not quite completed, was on exhibition; he purchased the work and shipped it to Green Bay in the Spring of 1837; he then mislaid the bill of acceptance. Though the statement is defensive in nature, there is no good reason to challenge it. The 40 years which transpired between purchase and statement justify the mistake about the Rotunda painting which was not completed until 1846. Martin (1805-1887) was a graduate of Hamilton College, settled in Green Bay to practice law in 1827, helped in the creation of the State of Wisconsin, and was a member of both the State Senate and Assembly. As the Gibbes Antipo (Fig. 15) shows, Vanderlyn could make the feminine aspect the focus of his copying. The hair is longer and less curled than his other versions of Ariadne. The teasing modesty of the neglige and the cute demeanor of the cupid seem calculated to pander to the growing market for sentimental genre. Perhaps the quick sale encouraged Vanderlyn to paint other versions, explaining thereby why accountable Ariadnes later appeared on the scene (e.g., International Centennial Commission, International Exhibition, Philadelphia, 1876, No. 150, Ariadne by Vanderlyn, owned by W.H. Eisenberg; Barrett’s Old Merchants of New York, vol. II, p. 359; “Col. William Gracie was alone then and next to John Trumbull was John Vanderlyn. The colonel had bought the ‘Ariadne’...”).

DEATH OF JANE McCREA

Oil on canvas
32-1/2 x 25-1/2
1804
Lent by the Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, Conn.

Provenance: Bought by Robert Fulton and presented to the American Academy of Fine Arts, New York; purchased through Alfred Smith in 1842 at the auction of the effects of the American Academy of Fine Arts with numerous other paintings; purchased by subscription from original subscribers by the Wadsworth Atheneum in 1855.


**Comments:** I have not been able to verify the assertion that Robert Fulton purchased this painting and offered it to the American Academy (cf. Yvon Bizardel, *American Painters in Paris*, New York, 1960, pp. 86f).

64

**THE MURDER OF JANE McCREA**
*(Copy by Unidentified Artist)*

Oil on canvas  
33-1/8 x 26-1/8  
1839  
Lent by New York State Historical Association, Cooperstown, New York

**Provenance:** MacBeth Galleries; purchased from them by Mr. Clark in 1956.


**Comments:** This work was considerably over-painted sometime prior to 1956. It appears to me that it must be the work exhibited (with the title listed above) in the May 1839 exhibition of the Apollo Association (No. 111); cf. Mary Bartlett Cowdry, *American Academy of Fine Arts and American Art Union: Exhibition Record, 1816–1852*, The New-York Historical Society, 1953, p. 364.

66

**THE LANDING OF COLUMBUS ON SAN SALVADOR, OCTOBER 12, 1492**

Oil on canvas  
11’ 10-1/2 x 18’  
1839-46  
The Capital, Washington, D.C.


**Comment:** The problem of viewing this painting with fairness is two-fold: first, modern sensibility is biased against official art in official edifices that is viewed chiefly by tourists and school children; second, the painting is adversely prejudiced by the belief that...
Vanderlyn, by hiring an assistant—either because of falling powers or because he was more interested in other projects—did not take the commission seriously. I wish to address myself to the second aspect of the problem for the evidence causing the prejudice is questionable. The many studies and drawings made in preparation for the final painting bear witness to a monumental effort. They must not be confused—as has hitherto been done—with the drawings clearly made for him by his assistant (Figs. 69 and 70). These works are costume studies, with inscriptions in French and rendered by a drawing hand of modest talent. After coming to this conclusion when examining the works at the Senate House Museum that two different hands were involved, I was interested to find partial explanation in a Vanderlyn letter. This letter was first quoted by Marius Schoonmaker in his response to a Clara Denton who had expressed the opinion that the actual work on the canvas was done by a French artist. Vanderlyn's letter states: "There perhaps never was a design or composition more fairly due to any artist than this of Columbus...Surely the little aid which was lent me on making drawings of most of the principal figures from the model was merely intended to help me on with more expedition and no other motive. The same person has also been for me to the Bibliothèque to make some drawings for the costume and this was to save me time and drudgery," (The New York Observer, July 13, 1893). The key statement here begins, "Surely the little aid..." Did the assistant in making the drawings of the principal figures, make a small contribution; or was he simply helpful around the studio when the drawings were made by Vanderlyn? If the first reading seems more grammatically plausible, who then did the studies for the minor figures? Would Vanderlyn, who assiduously sketched flora on San Salvador on his way to France, be likely to sit around for four or five years watching his assistant do all the work? Finally, if the assistant did all the drawings, wouldn't he be a talent we would hear about? The problem is ours, not Vanderlyn's. We must use our eyes to ascertain which of the larger drawings could have been done by the "sketcher of costumes."

**Provenance:** Kennedy Galleries; purchased by Austin I. Kelly, III.

**References:** The Kennedy Quarterly, vol. 7, No. 1, March 1967, p. 40 (Illust.).

**68 VEGETATION STUDY FOR LANDING OF COLUMBUS**

- Charcoal heightened with white on brown paper
- 8-3/4 x 9-1/2
- Pencil inscription describing ivy vines and Plantaion tree
- Early 1840's
- Lent by the Senate House Museum, Kingston

**Provenance:** Catherine Vanderlyn to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; purchased by Mr. Fred Johnston who gave it to present owners in 1963.

**69 COSTUME STUDIES FOR LANDING OF COLUMBUS**

(by Vanderlyn's assistant)

- Pencil on paper
- 10-1/2 x 8-1/2
- Inscription in brown ink
- Early 1840's
- Lent by the Senate House Museum, Kingston

**Provenance:** Catherine Vanderlyn to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; purchased by Mr. Fred Johnston who gave it to present owner in 1963.

**70 COSTUME STUDY FOR PINZON IN LANDING OF COLUMBUS**

(by Vanderlyn's assistant)

- Pencil on paper
- 10-1/2 x 8
- Inscriptions in brown ink
- Early 1840's
- Lent by the Senate House Museum, Kingston

**Provenance:** Catherine Vanderlyn to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; purchased by Mr. Fred Johnston who gave it to present owner in 1963.
LANDING OF COLUMBUS
At the Island of Guanahani, West-Indies. October 12th 1492.

1. Columbus
2. Martin Alonzo Pinzon
3. Vincent Yannez Pinzon
4. Rodrigo des Escobedo or Escobar, notary of the armament
5. Rodrigo Sanchez, inspector of armament
6. Mutineer in a suppliant attitude
7. Alonzo de Ojeda
8. Cabin boy in kneeling posture
9. Soldier whose attention is partly diverted from the ceremony by the appearance of the awe-stricken natives in the forest
10. Sailor in attitude of veneration for the admiral
11. Friar bearing a crucifix

In the distance, groups express joy and hilarity on their landing. Two figures somewhat nearer are contending for glittering particles in the sand. The three vessels—Santa Maria, Pinta, and Nina—are seen in the distance.

66a. Key for Landing of Columbus (66)

95. Landing of Columbus (adaptation for U. S. Currency), 1875 (design)
71 STUDY OF WHEEL-LOCK GUN FOR LANDING OF COLUMBUS

Black chalk heightened with white on gray paper
18-3/8 x 12
Early 1840's
Lent by the Senate House Museum

Provenance: Catherine Vanderlyn to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; purchased by Mr. Fred Johnston who gave it to the present owners in 1963

Comment: The gun is held by Alonzo de Ojeda in the final painting.

72 DRAWING OF FIGURES AT LEFT FOR LANDING OF COLUMBUS

Drawing, charcoal heightened with white on gray paper. Fixed area slightly brown.
17-1/2 x 22-1/2 (visible area)
Early 1840's
Fred J. Johnston, Kingston, New York

Provenance: Catherine Vanderlyn; to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; Mr. Fred Johnston; Kennedy Galleries; purchased by present owners in 1968.

References: “American Drawings, Pastels and Watercolors,” Kennedy Galleries, March 14-April 28, 1967, Part I, p. 73, item 125 (illus.).

Comments: See in the above-mentioned exhibition catalogue items 124 and 126 for other studies of the same figure.

73 DRAWING FOR LANDING OF COLUMBUS: SOLDIER LOOKING TOWARDS WOODS

Pencil, brown and white chalk on blue paper
17-1/2 x 14
Drawing of arm on verso
Early 1840's
Lent by the University Art Gallery, State University of New York at Binghamton

Provenance: Catherine Vanderlyn; to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; Mr. Fred Johnston; Kennedy Galleries; purchased by present owners in 1968.
74 STUDY OF SLEEVE FOR LANDING OF COLUMBUS

Charcoal on paper
14-5/16 x 10-1/2
(drawing on reverse of Alonzo de Ojeda with gun)
Early 1840’s
Lent by the Senate House Museum

Provenance: Catherine Vanderlyn to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; purchased by Mr. Fred Johnston who gave it to the present owners in 1963.

75 DRAWINGS FOR THE LANDING OF COLUMBUS:
STUDIES FOR THE FIGURE OF COLUMBUS

Nude Study

Brown and red chalk on gray tan paper
22-1/2 x 16-1/2
Early 1840’s
Lent by Kennedy Galleries, New York

Provenance: Catherine Vanderlyn; to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; Mr. Fred Johnston; present owners.


76 DRAWINGS FOR THE LANDING OF COLUMBUS:
STUDIES FOR THE FIGURE OF COLUMBUS

Standing Figure

Charcoal, brown and white chalk on creamy paper
15-1/2 x 14-1/2
Early 1840’s
Lent by Kennedy Galleries, New York

Provenance: Catherine Vanderlyn; to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; Mr. Fred Johnston; present owners.


77 DRAWINGS FOR THE LANDING OF COLUMBUS:
STUDIES FOR THE FIGURE OF COLUMBUS

Standing Figure

Brown and grey chalk with pencil on grey tan paper
20-1/2 x 17
Early 1840’s
Lent by Kennedy Galleries, New York

Provenance: Catherine Vanderlyn; to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; Mr. Fred Johnston; present owners.


78 DRAWING OF COLUMBUS

FOR LANDING OF COLUMBUS

Pencil on white paper
18-1/2 x 13
Early 1840’s
Lent by the Senate House Museum, Kingston

Provenance: Catherine Vanderlyn to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; purchased by Mr. Fred Johnston who gave it to present owners in 1963.

79 DRAWINGS FOR THE LANDING OF COLUMBUS:
STUDIES FOR THE FIGURE OF COLUMBUS

Study for Face

Pencil, brown and white chalk on tan paper
24-1/2 x 17
Early 1840’s
Lent by Kennedy Galleries, New York

Provenance: Catherine Vanderlyn; to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; Mr. Fred Johnston; present owners.

DRAWINGS FOR THE LANDING OF COLUMBUS:
STUDIES FOR THE FIGURE OF COLUMBUS
Clothed Torso

Colored chalks on tan paper
17-1/2 x 18
Early 1840's
Lent by Kennedy Galleries, New York

Provenance: Catherine Vanderlyn; to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; Mr. Fred Johnston; present owners.


OIL STUDY OF COLUMBUS FIGURE

Oil on canvas
18-3/4 x 17-1/8
1840's
Lent by the Senate House Museum, Kingston

Provenance: From the estate of Catherine Vanderlyn

DRAWINGS FOR THE LANDING OF COLUMBUS:
STUDIES FOR THE FIGURE OF COLUMBUS
Study of Sleeves

Charcoal, brown and white chalk on grey tan paper
12 x 15-1/4
Early 1840's
Lent by Kennedy Galleries, New York

Provenance: Catherine Vanderlyn; to Judge A. Schoonmaker; to his daughter, Mrs. William Laughton; Mr. Fred Johnston; present owners.


PORTRAIT OF SAMUEL BARD:
Copy after Vanderlyn by Thomas McClelland

Oil on canvas (lined)
34 x 26-1/2
"S. Bard" inscribed on parchment held by sitter
1821

Lent by Columbia University, College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York City

Comment: Initially this painting had blue ribbon credentials. Both Averill (1949, Cat. No. 21) and the Frick Art Reference Library listed it as a Vanderlyn, with a date of 1802-03. This date was undoubtedly based upon a letter the artist wrote to his brother Nicholas (March 28, 1802): "I have now on hand a portrait of Mr. and Mrs. John Livingston and one of Doctor Bard who resides at Staatsburgh near Doctor Tillison and who was here a few days ago, but did not remain long enough to finish it, which is now put off until another time."

Dr. Bard (1724-1821) was educated in Edinburgh, founded New York Hospital in 1791, the City Library, and the New York Dispensary. When the American government was established in New York, Washington selected him as his personal physician. He wrote articles on medicine, a book on midwifery and another on sheep breeding. His descendants founded Bard College. Presumably Vanderlyn's portrait of him was given to the College of Physicians and Surgeons after his death in 1821.

It seemed eminently probable that the painting resided peacefully in the medical school during the past 143 years. But there was something about the painting that disturbed me; while Bard's ship-prow of a face was clearly within Vanderlyn's scope, the brushwork did not look right.

Konstanze Bachmann, Curatorial Assistant of Artistic Properties of Columbia University, confirmed my doubts about this painting and brought up good reasons for assigning authorship to Thomas McClellend. She found out that the building in the background of the painting depicts Columbia College after the restoration of 1817-1820. The old College building prior to restoration had gables, no chimneys showing, and an open cupola without dome. Thus the Columbia version could not be the Vanderlyn original of 1802 (mentioned in the correspondence above), unless the architectural background was added or retouched later. Restoration and cleaning reports do not support this possibility. While the first "fixing" of the painting is not covered by a detailed report, reports of Ralph Mayer's restoration of 1958 and Michael M. Melnitzky's of 1966 do exist. Mayer noticed sketchy repaints in minor areas but stated that all the significant features were in good condition ("practically exact"). Melnitzky however, found overpaint on the face and hand which he removed and then compensated for. As there is no evidence in either report that the buildings were retouched, the chances for Vanderlyn's authorship disappeared.
The engraving made of Bard by William Main for McVicker’s Domestic Narrative (1822) helps us identify the painter of the Columbia picture. The engraving is very close to the Columbia picture and frankly states, “taken from the McClelland copy of Vanderlyn’s portrait.”

Thus if the Columbia Bard portrait is the McClelland copy painted in 1821 for the College of Physicians and Surgeons, where then is the Vanderlyn original of 1802? The only clues we have for tracking it down are old exhibition records. The Bard portrait listed in the “Parade of Patriots Exhibition,” Grand Central Art Gallery (Hotel Cotham Branch), New York, May 21–June 5, 1942, is the Columbia McClelland version. The Bard “portrait by Vanderlyn” lent by New York Hospital for the “Exhibition of Select Paintings for the Benefit of Mr. Dunlap,” Stuyvesant Institute, Nov. 18–Dec. 16, 1838, p. 7, still exists in the New York Hospital collection. Though its condition is poor, one can see that it is little more than a mediocre copy similar to the McClelland version but without architectural background.

The exhibition record of the American Academy of Fine Arts for 1816 provides the final clue: item 91 lists a portrait of Dr. Samuel Bard, “painted by Vanderlyn in 1802” and lent by Dr. Hosack. Dr. Hosack was Bard’s partner, member of the three-man committee of Columbia who hired McClelland (see minutes of that group for May 29, 1821 and January 1822), and also helped to found New York Hospital. He becomes the key figure in the problem. Having obtained the 1802 original, he must have had it used for the two extant copies. Even the large Waldo portrait of Bard in the New York Hospital Collection seems to be based on the lost 1802 prototype. Unless the Vanderlyn original turns up in some private collection, we shall only know of it through the copies the energetic Dr. Hosack made to honor his partner.

Comment: This work is presumed to be Vanderlyn’s portrait of Daniel D. Tompkins by virtue of a brass label on the frame. But this label is not backed up by supporting information: no one remembers who made the attribution or when, and under what circumstances the painting entered the Senate House Museum. The picture is left to speak for itself. It could be a Vanderlyn as its style is not too distant from the Schoonmaker portrait of 1816 (Fig. 28). To check both the reasonableness of this date and the sitter’s identity we must consult other known portraits of Tompkins: Trumbull’s of 1808 (City Hall, New York); J. W. Jarris’ of 1812 (New-York Historical Society); Sully’s of 1816 (The Brook, New York); and C. W. Peale’s of 1819 (Chamber of Commerce, New York). They all show a face that is fuller and more oval. This only proves that the portrait in question could not have been painted between 1808 and 1819 when the sitter’s age ranged from 34 to 45. Could the portrait show the young Tompkins before his face fleshed out? Before the plausibility of this suggestion can be judged, the possibility of contact between Vanderlyn and Tompkins should be ascertained. Tompkins is best known as Governor of New York (1807) and Vice-President under Monroe (1817). Ray W. Irwin’s recent book (1968) on Tompkins informs us that Tompkins helped Aaron Burr in the political campaign of 1800. Thus he moved in circles which could have included Vanderlyn (during the artist’s short return to America in 1801-03). As Tompkin’s personal papers were destroyed by fire years ago and Vanderlyn never mentions him, we are forced to make our final judgment in terms of the painting’s style alone: could Vanderlyn have painted such a picture between 1801 and 1803? I think not. It is probably a portrait of an unknown person he painted around 1816.

84 ALLEGED PORTRAIT OF DANIEL D. TOMPKINS

Oil on canvas
27-1/2 x 23-1/2
Date Unknown
Lent by the Senate House Museum, Kingston


References: Stillwell, 1928, pp. 90f; Averill, 1949, Cat. No. 85 (date given as c. 1820-25).

85 PORTRAIT OF ROBERT FULTON (?)

By Rembrandt Peale (?)

Oil on canvas
27-1/2 x 22
c. 1803-04
Lent by The Detroit Institute of Arts (Gift of the Ford Foundation)

Provenance: The Livingston Family to Miss Creuger, Creuger’s Island on the Hudson; purchased from her by Louis Van Bergen of Coxsackie, New York; purchased by Edsel B. Ford in 1926 from M. Knoedler and Company; presented to present owners by the Ford Foundation.


Comments: The controversy regarding the subject and authorship of this painting was brought to my attention by Edward Dwight. He agreed with E. P. Richardson that the work should be attributed to Vanderlyn rather than Rembrandt Peale. This is possible since it looks more like a Vanderlyn than it does a Peale. The identity of the sitter is more problematic: the face does not resemble Fulton as depicted by West, C. W. Peale, or by Fulton himself; nor does it resemble the Vanderlyn drawing of Fulton (Fig. 17). Fulton’s position as an artist and a listing of portraits made of him can be found in Eleanor J. Fulton, “Robert Fulton as an Artist;” Papers of the Lancaster County Historical Society, vol. XLII, No. 3 (1938), pp. 49-96.

Oil on wood
12 x 9-7/8

On back of panel: “Mrs. Ann Hivlyn died July 4th, 1816/Aged 80 years./Painted this picture 179-(-?)1871,” on paper at boundary of frame: “John Vanderlyn” Date Unknown Lent by the Cleveland Museum of Art, Dorothy Burnham Everett Memorial Collection

Provenance: Mrs. Henry A. Everett, Cleveland


Comment: In spite of this painting’s broad acceptance as a work of Vanderlyn, it does not seem to be his

86. Portrait of Mrs. Ann Hivlyn

86a. Back of Portrait of Mrs. Ann Hivlyn (86)
work. There are no authentic Vanderlyn’s prior to 1816 to which the “wet” optical style of this picture relates unless it be the Portrait Study of Aaron Burr in the Burton Collection (Fig. 27). Of special importance here is the painterly view out the window, the free treatment of the chair back, and the interest in the surface of the face. The authenticity of the painting has presumably been based on the inscription; but the inscription, being made by two different hands, neither of which are Vanderlyn’s, does not give compelling support (see Fig. 86a).

87 PORTRAIT OF B. THOMPSON

Oil on canvas
26-3/16 x 22-3/8
Date Unknown
Lent by the Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, Gift of Mrs. Frederic S. Gould

Comments: In the “Herbert Lawton Collection Sale,” American Art Association, Anderson Galleries, New York, April 2-3, 1937, this work (No. 340) was listed as the work of John Vanderlyn, the sitter being mentioned as a cousin of Count Rumford, the famous physicist. The Frick Art Reference Library has a note by Charles D. Childs (March, 1965), agreeing with the attribution, and another by Martin S. Soria (February, 1960) who disagreed: Soria attributed the work to Eliab Metcalf.

88 PORTRAIT OF JOSEPH READE

Oil on canvas
6-3/4 x 8-7/8
Inscribed on reverse in artist’s hand: “Painted by John Vanderlyn;” inscribed on the stretcher: “Received by Helen Reade Hamersley from Grandma Hawkes, October 17, 1875.”
Date Unknown
Lent by Yale University Art Gallery; Gift of Mrs. Francis P. Garvan

Provenance: Mrs. Hawkes to Helen Reade Hamersley; Thomas B. Clarke; sold at Clarke auction, January 7, 1919 (31) for $800 to Dr. Joseph P. Eidson, New York; sold to Francis P. Garvan, who presented painting to present owners.


Comments: In a letter to Thomas Clarke, Feb. 4, 1919, Rev. Hoes made the following comment: “I cannot place Joseph Reade and fail to find him in Appleton. Will you kindly tell me who he was, and where I can find a brief account of him? What is the authority for believing that his portrait is by Vanderlyn?” Hoes’ doubts are justified. If it were not for the authentic-looking signature on the back of the canvas (see Fig. 88a) no one probably would attribute the works to Vanderlyn. Joseph Reade still eludes identification. The only person with that name I could discover living around 1800 was the author of a book called Invasion! A poem familiarly didactic and argumentative. In three short cantos. Carmarthen, Printed for the author, and sold by J. Ross, 1804. See the portrait of an Unknown Man for a work of similar style (Fig. 89).

88a. Back of Portrait of Joseph Reade (88)
89 PORTRAIT OF AN UNKNOWN MAN

Oil on canvas
8-1/2 x 7-1/2
Date Unknown
Lent by the Senate House Museum, Kingston

Provenance: Gift to present owners from Mrs. E. C. Chadbourne, 1951.

Exhibition: "Exhibition of the work of John Vanderlyn," the Senate House Museum, May 6-20, 1938 (19).

Comment: This small painting, like the Joseph Reade portrait at Yale, cannot be associated with Vanderlyn's known works. It is about the same size as the Reade work, has the same thickness of pigment, and is held by a stretcher of like construction. If the Reade work stands, this painting does also.

90 A LADY AND HER SON

Watercolor
12-1/4 x 11-5/8
Signed upper right: "J. Vanderlyn Aug. 1800"
1800 (August)
Lent by the Senate House Museum, Kingston

Provenance: Given by Edward Coykendall to present owners in 1949.

Exhibition: "Exhibition of the work of John Vanderlyn," the Senate House Museum, May 6-20, 1938 (39).


Comment: The Frick Art Reference Library notes that a copy of the 1820 issue of Philadelphia Public Ledger was found on the back. The unusual rapport the two figures have with the world outside the frame is not found in Vanderlyn's work.

91 DRAWING OF A CLASSICAL LANDSCAPE

Pencil drawing
23-1/2 x 19
Signed and dated on rocks to lower left: "J.V.D. 1805"
1805
Lent by the Senate House Museum, Kingston

Provenance: Given by Edward Coykendall to present owners in 1949.

Comment: This work is akin to the Classical Landscape (Fig. 91), there being no certain work in Vanderlyn's oeuvre which could be used to justify the attribution on a comparative basis. The view features the Arch of Titus which was situated at the Summit of

Provenance: Given by Edward Coykendall to present owners in 1949.

Exhibition: "Exhibition of the work of John Vanderlyn," the Senate House Museum, May 6-20, 1938 (40).

Comment: If it were not for the signature it is doubtful if anyone would attribute this work to Vanderlyn. The initials and numbers are surprisingly inelegant for a man who prided himself on his penmanship. Equally strange is the incredible tree with its hidden masks and figures and the two female figures which give the appearance of bearing emblematic meaning. Although there is to my knowledge no specific rationale for the total story of the drawing, the two figures do make a contrast between the state of contentment on the left and meditative withdrawal (melancholy?) to the right. The meditative girl at the column is an infrequently used motif. Arthur Henkel's and Albrecht Schone's Emblemata: Handbuch zur Sinnbildkunst des XVI and XVII Jahrhunderts, Stuttgart, 1967, was no more helpful than specific iconographical books that Vanderlyn could have come into contact with: e.g., J. B. Bouvard, Iconologie, Paris, 1759, 3 vols; or the enlarged English version of Ripa, George Richardson, Iconology, or a Collection of Emblematical Figures, London, 1779, 2 vols (for which Archibald Robertson was a subscriber). Two examples of a melancholic female by a column are illustrated in Klibansky, Panofsky, and Saxl, Saturn and Melancholy. Nelson and Sons, 1964, Fig. 122 and 126. The seated figure to the left might be Prosperity (cf. Bouvard, vol. III, pl. 82). The grotesque figures in the tree seem closer to the spirit of Moritz von Schwind and "images made by chance" than they do to the older emblems such as the Nymph in a Tree, Hamadryades (cf. Bouvard, op. cit., pl. 10).
the Velia in honor of the death of Titus (81 A.D.). The
tewatercolor shows the edifice as it was before its 19th
century restoration, with remnants of the medieval
fortress of the Frangipani still to be seen (see Ernest
London, 1961, p. 133). It is not unlike any number of
typical scene paintings made between 1780 and 1810.
For example, see the Arch of Titus in J. Merigot,
*Collection of Views and Ruins in Rome*, London, 1797.
Merigot was the engraver for one of Vanderlyn’s
Niagara prints; cf. this catalogue, Fig. 40.

93 LANDSCAPE OF KINGSTON

Oil on board
7 x 9
C. 1818-20
Lent by Dr. and Mrs. Herbert Darlington, Bingham-
ton, New York

Provenance: Marius Schoonmaker; to his daughter,
MRS. LIZY SCHOOMAKER RAGINS, SAUGERTIES, NEW YORK;
purchased by Miss Mary Johnson, Saugerties; sold to
Thurston Thacher, Hyde Park; sold to present owners.

Comments: My impulse is to want this delightful little
landscape to be a Vanderlyn, possibly painted con
amore when the artist returned to his home town.
The image of the wanderer with walking staff is seen
in his early copy made when 14 years old (No. 82),
and in other of his landscapes. However, the drama
of the clouds and spatial recession is improbable for
Vanderlyn. The sketchy oil view of Venice on the re-
verse is by a different and much later hand (see Fig.
93a).

94 BACCHANTE AND SATYR:
Copy after Annibale Carracci

Oil on canvas
44 x 59
C. 1805-07
Lent by the New-York Historical Society

93a. Back of Landscape of Kingston (93)
Provenance: Unknown

Reference: Averill, 1949, Cat. No. 108 (dated 1812-18)

Comment: This painting has not been published or exhibited. A brass label on the frame bears the name of Vanderlyn. NYHS catalogues state that it was copied by Vanderlyn from the Carracci original in the Pitti. While I cannot prove Vanderlyn's authorship, I can report what is known and what is correct. The first record of the painting is found in the 1887 catalogue of the NYHS (item 794 and listed as a Vanderlyn). None of the earlier catalogues up through the issue of 1881 lists the work. The painting therefore must have come into the NYHS collection between 1881 and 1887. The records of the NYHS Minutes between 1881-87 were checked for me by Miss Charlotte P. Rowell, Assistant to the Director, but the results were negative. The Carracci painting of this subject in the Palazzo Pitti (No. 480) is close in detail but much smaller in size (11 x 16-1/2). The Walter Chrysler version is signed, dated and approximately the same size as the NYHS work but it differs in several details (see item 19, Italian and Baroque Paintings from the Collection of Walter P. Chrysler, Jr., Norfolk Museum of Arts and Sciences, 1968). In all probability the Uffizi version (No. 1452, 44-1/8 x 55-7/8) served as the model for the NYHS painting. I do not understand the logic of Averill's suggested dates, for between 1815 and 1818 Vanderlyn was in America. If the Uffizi original was taken to Paris during the Napoleonic era, Vanderlyn could have copied it between 1800 and 1815. Or it could have been painted in Italy between 1805 and 1807. While I find it strange that the artist makes no mention of this copy in his voluminous correspondence, history does not allow us to argue in a vacuum: the absence of supporting documentation raises doubts but proves nothing. While cleaning the picture recently Mrs. Julius Held examined the canvas and stretcher carefully with me but we found no meaningful clues. Mrs. Held observed that the paint was applied more thickly than in the NYHS's Vanderlyn portraits of Strong and Livingston (Figs. 24 and 34), and found the touch different. It remains to be seen if the demands made by the prototype upon the style of the artist can reasonably be used to explain this flexibility. The final question is iconographical. While everyone agrees about the Satyr, the female has been called a Bacchante (NYHS), a Ninfa (Pitti), and a Venus (Chrysler). Such ambiguity will not upset Satyrs for they are not known to be especially discriminating; but surely the Women's Liberation Front and the shade of Erwin Panofsky must feel offense.

95 LANDING OF COLUMBUS
(adaptation for U. S. Currency)

Steel engraving
3-1/16 x 7-1/16
1875 (design)
Lent by Mary Ann Latham Hiester, Endwell, New York


Comment: The Five Dollar National Bank Note with the Landing of Columbus was designed in 1875 by the Continental Bank Note Company of New York. When a bank received its National Bank Charter, the name and charter date of the local bank were overprinted on the basic design of 1875 and spaces were provided for the signatures of Cashier and President. John Sowers Davis, who signed as President for this Note of the First National Bank of Monroeville, Ohio, (Charter — Nov. 15, 1879), was the great grandfather of the present owner.

96 PORTRAIT OF JUDGE EGBERT BENSON
by Gilbert Stuart (Not in Exhibition)

Collection, Heirs of William Jay Iselin; on loan at Bedford House, Katonah, New York
Photo — Frick Art Reference Library
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