RACAR : Revue d'art canadienne
Canadian Art Review

Ronald Paulson. *Emblem and Expression: Meaning in English Art of the Eighteenth Century*. London, Thames and Hudson, 1975. 256 pp., 163 illus., $39.95

Rhodri W. Liscombe

Volume 4, numéro 1, 1977

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1077249ar
DOI : https://doi.org/10.7202/1077249ar

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

UAAC-AAUC (University Art Association of Canada | Association d'art des universités du Canada)

ISSN

0315-9906 (imprimé)
1918-4778 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer ce compte rendu

Liscombe, R. W. (1977). Compte rendu de [Ronald Paulson. *Emblem and Expression: Meaning in English Art of the Eighteenth Century*. London, Thames and Hudson, 1975. 256 pp., 163 illus., $39.95]. *RACAR : Revue d'art canadienne / Canadian Art Review*, *4*(1), 49–51. https://doi.org/10.7202/1077249ar

he was a Frenchman faced with an obvious linguistic problem. Luke Sullivan, who worked for Hogarth and also had the explanation at first hand from the author, supported Trusler when he informed Charles Rogers.

One of the most exciting of Dr. Paulson's many discoveries is the evidence of Hogarth himself. In the sale list for the 1745 auction of his paintings he called the scene "The Inspection." This is a very funny title once the meaning of this "Judgment of Solomon" picture has been grasped. For an inspection was no more practicable nor intended than the cutting of the infant into two halves.

I have chosen this example because on occasions where disagreement with Paulson is possible, he has been scrupulously fair both in presenting the evidence in his magnum opus, the catalogue, and in adding to or correcting it in his later publications.

Paulson's magnificent achievement has been to open up innumerable new paths of enquiry to others, both by fresh evidence and stimulating speculation. It is therefore with an unsolved problem that I close a review which is also intended as a tribute. Paulson has surprisingly little to say about the tailpiece to the Society of Artists' Catalogue of 1761. The frontispiece of the same catalogue, showing Britannia watering from a can the healthy saplings of Architecture, Painting, and Sculpture, identifies the three stumps in the tailpiece, now withered by the attentions of the connoisseurs, who are represented by a monkey in court dress. But why the dates 1502, 1600, and 1604? It is most unlikely that Hogarth would have specified dates for the demise of architecture, painting, and sculpture at random. Unfortunately, he offers no clue as to which of the three stumps the specific sister art belongs, thus complicating the task for the curious investigator.

Paulson rightly stresses Hogarth's love of mystification, and in the second volume of *Hogarth: His Life, Art and Times* he quotes appreciatively from *The Analysis of Beauty:*

> It is a pleasing labour of the mind to solve the most difficult problems: allegories and riddles, trifling as they are, afford the mind amusement.

JOSEPH BURKE
University of Melbourne
Melbourne, Australia

RONALD PAULSON. *Emblem and Expression: Meaning in English Art of the Eighteenth Century*. London, Thames and Hudson, 1975. 256 pp., 163 illus., $39.95.

Ronald Paulson uses this volume to develop ideas touched upon in his separate studies of Hogarth and his St. Martin's Lane Academy. Paulson identifies the existence of a movement to "break away from the old tradition of art as a sister to poetry or to moral philosophy." That phrase occurs in a passage about Thomas Gainsborough, the last of a group of artists beginning with Hogarth and including Zoffany, Stubbs, and Wright, who, he contends, reacted against the conventional view of art best propagated by Reynolds. He proposes that these artists were searching for new modes of expression by re-interpreting traditional iconography and developing the lesser genres, and that their paintings reflected innovations in English literature and aesthetic philosophy.

Paulson assigns the initiation of this movement to the subjective use of emblems and forms found in the landscape gardens laid out in the first half of the eighteenth century, notably those at Castle Howard, Stourhead, and at Stowe, where Cobham created an ensemble critical of the contemporary political situation as well as a less formal composition. The theme is continued in his analysis of Hogarth's earliest series of engravings, *The Harlot's Progress* (1732), in which, Paulson asserts, Hogarth satirized current society by ironic references to preceding moral and biblical iconography (such as *The Choice of Hercules* and *The Visitation* in the first plate). The use of visual puns and the peculiarities of the spatial settings were further evidence of Hogarth's desire to increase the range and immediacy of expression in his art. His engravings were a pictorial parallel to the novel, through which Richardson and Sterne sought to articulate individual experience by recourse to novelties in content and style. Paulson considers that Hogarth advanced further in undermining didactic meaning, citing, in particular, the ambiguities in the *Industry and Idleness* series (1747), and suggests that the success of his pictorial and literary meaning led to an emphasis upon visual expression by artists of the next generation.

To establish the wider context, Paulson contrasts Hogarth's radicalism with Reynolds's academicism and subsequently compares it with the work of a number of continental artists. Watteau is described as a highly idiosyncratic painter, querying the illusions of high art as of high society, Chardin as the first painter of objectivity, while Longhi is said to have been concerned primarily with the depiction of psychological relationships and Canaletto with those of three-dimensional form in space. Piranesi also appears as an innovator (though too briefly for the clarity of the argument) who wished to analyze Classical structure rather than to copy its artistic legacy.

Returning to England, Paulson defines the emergence of a number of other reactions against history painting and humanist ideals. First he equates the genre of the conversation piece with contemporary literature, asserting that both explored the subtleties of social intercourse. He elaborates at greatest length on Zoffany's group portraits, especially the motives that might have determined his choice and arrangement of the works of art in *The Tribuna of the Uffizi* (1772-78). Then he interprets the intentions of Stubbs, Wright, and Gainsborough. "What Stubbs demonstrates," he states, " . . . is that there is no necessary correlation, as Reynolds still believed, between the subject matter or style and the importance of the painting. Most crucial of the St. Martin's Lane Academy ideas for him was the play with genres that broke them up, either subverting or fragmenting them." He claims that Stubbs exposed the rupture between the old academic categories and those of the Beautiful and the Sublime which "originate (or at least so the aritst could tell himself) in nature rather than art." Enlarging upon Fuseli's complaint that Stubbs's figures were usually subordinated to animals, Paulson postulates that man is no longer the centre of Stubbs's universe, but dominated by the horse and the landscape. Man is merely another participant in the great cyclical patterns of nature and even potentially ridiculous, if Paulson's ironic interpretation of the *Soldiers*

of the 10th Light Dragoons (1793), be accepted. Anti-idealistic motives are also attributed to Wright, whose apparently factual records of scientific experiments represent the discovery "not of a new scientific truth so much as something elemental and terrifying at the heart of nature, brought out by contact with a man-made scientific mechanism." And Paulson discerns comparable meanings in Wright's paintings of caverns, scenes from literature, and landscapes in which man is isolated and transient, markedly different from the heroic vein of the modern history pieces of West and Copley.

Of Gainsborough he writes, "there is no ulterior motive in a Gainsborough painting — no attempt to teach, disturb, or inform the reader." This statement he expands through a detailed examination of a selection of Gainsborough's portraits, describing, for instance, the repetition of the shape of the viola da gamba in the composition of *Mrs. Thicknesse* (1760). He believes that Gainsborough very seldom employed literary allusion and that he preferred to exploit the play of forms — a process which he likens to Hogarth's use of expressive shapes — to evoke the character of his sitters, as in the sharply contrasted portraits of Lord and Lady Ligonier, (1770), who were to divorce a year later. Experimentation with form distinguishes Gainsborough's landscapes, according to Paulson, who sees in them a recurrent composition constructed on a "downward slant" usually directed towards the centre foreground. He also sees this pattern as a rejection of "classical" composition and as "a longing for resolution" issuing from a desire to escape from dissatisfaction with his family and the drudgery of face painting. By such means Gainsborough was "initiating a kind of communication that is quite different from the essentially literary associationism" of Reynolds, if closer to the style of Sterne.

Clearly this literary approach to the history of eighteenth-century art yields much interesting material, especially with regard to the levels of meaning possibly intended by the artists who form the subject of the book. The reader might be forgiven for rejoining that Paulson shares too little with that mythical figure, "Old Leisure," to be found in George Eliot's *Adam Bede*, "of quiet perceptions; undiseased by hypothesis: happy in his inability to know the causes of things, preferring the things themselves."

Paulson's pursuit of unifying themes in the artists' work and their relation to developments in literature and syntax leads him either to overlook or assume too much about numerous significant factors in the wider historical and cultural perspectives. He gives meanings to every aspect of the composition of the landscape garden and Georgian country house, thus forgetting that designers and patrons alike were also interested in natural or art historical forms for their own sake. Colin Campbell talked of trying to emulate the "temple beauties" in his architecture, and Hoare turned to Robert Wood's recently published *The Ruins of Balbec* (1757), for a model for the temple dedicated to Apollo at Stourhead, as Paulson but briefly notes. The St. Martin's Lane and Royal Academies deserve more extensive treatment in this context, as does the impact of the Enlightenment upon Wright, and the union between science and art. Similarly, the taste of the antiquary is hardly considered in the chapter on Zoffany, and examination of the Sublime is limited to Wright and Stubbs, excluding its import for Reynolds, West, Fuseli, and other supposedly conventional artists who contributed to the Boydell Shakespeare Gallery in 1786. Paulson also underestimates the importance of the individual talent and interests of the artists; indeed, the individuality of artists in the eighteenth century is one of the reasons why most attempts to categorize the period fail. Too much is construed from Stubbs's predilection for painting horses, for which, in any case, he was celebrated and patronized, and of Gainsborough's quarrel with the Royal Academy which derived mainly from his displeasure at the manner of hanging his portraits. Neither artist was as radical stylistically as Paulson avers. Stubbs applied the popular Classical frieze format to animal portraiture, Gainsborough emulated the refinement of pictorial beauty achieved by Van Dyck, and both made some response to the challenge of history painting.

Paulson's hunt for underlying principles also leads him to be subjective in interpretation and arbitrary in the choice of examples. The curiosities of scale in *The Light Dragoons*, which he attributes to Stubbs's "admission of the incommensurability of man and animal on the one hand and satire on the other," could be seen as proceeding from his desire to create a satisfactory composition while depicting the details of the splendid uniforms. Writing of the *Tribuna*, Paulson even confers censorious emotion on the *Knife Grinder*, seemingly "appalled" at the sight of the *Venus of Urbino* and the surrounding dilettanti, to substantiate his belief that the painting manifests the artist's inner conflict between carnal and spiritual impulses. Again, one questions whether Reynolds's *Portrait of Nelly O'Brien* (1760-62) can be compared with a Virgin and Child composition and thus show the artist being "wickedly witty," when more obvious instances of his copying that type exist, such as the *Portrait of Mrs. Richard Hoare and her Infant Son* (ca. 1783). A more appropriate example of Reynolds's humour might be found in his *Self-Portrait and Bust of Michaelangelo* (1773), which Paulson reads straightforwardly, but in which Reynolds literally puts his mentor into the shade, almost as if to illustrate an epithet voiced by some of his contemporaries. And to what extent is it possible to read precise meaning into the imitation and adaptation of historical iconography? Are the classical pilasters, arch, and relief in Wright's *Blacksmith's Shop* (1771) intended to recall a Nativity scene and thereby to signify that the painting represents the "secularization of a miracle," or do these features refer to the Classical civilization with which scientific and technological developments were often compared in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries? The criticisms made in this paragraph might seem to be of minor importance, but Paulson constructs his arguments upon such personal and partial interpretations.

He further associates artists as disparate as Hogarth, Watteau, Wright, and Gainsborough in a more or less comparable movement for change. He appears to combine the different reactions against the Baroque and Rococo styles as one against those academic conventions which were, in fact, revived to purge the corruptions of the former movements. Although Hogarth and Watteau reacted against the late Baroque style, neither entirely renounced academic practice. Watteau derived much from Rubens and, as Paulson admits, Hogarth borrowed extensively from the old masters and attemtped to establish an English academy. Indeed, Hogarth's art belongs with a more universal theme

than any defined by Paulson, namely the striving for national cultural reform, which was fostered by the Enlightenment and which became intimately connected with the creation and expansion of the academies during the eighteenth century. In this process a contributory factor was the renewed interest in Dutch art in France and, to a lesser degree, in England, which Paulson chooses to link with the anti-academic groups. Dutch art influenced not only Chardin, the conversation piece genre, and Longhi, but also Boucher and Greuze, who, like the lesser members of the St. Martin's Lane Academy, are hardly examined by the author. Diderot — another important omission in a study in which European art and aesthetics are considered — praised Dutch painting for its truth and morality before he enjoined artists to emulate the stoicism and clarity of Classical art. He also contributed to the rewriting of academic theory in the eighteenth century which was, however, less exactly defined than Paulson suggests. While Reynolds endorsed the academic system in his *Discourses*, he also stressed the value of invention and of personal expression. Nor did he follow his own precepts too closely. His portraits remain as vivid records of contemporary society as do those of Gainsborough, containing at least some of the elements of style and communication which Paulson considers to be progressive. He ignores the effect upon pictorial expression of experiments with materials and technique. Furthermore, each of the covey of artists singled out by Paulson adopted Reynolds's proposition that a modern style should be created by the adaptation of historical art and culture. Gainsborough, for one, combined the Claudian composition and presumed system of colouring with picturesque irregularity in his mature landscapes and, as is acknowledged, similarities of approach and intention can be traced between Wright and Copley or Zoffany and Barry. Genre painting, which Paulson regards as running counter to academic art, also occupied a significant place in the Royal Academy exhibitions, but the effectiveness of this section of the book is diminished by the absence of comment upon Morland, Mortimer, Peters, and Wheatley, whose art confounds dogmatic distinctions.

Lastly, the manner in which Paulson presents his arguments is confusing. The summary of the book in the concluding paragraph is in itself a sample of the obscurities that confront the reader. Recalling the importance of comprehending "usage, context and relationship" in eighteenth-century art, he continues, "the comic demonstration of this fact in Hogarth's work has proved paradigmatic for the operation of iconography in the second half of the century. The development we have traced is from Reynolds and a grammatical system, based on eternal normative laws of syntax and semantics, to Wright and Gainsborough and what we might call, by analogy, a philological system in that origins of images are sought and both artist and viewer reach back in search of an etymology (*etymos logos*, authentic meaning), which is in effect a new beginning." He fails to elucidate whether he means that the artists upon whom he concentrates effected a "new beginning" in terms of the history of art, a new language of form without significance for the future, or merely the truism that each arrived at an individual style by reinterpreting received knowledge and contemporary practice. In either of the former cases the statement requires that Paulson pursue his themes into nineteenth-century art, not forgetting a fuller examination of the earlier periods.

The implication appears to be that these artists reduced the validity of the humanist tradition and, more specifically, the academic view of art. Clearly both were disrupted by the emergence of opposing cultural forces, including the Romantic Movement and the materialistic and mechanistic ideas engendered by the Industrial Revolution. Yet a majority of artists and theorists in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries sought to adapt the old ideals, as indicated by the adherence of such imaginative painters as Turner and Delacroix to the fundamental academic principles. That astute architectural historian, James Fergusson, classified the early nineteenth century with the Renaissance and, despite the obvious differences in medium and purpose, his judgment holds good for the history of painting and sculpture. The profound transition occurred in the mid-nineteenth century when artists began to reject not only traditional iconography but also the authority of historical art and the Renaissance concept of art as a sister to poetry and morality.

RHODRI W. LISCOMBE
University of British Columbia
Vancouver

FRANCIS HASKELL. *Rediscoveries in Art: Some Aspects of Taste, Fashion and Collecting in England and France.* Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1976. 246 pp., 255 illus., $19.50.

It was one of the more endearing expressions of nineteenth-century certainties on both sides of the Atlantic for the upper façades or pediments of art galleries and libraries to be adorned with labelled figures in stone that represented a rather free mingling of the great artists or poets and thinkers of the past with those of modern times.

It must have now and then occurred to someone of more recent date to wonder why, in the case of the Parnassian assemblies of artists, this one was included and another not. There undoubtedly was a time when the choice aroused actual discussion and perhaps controversy, but it had seemed long past. If anyone of sufficient learning looks at them now, it is usually only to note the obvious descent of the idea from Raphael and to regret that the conception and execution likewise represent a descent.

It has remained for Francis Haskell to develop such a moment of initially mild curiosity into a book, or, to be more accurate, a series of lectures that have now been polished into a book with the promising title of *Rediscoveries in Art*. I should like to say at once that it is a very good book, rich in new ideas and fresh perceptions, plummy with unhackneyed illustrations, rewarding at nearly every turn, witty and warm.

The banch of study, as much social as art history, that is devoted to the nature, deployment, and effects of patronage in the fine arts has in recent years been largely an English preserve and its most eminent practitioner is Francis Haskell. It is a subject that on this continent somehow seems both more useful and more attractive to museum curators than to academic art historians. The latter too often