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The Artistic and Literary Career of Charles Jervas (c.1675-1739)

Charles Jervas (c.1675-1739) was an Irish-born portrait painter who rose to the position of Principal Painter to King George I and II, succeeding his former teacher Sir Godfrey Kneller. His life and career have hitherto evaded a comprehensive study, possibly a legacy of the ridicule to which his person and oeuvre have long been subjected. The purpose of this study is to reassess the course and nature of Jervas’s career, and particularly in relation to three distinct patron groups; Sir Robert Walpole and his fellow-Whigs; the royal family and court; and William Digby, 5th Baron Digby of Geashill. In spite of his successful artistic career in London and Ireland, Jervas has often been remembered primarily for his friendships with literary contemporaries (most importantly Alexander Pope) rather than his artistic practice or his own writings. Jervas’s literary achievements, most famously his new translation into English of Cervantes’ Don Quixote (1742) are critically reassessed. A detailed biography, exploration of the artist’s extended period of training in continental Europe (1698-1708/09) and an illustrated catalogue raisonné of Jervas’s oeuvre are included in the scope of the present study.
‘Of Jervas only future Times shall tell
None practis’d better, none explaind so well
Thou only sawst what others cou’d not know;
Or if they saw it, only thou canst show’.

Alexander Pope, extract from initial draft of poem *To Mr. Jervas*, c.1715.

‘…between the badness of the age’s taste, the dearth of good masters, and a fashionable reputation, Jervas sat at the top of his profession’.
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INTRODUCTION

Charles Jervas is a remarkably overlooked figure within British (and Irish) art history. For a portraitist with such an eminent range of patrons and equally celebrated literary friends he has hitherto evaded close scrutiny. Previous scholarship has consistently (and contentedly) presented him as having obscure familial/social origins, a ruthless ability to nurture advantageous contacts (which is used to explain his professional success), and an unpleasantly inflated sense of his own talents. No empirical research into his genealogy, training, literary achievements or oeuvre has yet been published, and no satisfactory explanations have been offered for his spectacular career trajectory. It is unsurprising that an historian in the 1960s could write that Jervas ‘still shimmers somewhat unsubstantially upon the surface of Augustan art history’.¹

The present study has set out, primarily, to examine the factors involved in Jervas’s artistic and literary achievements, and these are treated in chapters 1 to 5. The first chapter explores the artist’s ten or eleven years in continental Europe, which laid the foundation, both artistically and socially, for his later career. Chapter 2 explores Jervas’s relationship with Robert Walpole and its important implications for his network of patrons. With Walpole and the Whig party’s support, Jervas secured the appointment of Principal Painter to the crown in 1723, which is examined in chapter 3. An anomalous patron in the context of his oeuvre is William Digby, 5th Baronet, whose ties with Jervas reveal a complex familial interdependence originating in Ireland; their relationship is examined in chapter 4. The final chapter treats of his considerable literary achievements and close friendship with Alexander Pope. Further themes not covered in these chapters are handled in this Introduction, namely Jervas’s family and marriage, his homes in London and Middlesex, visits to Ireland, brief journey to Italy 1738-39, death and posthumous sales. This is followed by an exploration of his artistic training, influences,

Introduction

studio practice and stylistic conventions. The nature and extent of Jervas’s legacy will be explored in the concluding pages. The main Appendix consists of a catalogue raisonné of the artist’s oeuvre, which is preceded by a short introduction of its own.

Family background

The genealogy of the Jervas family is unclear, though the surname is evidently an anglicisation of the French ‘Gervaise’. Charles’ father was John Jervas, and appears among the army lists of those serving the crown in Ireland in the Commonwealth period. John Jervas was one of the many beneficiaries of the mass confiscation of over 2.5 million acres of Irish land enacted in 1642 as part of the suppression of the previous year’s rebellion. By selling portions of land to small-scale English investors called ‘adventurers’, the crown raised vast sums to finance the ongoing and costly war in Ireland. The rebellion was declared ‘appeased and ended’ in 1653, and the English government proceeded with the allocation of specific plots to the adventurers and ‘servitors’ (the soldiery, in lieu of salaries owing). The redistribution of property in Ireland was further aided by the Acts of Settlement (1662) and of Explanation (1665), and it is under these acts that John Jervas, presumably in the capacity of a servitor, was granted property in King’s county (now co. Offaly). In December 1666 he was allocated a total of 676 acres and 1 perch in Roscorragh (Roscore) ‘with some houses thereon’.

---

2 Jervas and his contemporaries used various spellings of his name; his father is usually recorded as ‘Jervis’; the Duke of Shrewsbury in his diary kept in Rome in the early 1700s refers to the artist as ‘Gervaise’, while the artist normally signed his letters as ‘Jervas’, ‘Jervis’ or ‘Jarvis’. In his posthumous sale catalogue, and the title page of his 1742 translation of Don Quixote, his surname is spelt ‘Jarvis’. While these differences must reflect the lax attitude to spelling in the period, they presumably also indicate variations in pronunciation.  
5 Ibid, pg. v-ix.  
6 Ibid, pg. xx-xi.  
7 Modern place name spellings are given in brackets.
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Curcush (Corcush), Fartane (Fertaun) ‘with 1 large house’, and Aghgall (Agall), all in the barony of Ballycowan in the north of the county (fig a).\(^8\)

John Jervas married Elizabeth Baldwin, the daughter of another English soldier and planter. ‘John Bauldwine Esq’ is first recorded in Ireland around 1659, when he is listed as one of three *tituladoes*\(^9\) in the parish of Gashell (Geashill) in King’s county,\(^10\) and two years later was a commissioner for the collecting of poll tax in the same county.\(^11\)

Captain Baldwin (d.1698-99)\(^12\) and the veteran soldier Sir William Flower (d.1681)\(^13\) were jointly granted in February 1667 a total of 2,677 acres in the barony of Clonlisk, in the south west of King’s county.\(^14\)

\(^8\) Acreage given is in English measurements; 676 acres and 1 perch is equivalent to 417 acres, 1 rood and 14 perches in Irish measurement. *15th Annual Report of the Irish Record Commission*, vol. 3, Appendix 16 ‘Abstracts of grants of land and other hereditaments under the Acts of Settlement and Explanation 1666-1684’, Dublin, 1825, pg. 77 (which gives a breakdown of the grant into townlands within the barony).

\(^9\) A *titulado* was ‘the principal person or persons of standing in any particular locality’. Séamus Pender (ed.), *A Census of Ireland circa 1659, with supplementary material from the Poll Money Ordinances (1660-1661)*, Dublin 1939, pg. v.

\(^10\) Ibid, pg. 439.

\(^11\) The poll tax was raised throughout the country to finance the upkeep of the English army in Ireland. Ibid, pg. 641. F R Montgomery Hitchcock in *The Midland Septs and the Pale*, Dublin, 1908, pg. 299 states that John Baldwin came from Warwickshire, but does not give his source for this information; William Baldwin in *Genealogy of Baldwins from Queens County Ireland and Their Descendants in America and Elsewhere*, New York, 1918, pg. 23, says that ‘...the Baldwin followers of Cromwell came largely from Lancashire, England’.

\(^12\) Captain Baldwin’s will was dated 13 November 1698, and proved on 1 Feb 1698/99; the original does not survive. Arthur Vicars, *Index to the Prerogative Wills of Ireland, 1536-1810*, Dublin, 1897, pg. 18. Thrift Abstracts of Wills, ref. no. 1566 and Betham’s Handlist of Abstracts, series I, vol. 1 (B 1671-1700) MF 1, pg. 81. Both National Archives, Dublin.

\(^13\) Flower was the son of Sir George Flower, who partook of the late Elizabethan attempts to quell rebellion in Ireland. Sir William contributed to the suppression of the 1641 Irish uprising, and from this period was among a ‘personal of and junior and aspirant officers’ close to the powerful James Butler, Duke of Ormond. He was knighted in 1660 and remained an active soldier and advisor to Ormond during the latter’s Viceroyalty (1662-1669). Flower’s grandson Colonel William Flower (1685/86-1746) built the surviving Castle Durrow demesne in Durrow, Co. Laois, and the latter’s son Henry Flower (d.1752) was created 1st Viscount Ashbrook, which peerage is still extant (See Toby Barnard, ‘James Butler, first duke of Ormond (1610-1688)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edition, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4191, accessed 15 Oct 2007; John Burke, *A general and heraldic dictionary of the peerage and baronetage of the British Empire*, London, 1832, vol. 1, pg. 47; Edward O’Brien, *An Historical and Social Diary of Durrow, County Laois 1708-1992*, Ireland, [place of publication not given], 1992, pg. 1-3).

\(^14\) The grant was for 2,677 acres, 2 roods, 28 perches. This is equivalent to 1,653 acres and 9 perches in Irish measurement. The grant included 475 acres in the townlands of Shinrone and Kilbalasoke (Kilballyskea) ‘with a castle thereupon’. *15th Annual Report of the Irish Record Commission*, vol. 3, Appendix 16 ‘Abstracts of grants of land and other hereditaments under the Acts of Settlement and Explanation 1666-1684’, Dublin,
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(also ‘of Currughlouty’) and Martin (‘of Geashill’) were among 39 Protestant landowners in King’s county outlawed by the 1689 Act of Attainder, which for a brief period threatened to repeal the settlement rights of those planters who had been granted land confiscated from the indigenous Catholics since 1641. However, the ultimate victory of King William III at the Boyne the following year ensured continued land ownership in the hands of the English settlers. Consolidating their influence locally, Captain Baldwin’s son John (d.1700), held the title of High Sheriff of King’s county in 1697, a post his father had held in 1672. The present Corolanty House, six miles south of Birr, was built in 1698 by John Baldwin jnr, Charles Jervas’s uncle, and the Baldwin estate was bequeathed to Trinity College Dublin by the provost Dr. Richard Baldwin (c.1666-1758).

Charles was the eldest child of John and Elizabeth Jervas (née Baldwin). His date of birth has been uniformly considered to be c.1675, but two pieces of documentary evidence suggest that a date of c.1670 is more credible. Jervas was granted access to Hampton Court palace by the Lord Chamberlain in July 1694 in order to make copies of the Raphael cartoons, and by the following year (at the latest) had an established portrait

1825, pg. 94 (which gives a breakdown of the grant into townlands within the barony). See also G N Nuttall-Smith in The Chronicles of a Puritan Family in Ireland, Oxford, 1923, pg. 118 transcribes details of Flower and Baldwin subletting a portion of their land in 1667, and pg. 121. Also Thomas Lalor Cooke, The Early History of the Town of Birr, or Parsonstown, Dublin, 1875, pg. 190, and O’Hart, Irish Landed Gentry, Appendix 10 ‘The “Forty-Nine” Officers’, pg. 373, 387.


16 John Baldwin jnr.’s will was dated 31 January 1699/1700, and was proved very shortly afterwards. The original does not survive. Vicars, Index to the Prerogative Wills, pg. 18. Betham’s Handlist of Abstracts, series I, vol. 1 (B 1671-1700) MF 1, pg. 85-86. National Archives, Dublin.

17 Montgomery Hitchcock, The Midland Septs, 1908, pg. 299.

18 Dr Baldwin’s parentage has always been unclear, something on which he never attempted to elucidate, and so the precise manner by which he acquired the King’s county estate is unknown. See H T Welch, ‘Richard Baldwin (c.1666-1758)’, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1167, accessed 6 June 2007] and F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, An Account of the early Septs and the later settlers of the Kings County and of Life in the English Pale, Dublin, 1908, pg. 299.

19 See chapter 3 pg. 87-89.
practice on Long Acre in Covent Garden. Arguably, the level of expertise and reputation these events imply is unlikely for a nineteen or twenty year old. Secondly, Vertue records in his notebooks, apparently paraphrasing Jervas, that the latter ‘...haveing learnt the art of painting at the wrong end was 30 years old when att Rome...he began then to draw as if he had never learnt’. Although imprecise, the comment does suggest that Jervas was near to thirty when he arrived in Rome in 1699.

Jervas’s siblings, in order of birth, were Lucy, Martin, Mary, Mathew, John and Trevor (fig b). Charles is believed to have been born in the parish of Shinrone in Clonlisk, which suggests that his parents were then living on the Baldwin property, rather than John Jervas’s land in Ballycowan. The barony of Clonlisk measured approximately twelve miles from east to west, and five miles north to south. It was described in The Civil Survey AD 1654-1656 as follows: ‘The soyle in this barony is for the most part limestone and sandy yet indifferent good both for tillage and grazeing; it is well watered with streames and brookes which afford indifferent good fishing for trout and eele. There is one river called Brosnagh ariseing form the mountaine of Slewbloom runs through the barony but not navigable’. The population in the barony in c.1659 was recorded as 972 persons of native Irish origin and 109 of English or Scottish origin, a ratio of almost 9:1.

Jervas’s father John emigrated to New Jersey in c.1688 with his son Martin, ‘with as much haste and privacy as he could for fear of being massacred by the Papists’. Both John and Martin were Quakers, a religion which was first introduced into Ireland in

---

20 Collection for Improvement of Husbandry and Trade [newspapers], issue no. 139, 29 March 1695, unpaginated. See fig. q.
21 The Walpole Society, Vertue Notebooks, Oxford, 1933-34 (vol. 3), pg. 16.
22 One John Jervas was admitted to Trinity College, Dublin in 1697-98 at the age of 19; he is recorded as having been born in Clonlisk, and being previously taught by a Mr. Archibald of Shinrone. This is quite possibly Charles’ younger brother John. George Dames Burtchaell and Thomas Ulick Sadlier, Alumni Dublinenses, Bristol, 2001, vol. 2, pg. 439. This John Jervas’s father is recorded as ‘John Jones’, presumably a typing error.
24 Pender, A Census of Ireland, Dublin 1939, pg. xvi.
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1654 and in spite of widespread harassment from the authorities had gathered some 6,000 followers from among the English planter population by the late 1680s. The departure of John and Martin coincides with the Williamite wars in Ireland; the planter population was especially vulnerable to attack by the dispossessed native Irish, and their religious conviction forbade the bearing of arms for any cause. West New Jersey, John and Martin’s destination, was intended to be a ‘refuge for persecuted Quakers’, where freedom from religious discrimination was a fundamental tenet of the growing colonies there. The Jervases’ enforced exile is chronicled by one James Parrock, the grandson of a Quaker friend George Goldsmith, in a legal deposition made in Philadelphia in 1751. Goldsmith, like John Jervas, was a Cromwellian soldier granted lands in Ireland; he apparently settled in Ballinakill in Co. Laois before departing for New Jersey in 1681. When John Jervas and his son Martin fled Ireland some years later, they travelled via Boston to Gloucester county in New Jersey, where Goldsmith had settled. John moved on to Cape May on the southernmost tip of New Jersey, which was first settled around 1685 (fig c). Cape May’s earliest inhabitants relied on the whaling industry in Delaware Bay, but the whale population was very soon depleted, and the colony increasingly turned to traditional farming for subsistence. The boundaries for Cape May county were formally established in 1692, the land being owned by a syndicate of forty-eight London merchants known as the West New Jersey Society. John Jervas’s presence there is first recorded in January 1690/91, when he assisted in making an inventory of the estate of...
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the late John Brigs. The following year he was convicted of ‘helping ye Indains to Rum’ in his own home, though the penalty for his misdemeanour is unrecorded. Jervas was a juryman in a post-mortem inquiry in August 1693, and from the following March is referred to as a Justice of the Peace. In this role he handled mainly cases of property transaction or dispute, and the granting of letters of administration. Jervas was evidently also a farmer, as he registered his cattle’s identifying ‘ear mark’ in April 1696. He sold 320 acres ‘near Cape May on the Sound side’ to one John Whitlock in November 1697, which land Jervas had previously bought from George Taylor, the agent of the spectacularly wealthy colonial adventurer Dr. Daniel Coxe (1640-1730). It is quite possible that ‘Jarvis Sound’ in Cape May is the region of land in question.

A conflict in the archival evidence arises over the death of Charles’ father John Jervas. The Prerogative Court (presumably of Armagh) granted on 7 February 1697/98, ‘administration of the goods of John Jervas late of Clonlisk in Kings Co. Gentlemen, died in Cape May in America intestate’, to ‘Charles Jervas of the city of Dublin Gentlemen natural and legitimate son of the said dead to the use of him as of Lucy,

31 William Nelson (ed.), Archives of the State of New Jersey, First Series; Documents Relating To The Colonial History of the State of New Jersey, Volume XXIII; Calendar of New Jersey Wills, vol. 1 (1670-1730), Paterson, New Jersey, 1901, pg. 60. With many thanks to David Tourison of Sheridan, Wyoming, USA, for uploading transcriptions of many of these Cape May official records onto www.ancestry.com, and for tracing further Jervas entries in the records.
32 John Edwin Stillwell, Historical and Genealogical Miscellany: Data Relating to the Settlement and Settlers of New York and New Jersey, New York, 1903, vol. 1, pg. 378. The dating for this entry is unclear, but judging by entries before and after, it appears to fall in the second half of 1692 or early 1693.
33 Ibid, pg. 380 [7 August 1693].
34 Ibid, pg. 381 [20 March 1693/94], 382 [10 April 1694], 384 [19 June 1694], 386 [23 June 1694], 387 [18 September 1694], 388 [8 November 1694], 389 [16 January 1994/95], 389-90 [2 March 1694/95, 19 January 1694/95], 391 [22 April 1695], 392 [17 March 1695/96], 392-93 [15 March 1694/95], 393 [19 March 1695/96], 394 [7 December 1694], 396 [15 September 1696, 13 December 1696, 12 January 1696/97, 17 March 1696/97, 16 January 1696, 19 January 1697/98], 396-97 [11 October 1698], 397 [12 October 1698, 6 April 1697], 400 [1696, 227 October 1698], 401 [1 May 1696].
35 Ibid, pg. 380 [16 April 1696].
36 William Nelson (ed.), Archives of the State of New Jersey, First Series; Documents Relating To The Colonial History of the State of New Jersey, Volume XXI; Calendar of Records in the Office of the Secretary of State (Deeds, Surveys, etc) 1664-1703, Paterson, New Jersey, 1899, pg. 499.
37 Henry D Biddle (ed.) in Extracts from the journal of Elizabeth Drinker from 1759-1807 AD, Philadelphia, 1889, pg. 4 states that John Jervas settled in that part of Cape May now called Jarvis Sound, directly north of Cape May harbour. See fig c.
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Martin, Mary, Mathew, John & Trevor Jervas the natural & lawful children of s[ai]ld. dead’.38 Curiously, the final appearance of Jervas in Cape May, however, occurs in October 1698 – eight months later - when he was still performing the role of JP.39 As both sources (from the Prerogative Court and Cape May county records) are available only in transcription, presumably an error has occurred in one or other to produce this contradiction of dates. In spite of this apparent evidence of John Jervas’s death in c.1697-98, James Parrock testified that Jervas returned to Ireland in 1701, and a will of ‘John Jervis, Rosscorroll,’ King’s county, dated 3 March 1708/09, is lodged with the Registry of Deeds in Dublin, and supports the theory that he returned to and died in Ireland.40 Both the record of administration (1697/09) and will (1709) appear from internal evidence to refer to the same John Jervas, so it must be concluded that his death in Cape May was erroneously reported at the earlier date, and letters of administration granted to his eldest son Charles, and that following his return to Ireland he resumed ownership of his property in King’s county, and died in 1708/09. It is perhaps significant that Charles Jervas’s return from Italy in the winter of 1708-1709 appears to coincide with his father drafting his will.

Little is recorded of Charles’s siblings, apart from his brother Martin who departed for New Jersey with their father c. 1688. ‘Martin Jarvis’ of Gloucester county, appears in the

---

38 The Prerogative Court’s ruling is preserved only in two 19th century abstracts the originals having been destroyed in Dublin’s Custom House in 1921. Thrift Abstracts of Wills, ref. no. 2852, and Betham’s Handlist of Abstracts, series II, vol. 27 (I and J 1661-1759) MF 38/13, pg. 69. Both National Archives, Dublin.
40 The will lists the testator’s surviving children as Charles (eldest son), John, Martin and Mary. The testator bequeaths to his son Charles and the latter’s male heirs, ‘all his real Estate in the Kingdom of Ireland’. His son John Jervis was appointed as executor. This document provides the only mention of the testator’s brother William, described as, ‘late of Battell, county of Sussex’. A William Jervis had petitioned King Charles II c.1662-63, along with two others, for a commission to manage ‘several fishings’ in Ireland; all three petitioners had ‘served the late King in his unhappy wars and have ever since been ready to serve your Majesty’. There is no further information surviving to indicate that this was John Jervas’s brother. Robert Pentland Mahaffy (ed.), Calendar of the State Papers relating to Ireland preserved in the Public Record Office, 1669-1670, with addenda 1625-1670, London, 1910, pg. 674. All the family information from this will and all others mentioned in this chapter are compiled in fig b. 99,195: 68584 certified memorial copy of will. Registry of Deeds, Dublin. P Beryl Eustace, Registry of Deeds, Dublin, Abstract of wills, vol. 1 (1708-1745), Dublin, 1956, pg. 267.
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New Jersey records from January 1696/97, his occupation that of cordwainer (cobbler).

James Parrock’s deposition of 1751 confirms that Martin was a shoemaker, and notes that he married the fellow-Quaker Mary Champion in 1698 and settled in Philadelphia in 1705. Martin’s granddaughter Elizabeth Drinker née Sandwith (1734-1809) kept a diary of her life in Philadelphia between 1759 and 1807, extracts from which have been published.

Marriage and descendants

Jervas married Penelope Hume (d.c.1746) on 14 January 1726/27 in St Benet Paul’s Wharf, near St. Paul’s Cathedral (fig d). Little is known of Penelope’s ancestry, though Vertue noted that ‘Mr Jervais had the good fortune to marry a Gentlewoman with 15 or 20 thousand pounds’. Horace Walpole in Anecdotes of Painting in England states that Penelope was a widow at the time of her marriage to Jervas, which has been repeated by most biographers since, but the contemporary register of their marriage listed Jervas as a bachelor and Hume as a spinster. At the time of her marriage, Penelope was living in the parish of St Mary le Savoy on London’s Strand. Pope, in a rare documentary reference to Mrs. Jervas, wrote to a friend that Jervas had bequeathed him £1,000 in his will; Pope commented that the gift, ‘takes no effect, unless I out live his Widow, which is

---

41 William Nelson (ed.), Archives of the State of New Jersey, First Series; Documents Relating To The Colonial History of the State of New Jersey, Volume XXI; Calendar of Records in the Office of the Secretary of State (Deeds, Surveys, etc) 1664-1703, Paterson, New Jersey, 1899, Gloucester Deeds, no. 3, pg. 375.

42 Henry D Biddle (ed.), Extracts from the journal of Elizabeth Drinker from 1759-1807 AD, Philadelphia, 1889.


45 Walpole Society, Vertue Notebooks, (vol. 3), pg. 59.

46 Microfilm 5718/1 St Benet and St Peter Paul’s Wharf. Register of Marriages 1715-1728, unpaginated. Guildhall Library, City of London. Littledale, The Registers of St Bene’t and St Peter, Paul’s Wharf, pg. 324.
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not very likely, however I think him absolutely in the right in giving nothing from her, to whom he owed almost every thing’. 47 Penelope made her will in August 1743, when she was resident in Somerset House on the Strand, presumably in one of the crown’s grace and favour apartments. 48 She was then receiving a government pension of £50, and on her death was buried in the Chapel Royal in Somerset House. 49 Penelope’s sole executor and main beneficiary of her will, which was proved on 14 January 1746/47, was John Hampden (c.1695-1754). 50

Jervas and Penelope had no recorded children. The celebrated naval officer John Jervis (1735-1823), 1st Earl of St. Vincent was, according to a contemporary newspaper, ‘a Descendant of the celebrated Charles Jervas, the Portrait Painter…[of whose works] it is said, there is not a single one left; for as the Human Race gives Place to rising Generations, so do their Pictures to the new Works of succeeding Artists’. 51 The Earl was the son of Swynfen Jervis (1700-1771) of Meaford in Stone, Staffordshire, whose connection (if any) to Charles Jervas has yet to be established. 52

Homes in London and Middlesex

Jervas’s London home and studio was in Cleveland Court, St. James’s, from at least 1713 until his death. 53 It occupied a section of the former mansion called Berkshire House,

49 James Coleman (ed.), A Copy of the Names of all the Marriages, Baptisms, and Burials which have been solemnized in the Private Chapel of Somerset House, Strand, in the County of Middlesex, extending from 1714 to 1776, London, 1862, pg. 22. The entry reads; ‘1746-47. Mrs. Penelope Hume’.
50 PROB 11/752. Will of Penelope Jarvis [Jervas], dated 11 August 1743, proved 14 January 1746/47. National Archives, Kew.
51 Public Advertiser [newspaper], 2 May 1782, issue 14,929.
53 A letter from Nicholas Rowe to Pope, dated 20 August 1713: ‘To Mr. Pope at Mr. Jervas’s in Cleaveland court by St. James’s house’. Add. 4807 f81v. British Library.
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built in 1626-27 by Thomas Howard, son of the Earl of Suffolk.\textsuperscript{54} The location was immediately north-west of St. James’s Palace, and adjoining the royal deer park of St. James’s Park (the section now known as Green Park) (fig e). The house was then situated in a virtually open landscape, but by the end of the century the areas north and south of Piccadilly were intensively developed with elegant terraces, mansions and squares immediately inhabited by the nobility. Berkshire House and some of the adjacent parcels of land were purchased by King Charles II for his mistress Barbara Villiers (1641-1709) in 1668, and when she was created Duchess of Cleveland two years later, the house took her name. Cleveland House was lavishly renovated at this time, and right-angled east and west wings added which created a large forecourt on the south front. The Duchess sold the house and land to a speculative builder John Rossington in 1689, who soon after severed the two wings, which were further subdivided, creating a series of independent residences on what gradually became known as Cleveland Court.\textsuperscript{55}

Cleveland House itself was leased, and then purchased wholesale in 1700, by John Egerton, (1646-1701), 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl of Bridgwater, and known thereafter as Bridg(e)water House. It was inherited by his son, Scroop Egerton (1681-1745) the following year, who lived there with his wife Elizabeth Churchill, Jervas’s ‘muse’ (CR E1 – E10). Later tenants during Jervas’s time in Cleveland Court were Sir Paul Methuen, the eminent diplomat and statesman (1717-1721) and Charles Townshend (1722-1730), son and heir of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Viscount Townshend, Walpole’s ally. Jervas’s postal address was simply ‘Cleveland

---


\textsuperscript{55} The Poor Rate books from the early 1700s to 1737 refer to the area simply as ‘Over Against the Stables of St. James’s [Palace] Stables’. Cleveland Court, parish of St. James’s, ward of Pall Mall, in the City of Westminster Archive Centre.
Court’ or sometimes ‘Bridgwater House, Cleaveland Court’, but the contemporary Poor Rate books help to locate his home in the north east corner of the Court, at the northern end of the former east wing (fig f, g). His neighbours in the Court (i.e. the east and west wings) included Richard Hill (1655-1727) the diplomat, Heneage Finch (1657–1726) 5th Earl of Winchilsea, William Clayton (1671-1752) (CR Copy13, Copy14), John Hobart (1693-1756), 1st Earl of Buckinghamshire (CR Coll14), members of the Pulteney family (CR P18, P19), and his own close friend James Eckersall.

After Jervas’s death in 1739, his home and studio were taken over by another portraitist, John Robinson (1715-1745). Born in Bath, he trained under John Vanderbank (1694-1739), and Vertue noted in 1745 that he was ‘much cryd up’ for his ‘Imitations and manner of Vandykes’. Robinson married a wealthy bride and found noble patronage early in his career, but incurred the wrath of fellow painters such as Allan Ramsay (1713-1784), Thomas Hudson (1701-1779) and Isaac Whood (1688-1752) who forbade the drapery painter Joseph van Aken (c.1699–1749) from accepting work from him. Few of his portraits survive; that of Lady Charlotte Finch née Fermor (1725-1813), later governess to

---

56 An undated envelope addressed to Pope, presumably dating from the time in which he lived with Jervas at Cleveland Court (between the springs of 1713 and 1714) is inscribed: ‘Mr Pope to be left with Mr Gervaise at Bridgwater house in Cleaveland Court St James’s’. He later used the blank reverse of the envelope to inscribe his translation of part of book 8 of Homer’s Iliad, published as volume 1 in 1715. Add. 4807 f115v. British Library.

57 Poor Rate books 1708-1740 for Cleveland Court, City of Westminster Archive Centre. Jervas is included in these records only for the period 1726-1735, suggesting that he leased rather than owned the property. The Poor Rate collectors listed the heads of households in the Court, working clockwise from the south-west corner property long occupied by members of the Selwyn family. The proposed location of Jervas’s house is supported by the notice in the Evening Post of 15 April 1725, directing subscribers to Pope’s Odyssey to collect their copies from Jervas, ‘next door to the Right Hon. the Lord Viscount Townshend’s’. Townshend leased Cleveland House from the Earl of Bridgwater in the period 1722-1730.

58 References to neighbours are drawn from the contemporary Poor Rate books at the City of Westminster Archive Centre.

59 Lord Hobart lived at Cleveland Court briefly in 1731. Poor Rate books for Cleveland Court, parish of St. James’s, ward of Pall Mall, in the City of Westminster Archive Centre.

60 ‘James’ was James Eckersall (c.1679-1753), a courtier from at least 1708 until his death, (C Sainty and R O Bucholz, Officials of the Royal Household 1660-1837, London, 1997-8) who became a close friend of both Pope and Jervas; the latter bequeathed both men £1,000 in his will.


62 Walpole Society, Vertue Notebooks, (vol. 3), pg. 125.
the children of King George III is in the National Portrait Gallery, dated 1744. Robinson died prematurely of a fever the following year, judged by Vertue to be, ‘a promising genius and a good painter’.64

Bridgwater House was reoccupied by its owner, Scroop Egerton (now 1st Duke of Bridgewater) in 1736. His son Francis (1736-1803), the 3rd Duke, drastically remodelled the house in the 1795-97, and his descendant Francis Egerton (1800-1857), 1st Earl of Ellesmere, razed the property in 1840-41 in order to build a new Bridgwater House (completed in 1854), designed by Sir Charles Barry.65 The east wing of the former Cleveland House, in which Jervas lived, had been entirely destroyed by fire in 1786 or 1787, and the site is now taken up by the southern end of Little St. James’s Street and part of the terrace 3-7 Cleveland Row (fig h, i). The present Bridgwater House gives onto Cleveland Row, and the name Cleveland Court is now used for a passageway off the nearby St. James’s Place (clearly visible in fig f).66

Jervas also owned a house in Hampton, Middlesex, which may in fact have been inherited by his wife. Her cousin John Ireland (d.1725) bequeathed, ‘all my Copyhold Estate at Hampton’, to his aunt Elizabeth Ireland, on her death to be passed to ‘my said Cousins Rachael and Penelope Hume and to their Heires’.67 The Jervases property was known as The Elms or Elm Lodge, and was situated on High Street, just north of Hampton village (fig j, k). They had taken ownership by early 1732 at the latest, as Pope then wrote to an acquaintance that, ‘Mr. Jervas is come hither for his health, to Hampton, & is to reside here some time every week’.68 It was subsequently owned by

63 National Portrait Gallery, London, no. 6205. The portrait was engraved in mezzotint by John Faber Jr – two impressions are held in the National Portrait Gallery, nos. D1949 and D1950.
64 Walpole Society, Vertue Notebooks, (vol. 3), pg. 125.
65 Sheppard, Survey of London, pg. 496-497.
66 This Cleveland Court was in existence, and so-named, since the 1680s, but was distinguished from the larger Cleveland Court to the south by being referred to as ‘Cleveland Court, St. James’s Place’.
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the poet Edward Lovibond (1723-1775). When Horace Walpole visited Lovibond c.1770, he admired the latter’s collection of paintings by Charles and Mary Beale, Cooper, and after Lely, and noted that, ‘the garden seems to have been laid out by Pope after his own [i.e. after Pope’s famous garden at Twickenham].’ At Lovibond’s posthumous sale in 1776, Walpole purchased the Lely copies; these were nineteen copies by Jervas, which Lovibond had bought with The Elms, after Lely’s portraits of Caroline courtiers. A Mrs. Gouldsmith, widow of a London merchant, lived at The Elms in 1800, and a later owner in the 1860s was Lord Charles Fitzroy (1791-1865), son of the 4th Duke of Grafton and subsequently his widow (d.1871). The property was extensively damaged by fire on the night of 5 October 1913, for which two champions of female suffrage, Rachel Peace and Mary Richardson were found guilty. The house had been unoccupied for two years, but was owned by Rosalind Howard (1845-1921), Countess of Carlisle, who was ironically an ardent campaigner for women’s rights. Lady Carlisle sold the site to a builder the following year, The Elms was demolished, and three houses and two bungalows were erected in its place. The suffragette Mary Richardson was also responsible for the mutilation of Velázquez’s The Toilet of Venus (The ‘Rokeby Venus) in the National Gallery in 1914.

---

73 Ibid, pg. 53. Mss ledger of rate payers in Hampton 1850 onwards, London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Studies Collection, Richmond Public Library.
74 The Times, 6 October 1913, pg. 3; 7 October 1913, pg. 3; 14 October 1913, pg. 4; 5 November 1913, pg. 15, 17 November 1913, pg. 3.
75 G D and Joan Heath, ‘The Women’s Suffrage Movement in and around Richmond and Twickenham’, Borough of Twickenham Local History Society, paper 13, 1968, pg. 31-35.
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Visits to Ireland

Jervas is recorded as having made many visits to Ireland from the time he settled in London in 1708-1709. The earliest known was in August 1716, when he bore a letter from Pope to their mutual friend, the poet Thomas Parnell (1679-1718). He was in Dublin in October that year, when Swift wrote to Archdeacon Thomas Walls; ‘Do you hear anything of Jarvis’s going[?] For I hate to be Toun while he is there’. The following month Jervas was his guest in Dublin at the deanery, and Pope congratulated the artist, ‘on the pleasure you must take in being admired in your own Country, which so seldom happens to Prophets and Poets. But in this you have the Advantage of Poets; you are Master of an Art that must prosper and grow rich, as long as people love, or are proud of themselves, or their own persons’. By December he was completing a portrait of Jacky Walls, the Archdeacon’s son, and preparing to return to London (CR W2). On this return journey, he brought a portrait of Parnell to Pope, which the recipient confided to Parnell ‘is infinitely less lively a representation, than that I carry about with me, and which rises to my mind whenever I think of you’.

Soon afterwards, in the summer of 1717, Jervas was back in Ireland for a prolonged stay, and brought many copies of Pope’s just-published third volume of the Iliad for Irish subscribers. He appears to have remained in Ireland for the whole of 1718, and was again a guest of Swift; they dined on ‘Bief [beef] ale &c’ at the deanery in May. By July, Pope chides him that, ‘Every body here [in London] has great need of you. Many Faces

---

78 ‘Dr. Swift, I believe, is a very good Landlord, and a cheerful Host at his own Table’; letter Pope to Jervas dated 14 November 1716. Sherburn, *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*, vol. 1, pg. 371.
81 Letter dated by the editor ‘probably March or April 1717. Sherburn, *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*, vol. 1, pg. 395.
have died for ever for want of your Pencil, and blooming Ladies have wither’d in expecting your return', and entreats the artist; ‘Come then, and having peopled Ireland with a World of beautiful Shadows, come to us’. It was during this visit that Jervas translated Machiavelli’s novella *The Marriage of Belfagor*, which is dated 1719 on the title page, but was probably published in Dublin at the end of 1718. A mutual interest in Jervas’s next and final publication, *Don Quixote*, is alluded to in the spring of 1719, Pope writes, ‘I begin to fear you’ll die in Ireland...I shou’d be apt to think you in Sancho [Panza]’s case; some Duke has made you Governor of an Island, or wet place, and you are administering Laws to the wild Irish’. Jervas was still in Ireland in April 1719, when the Archbishop of Dublin, William King (1650-1729), records a payment of £51.15s to the artist ‘for 2 pictures and frames’ (CR K1, K2). Swift mentions in September 1721 that, ‘Mr. Jervas is gone to England’, which probably represents a separate visit to Ireland, rather than a continuation of the one which began in the summer of 1717. He is further recorded in Ireland in July 1722, the summer of 1729, and finally in 1734.

84 Letter dated 9 July 1716, but the editor agrees that it should probably be dated 9 July 1718. Sherburn, *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*, vol. 1, pg. 347.
87 Ms 751/3 f.95. Trinity College Dublin library.
90 Jervas was back in London by 2 September 1729, his wife having, ‘laid her commands upon me to make all possible haste out of Ireland, & like a most dutiful husband I travell’d day & night, little less than seven hundred miles in five weeks’. Letter Jervas to Mrs. Caesar, 2 September 1729. Sherburn, *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*, vol. 3, pg. 50-51. Also letter Knightley Chetwode to Swift, 10 September 1729. Williams, *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*, vol. 3, pg. 344-345.
91 Letter Jervas to Swift, 24 November 1734. Williams, *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*, vol. 4, pg. 272. In this letter, it is clear that Jervas has recently returned to London from a visit. He was apparently turned away from the deanery when he called on Swift, and writes, ‘If ever I see Dublin again, & you[r] Teague [Irish Catholic, pejorative] ‘scapes hanging so long, I will myself Truss him up, for nonadmittance when you were in a conversible condition.’
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Jervas’s visits to Ireland were prompted by professional, landed, and inevitably also familial interests. Numerous Irish sitters (or more correctly, those members of the ‘New English’ demographic in Ireland) figure among his portrait oeuvre, such as Colonel William Forward of Castle Forward, co. Donegal (CR F11); George Rochfort of Gaulstown, co. Westmeath (CR R2); Robert and Sarah Mason of Masonbrook, co. Galway (CR M5-M7); Gabriel Stokes, Deputy Surveyor-General of Ireland (CR S21), and Thomas Carter, Master of the Rolls in Ireland (CR C53, C54), *inter alia*. Pope’s letters already quoted confirm that Jervas was taking commissions, and ‘being admired’92 in Ireland, though few of Jervas’s Irish subjects can be proven to have been executed in Ireland; Thomas Parnell, William King and Jacky Walls were certainly painted there, and probably also the portraits of the Conollys of Castletown House, co. Kildare (CR C86-88). Other sitters, like the Cosbys of Stradbally, co. Laois (CR C98, F4-F6), Luke Gardiner, Irish MP and property developer *extraordinaire* (CR G1), Mary Grace of Gracefield, co. Laois (CR G62), and Joshua Allen, Viscount Allen of Stillorgan, co. Dublin, (CR A8-A13) could equally have been executed in Jervas’s London studio during his sitters’ visits to that city, or from preliminary sketches made in Ireland.

Jervas’s property in Ireland is largely unrecorded, though it presumably consisted of land in co. Offaly inherited from his father. He may be the Charles Jervas who petitioned the Treasury in 1715, ‘praying to be discharged from a demand of quitrent on certain lands [in Ireland] belonging to him which he alleges are not in any manner liable to pay the same’.93 During his long sojourn in Ireland 1717-c.1719, Jervas was evidently embellishing his demesne, and sent a now-lost description of the works to Pope; the latter responded that, ‘I must own, when you talk of Building and Planting, you touch my Strings’, before discussing his own new home and garden at Twickenham; ‘It is here I hope to receive you, Sir, return’d in triumph from Eternalizing the Ireland of this Age.

93 The Treasury referred the matter to the Lords Justice of Ireland on 1 September 1715, though the original petition is lost. The quit rent system was commonly used by the British government with regard to colonial property, requiring the grantee or leaseholder to pay a regular rental fee to the Treasury. William A Shaw (ed.), *Calendar of Treasury Books, August 1714 – December 1715*, London, 1957, vol. 29, part 2, pg. 718.
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For you my Structures rise; for you my Colonades extend their Wings; for you my Groves aspire, and Roses bloom’. In late 1721, Jervas was embroiled in a dispute, in Swift’s words, ‘about meres [boundaries] and bounds’, with which a fellow-landowner, Knightley Chetwode (1679-1752) in neighbouring co. Laois appears to have had an interest. Its resolution may be indicated in Swift’s letter to Chetwode of the following January, in which he writes, ‘Mr. Jervas writes me word, that Morris Dunn is a person he has turned off his lands, as one that has been his constant enemy, etc. and in short gives him such a character as none can be fond of’.

Knightley Chetwode’s property near Portarlington in Laois was acquired with his marriage to Hester Brooking in 1700, and was renamed Woodbroke (a combination of their surnames). There he built Woodbroke House and laid out the gardens where Swift was a visitor (fig l). Jervas made a visit to the estate in the summer of 1729, of which Chetwode wrote the following account to his friend Swift;

Sir, a person of some figure and distinction [Jervas], whom probably you saw every day you lived when in London, came hither the morning I proposed to acknowledge your favour [i.e. letter] of the 30th; so that I was compelled to lose post to hear him talk of fine pictures, distant prospects, and Elysian fields. He pressed me hard to hasten to England at least; but at last it came almost to Paul and Agrippa [i.e. a rapid conversion], for when I walked him through Versailles’ labyrinth, and through some of my other improvements, [and] that he had gorged himself with what he called better fruit than he eat in England or abroad, [and] flew the hawks at my partridge which in almost every field I sprang for

---

98 A beech grove designed in imitation of one at Versailles. Williams, The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, vol. 3, pg. 345n.
him, he swore I was happier than if crowned, and that he would willingly quit
the world, and come into my retreat.99

Jervas instructed his Irish executors, on the death of his wife Penelope, to sell all his
‘lands and tenements lying in Ireland[,] my stock of cattle great and small’, the proceeds
of which he apportioned as monetary bequests to family and friends.100

Italy 1738-39

Jervas’s second and final visit to Italy was prompted by his ill health. ‘Poor Jervas,
whose Last Breathings are to be transferred to Italy…in hopes of some reprieve for his
Asthma’, wrote Pope to Fortescue in September 1738, on the day Jervas set sail.101 Vertue
recorded that Jervas had by this time been, ‘long in Lingering ill state of health’ but
claims that the artist also had professional motives, and ‘set out to Italy to purchase
pictaintings [sic] for the royal family.’102 Little is known of the time he spent abroad; he
travelled to Rome and Naples overland, Pope remarking on Christmas Day of that year
that Jervas had sent his wife, ‘a most Poetical Letter of his Travels over [the Alps], upon
which I intend to ground my letter to him’.103 While in Rome, he collected his papal
compensation for Raphael’s *Transfiguration* cartoon, which had lain in a bank account
since c.1702 (see chapter 1 pg. 104-108). No acquisitions for the royal collection are
known, but Jervas did purchase Maratti’s portrait of *Pope Clement IX* (1669) which he
sold to Sir Robert Walpole for 200 guineas (see chapter 2 pgs. 135-136). Jervas returned
to London in May 1739, ‘not much better’, according to Vertue.104 Pope concurred, but
wrote that ‘his Spirit retains all its vigor, and he is returned, declaring Life itself not

---

102 Walpole Society, *Vertue Notebooks*, (vol. 3), pg. 93.
104 Walpole Society, *Vertue Notebooks*, (vol. 3), pg. 93.
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worth a Day’s journey at the expense of parting from one’s Friends’. In his final months, he dined with Pope ‘upon a venison pasty’, when they toasted their mutual friend Fortescue, ‘temperately, as to liquor,...for neither he [Jervas] nor I are well enough to drink wine’. Jervas died at his home in Cleveland Court on Friday 2 November 1739, his place of burial as yet unknown.

Will and posthumous sales

On 2 September 1738, six days before departing for Italy, Jervas signed his last will. His ‘dear Wife Penelope Jarvis’ was appointed executrix, supported by a group of no fewer than eight fellow executors, most of them public figures. Among those designated to handle the testator’s assets in Britain were William Fortescue (1687-1749), judge and lifelong friend to John Gay and Pope, who like Jervas enjoyed considerable professional patronage by Robert Walpole (CR W20-W27). Fortescue later told Pope that he ‘could not with any Conveniency act as an Executor’ to Jervas’s will, though the circumstances of his indisposition are unknown. John Hampden (c.1695-1754) of Great Hampden in

---

108 The following registers of burials have been consulted: Rolls Chapel; St. Anne, Soho; St. Clement Danes; St. George, Hanover Square; St. James, Piccadilly; St. James, Sussex Gardens; St. Margaret, Westminster; St. Martin-in-the-Fields; St. Mary le Strand; St. Marylebone; St. Paul, Covent Garden; Savoy Chapel; Somerset House Chapel Royal; Temple Church (all registers in the City of Westminster Archives Centre); St. Mary’s Church, Hampton, Middlesex (London Metropolitan Archives); Joseph Lemuel Chester (ed.), The marriage, baptismal, and burial registers of the collegiate church of abbey of St. Peter, Westminster [i.e. Westminster Abbey], London, [The Harleian Society, publications vol. 10], 1876; John W Clay (ed.), The Registers of St. Paul’s Cathedral, London, [The Harleian Society, registers vol. 26] 1899.
109 The document was witnessed by John Carter ('New Palace Yard, carpenter and joyner'), Thomas Bishop ('Spring Garden...citizen and joyner') and John Bell ('Kings Street Saint Giles’s, carpenter and joyner'). All the following quotes from Jervas’s will are from PROB 11/699. Will of Charles Jarvis [Jervas].
Buckinghamshire was another executor, great grandson of the celebrated parliamentarian John Hampden (1594-1643), ‘The Patriot’. Hampden was related to the Earl of Buckingham, which explains the presence of a copy of Jervas’s will in the Earls’ archive.\textsuperscript{112} Hampden was subsequently Penelope Jervas’s sole executor, and so inherited several works by the artist which were sold in his own posthumous sale in 1754.\textsuperscript{113} Jervas’s first cousin William Baldwin (d.1739) of Meriden Hall, Warwickshire, was both an executor and beneficiary, recipient of the testator’s ‘several lands and tenements’ in Meriden. The copy of Jervas’s will among the Digby archive, which family inherited Meriden Hall in the 1760s, was presumably originally entrusted to Baldwin in his capacity as executor.\textsuperscript{114} William Monck ‘of Cork Street’ and John Tovey ‘of Lancaster Court in the Strand’ complete this group of British executors. Tovey’s ‘honour and integrity’ are specifically mentioned in the will, and he was bequeathed ‘the ground and houses in Denmark Court our third part…[as a] right token of gratitude for his generous behaviour in the Execution of [Penelope Jervas’s] cousin John Ireland’s will’.\textsuperscript{115} All the individual legacies named in Jervas’s will were to be gifted only after the death of his widow. These included £1,000 to Lady Mary Clarke (c.1685-1754), ‘daughter of my old friends James and Elizabeth Clarke of Whitehall’, and the same to each of Lady Mary’s three daughters.\textsuperscript{116} James Clarke’s great nephew, ‘William Clarke now of

\textsuperscript{112} Hampden was second cousin to John Hobart (1695-1756), 1\textsuperscript{st} Earl of Buckinghamshire, whose sons George and Henry are mention in Hampden’s will. As no significant relationship (other than professional) between the Earls of Buckinghamshire and Jervas can be established, it is likely that the latter’s will was among Hampden’s papers, which found their way into the Buckinghamshire archive. D-MH/26/4, Centre for Buckinghamshire Studies, Aylesbury. Romney Sedgwick, The House of Commons 1715-1754, London, 1970, pg. 103-104.

\textsuperscript{113} ‘Sale catalogues of the Principal Collections of Pictures sold by auction in England with in the years 1711–1759’. Pressmark 86.00.18, vol. 1, pg. 446-447, National Art Library, V&A.

\textsuperscript{114} MS 3887/B/173. Will of Charles Jarvis [Jervas], last page only, dated 2 September 1738, Birmingham City Archives. See also Jervas’s relations with the Digby family explored in chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{115} Denmark Court was parallel to the Strand, on the north side, between the Strand and Covent Garden. It was cleared in the 1830s, and incorporated into Exeter Street . George Gater and E P Wheeler, The Survey of London volume 18, The Strand: the parish of St. Martin-in-the-Fields part 2, London, 1937, pg. 126.

\textsuperscript{116} James Clarke (c.1634-1709) held the Irish offices of constable of Dublin Casle, store-keeper of the Dublin custom house, and Comptroller of the Lord Lieutenant’s household (Edward Wedlake Brayley, A Topographical History of Surrey, London, 1850, vol. 2, pg. 303-304, 310-311). He was a member of the Chandry sub-department in the royal household 1674-1685, which department supplied the court with candles. He was appointed Second Clerk of the Kitchen in 1689, and from the following year until his death in 1709 was First Clerk of the Kitchen (R O Bucholz (project director), The Database of Court Officers 1660-1837, Household
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Constantinople’ was gifted £100. His old friends Alexander Pope (1688-1744) and James Eckersall (c.1679-1753),\(^{117}\) were each gifted £1,000. Pope expressed his surprise at the bequest to Hugh Bethel, writing that, ‘I had not the least imagination of such a thing...It is the first Legacy I ever had, & I hope I shall never have another at the expense of any man’s life, who would think so kindly of me’.\(^{118}\) Jervas made provision for his servants the brothers William and Francis (Frank) Waters, Thomas Jones, Robert Field, Catherine Beevor and her niece Elizabeth (Betty) Uthwat,\(^{119}\) as well as his wife’s aunt, also called Penelope Hume.

Jervas appointed three separate executors, all Irish-born lawyers, to assist his wife in settling his Irish estate. Thomas Marlay (c.1678-1756) of Celbridge Abbey, then Chief Baron of the Irish Exchequer, was one, and Jervas gifted £500 each to his two daughters.\(^{120}\) The second was Thomas Carter (1690-1763), Master of the Rolls, and a major landowner in counties Kildare, Meath, and Offaly (CR C53, C54).\(^{121}\) His two daughters were each bequeathed £1,000. John Maxwell (1687-1759) of College Hall, county Armagh, was the final executor; MP for Cavan between 1727 and 1756, he was

---

\(^{117}\) Eckersall, like James Clarke, also held various court office in the royal kitchens. See chapter 5 footnote 11 for biographical note.


\(^{119}\) Jervas had two servants by the name of Frank and Betty when Pope was staying at Cleveland Court in 1718; he wrote to Jervas, then in Ireland, that ‘Frank and Betty (that constant Pair) cannot console themselves for your Absence; I fancy they will be forced to make their own Picture in a pretty Babe, before you come home: ‘Twill be a noble Subject for a Family Piece’ (Sherburn, *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*, vol. 1, pg. 347; letter dated 9 July 1716, but the editor agrees that it should probably be dated 9 July 1718). Thomas Jones and Robert Field remained in the household after Jervas’s death, as they are mentioned in Penelope Jervas’s will of 1743, and one of her witnesses was William Waters (PROB 11/752. Will of Penelope Jarvis [Jervas], dated 11 August 1743, proved 14 January 1746/47. National Archives, Kew).


created Baron Farnham of Farnham in county Cavan in 1756. Jervas instructed his Irish executors to sell all his ‘lands and tenements lying in Ireland[,] all my stock of cattle great and small’, in order to provide bequests to his Irish-based family and acquaintances. His first cousin Catherine Baldwin’s four daughters were to receive £500 each (CR M10-M11), and monetary bequests were also made to the children of his siblings Martin (‘of Pensylvania’), John (‘of Clonlisk’) and Mary. The five daughters of Lady Elizabeth Handcock, widow of Sir William Handcock (1654-1701) were gifted one hundred pounds each, ‘for their father and mothers sake’. The will was proved on 3 December 1739, just over a month after Jervas’s death, when letters of administration were granted to his widow.

Jervas left his household goods, plate, jewels, furniture, coach and horses to his wife, as well as, ‘a score of pictures of our friends or relations done my myself’. Regarding the rest of his massive art collection, he left specific directions that his executors;

- do sell or cause to be sold all my collection of pictures, drawings, ivory, basso-rilievos of flamingo with models in terracotta of him[,] enamell’d Urbino-Ware by Raphaels Scholars[,] cartoons of Domenichino[,] Carlo Maratti and Niccolo Berettoni and others with all my prints whether loose or bound in books and [I] would have the sale of the above mentioned particulars after due public notice to be as soon as conveniently may be after my decease.

Less than two months after his death, a notice in The London Daily Post and General Advertiser of 29 December 1739, announced that the sale of Jervas’s, ‘most valuable Collection of Pictures, Prints, Drawings, Busto’s, Basso-Relievo’s, Alto-Relievo’s in

---

123 Catherine was married to Thomas Meredyth (c.1680 or 82-1731/32).
124 William Handcock, an Irish-born lawyer, was MP for Boyle (co. Roscommon) 1692-1693, and for Dublin city 1695-1699. He was Recorder of Dublin from 1695 until his death six years later, and knighted on 6 January 1699/1700 in Dublin Castle by the Lord Justices of Ireland. He married Elizabeth Coddington in 1685, and she married secondly James Forth (1677-1731). Her five daughters are named in the will as ‘Mrs Griffith, Mrs Jane Han[d]cock Elizabeth Forth, Mary Forth and Mrs. Dorothy Forth’. Johnston-Liik, History of the Irish parliament, vol. 4, pg. 359; Shaw, The Knights of England, vol. 2, pg. 271.
125 PROB 11/699. Will of Charles Jarvis [Jervas].
Ivory, most exquisitely done by Fiamingo, Albano; enamell’d Ware painted by Raphael and his Disciples; Models and Plaisters of the most eminent Painters and Sculptors, both ancient and modern’, was to take place the following February. The sale was held in Jervas’s Cleveland Court home, and commenced, later than announced, on 11 March 1739/40 (fig m). The auctioneer was John Heath (d.1762) who later sold the collection of the Duke of Richmond in 1751, though the absence of his name from Jervas’s sale catalogue, and so presumably others, prevents an examination of his career. Over nine days between 11 and 20 March 1739/40, the sale of oil paintings took place, in which 657 lots were offered. The catalogue’s frontispiece was drawn and engraved by Gerard Vandergucht (1696/97-1776), and shows a pyramidal tomb on which a putto is chiseling the artist’s name, and title of the sale (fig n). An allegory of painting, bearing a palette and brushes, rests a hand on a relief portrait of Jervas in profile (fig o). Around the tomb lie relics of Classical civilisation, and Trajan’s column can be seen in the background.

The first four lots together represent forty-four ‘Cloths on Frames, with various Heads unfinish’d’, presumably from Jervas’s studio. 120 of the lots were specified as copies by Jervas after various artists, largely Van Dyck, Guido Reni, and Maratti, and a further 91 lots were copies in which the copyist is unnamed, but was most likely Jervas (or his studio). Few of the paintings were identified as original works by Jervas, but they

---

126 London Daily Post and General Advertiser, Saturday 29 December 1739, issue 1616, unpaginated. The same notice was repeated in the paper on Thursday 3 January 1739/40, issue 1619, unpaginated.

127 Heath’s name does not appear on the sale catalogue, but a further announcement of the sale published in the Daily Post newspaper, Thursday 28 February 1739/40, issue 6388, unpaginated, is signed ‘J. Heath, Auctioneer’. Heath’s own posthumous sale included, ‘Several Whole length Pictures, ad vivam, of Illustrious Persons’, by Jervas, presumably acquired by the auctioneer at the time of Jervas’s sale (Gazetteer and London Daily Advertiser, Saturday 24 July 1762, issue 10,355, unpaginated, the same sale notice repeated in that newspaper on Tuesday 27 July 1762, issue 10,377). No copy of Heath’s own sale catalogue appears to have survived.

128 This frontispiece has been removed or excluded from the two Heath sale catalogues i.e. the (1) pictures sale and (2) the prints and drawings sale, in the British Library but can be seen in the Christopher Cock sale catalogue of 1741 (the copy held by the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, Netherlands). However, inscribed on a fallen pediment to the right of the composition are the words ‘Heath auctioneer’, so the print must have been used originally for the two earlier sales, rather than commissioned and added for Cock’s sale.
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include portraits of his friends Swift (lots 23, 80, 371) and Parnell (lots 80, 579) and his early patron John Norris, joiner in the royal household (lots 423, 577). Other works catalogued as being by Jervas, such as lot 133 ‘The Angels appearing to the Shepherds’, and lot 308 ‘Job restored to great Riches’, were possibly original compositions in the field of history painting, but more likely were further copies. The remaining paintings offered for sale were attributed to a range of old masters, such as Titian, Michelangelo, Caracci, Rubens, Teniers, Rembrandt, Poussin, Maratti and his follower Berrettoni. Among the British-based artists are works by Van Dyck, Lely, Soest, and Dobson, but few artists who could be called Jervas’s contemporaries are represented; paintings by Giuseppe Chiari, whom he must have known in Rome, and Francesco Solimena, who was working in Naples during both of his visits to Italy, are included in the sale. One work each by Kneller, Antoine Watteau (1684-1721), Nicolas Lancret (1690-1743), Simon Verelst (c.1644-1721), the still life painter John van Son (d.1700) and four by the van de Velde family are the only other works by Jervas’s contemporaries. The average lot price (for all 657 lots, including the non-paintings) was £6.10s approximately, but the highest price achieved was £88.4s for a painting was ‘A Capital Landskip, with Ruins, Figures and Cattle, a Sunset, by Claude Lorainese [Lorrain]’, which was bought by the artist Bartholomew Dandridge (1691-c.1755).

This sale also included a selection of non-picture lots. The carvings by Fiamingo, specifically mentioned in both Jervas’s will and the cover of the sale catalogue, were offered on the last two days of the sale. The sculptor was François Du Quesnoy (1597-1643), a Flemish artist (hence the name il Fiammingo) who worked in Rome from 1618 until his death. Du Quesnoy studied ancient and modern sculpture in the city’s

---

129 Lot 579 is described as ‘Archdeacon Parnel and another Head, and the Repose in Egypt’, the artist(s) are not named, but the portrait of Parnell is assumed to be by Jervas. This lot was bought by Alexander Pope for five shillings. SM 1536, Glasgow University Library Special Collections holds a copy of Jervas’s picture (i.e. 11-20 March1739/40) sale catalogue, annotated with all the buyers and prices achieved.

130 Lot 121, ‘Lewis the XIVth painted for King Charles IIId, by Sir Go. Kneller’. The dimensions of the painting are given as 8ft 9in by 5ft 9in.

collections, accompanied by Poussin when the latter arrived in Rome in 1624, and occasionally engaged in ‘restoring’ missing elements to classical fragments (e.g. the ‘Rondanini Faun’ in the British Museum). His varied oeuvre, in wax, plaster, terracotta, marble, ivory and bronze was popular with elite Roman patrons, including Pope Urban VIII and he collaborated with Bernini on the baldacchino in St. Peter’s basilica (1624-1633).

The lots attributed to him in Jervas’s sale include alto- and basso-relievos and small scale busts mainly of boys, in his full range of media. Fifteen of the eighteen lots by Du Quesnoy achieved relatively low prices (an average of £1.3s.2d), but the final three, all elaborate ivory alto-relievos, were bought by ‘Whaley’, along with a desk and bookcase, for the sum of £127.11s.6d.

Also mentioned on the catalogue cover are the ‘curious Albano enamel’d Ware, in Vases, Ewers, Cisterns, Dishes, Plates, &c. painted by Raphael and his Disciples’. The catalogue does indeed attribute the painting of many of these items, now known as majolica, to that master, but they would have been executed in established centres such as Urbino, Gubbio and Deruta drawing on motifs from the oeuvre of Raphael and his followers.

Another contemporary collector in England was Sir Andrew Fountaine (1676-1753) who was in Rome in the spring and summer of 1702, coinciding with both Jervas and the Duke of Shrewsbury. The picture sale also included a small quantity of furniture (sconces, mirrors, display cases, etc), intaglios, four pistols (lot 645-655), and a suit of armour (lot 657).

---

132 Lots 526-534; 610-612; 614-615; 617.
133 ‘Whaley’ bought lots 639, 640, 641 (these the Du Quesnoy ivories) along with 642, ‘a Maple-desk and Book-case, with Looking-glass Doors’. Of the three alto-relievos, lot 639 was a bacchanalian scene, lots 640 and 641, which were framed with lapis lazuli, being biblical in subject matter.
134 Fountaine’s collection of majolica was sold in 1884. See Andrew Moore, Norfolk and the Grand Tour. Eighteenth century travellers abroad and their souvenirs, exhibition catalogue, Norwich, Norwich Castle Museum, Norwich, 1985, no. 23-35. Jervas’s sale included 56 lots of majolica.
All the buyers in this sale are recorded in a surviving annotated copy of the catalogue.\textsuperscript{135} The wealthy diplomat Sir Paul Methuen (c.1672-1757) bought eighteen lots, mainly copies by Jervas, but also works by Salvator Rosa, Rubens and the painter of battle scenes Jacques Courtois (1621-c.1676), known as 'il Borgognone'. Other aristocratic buyers included Thomas Coke (1697-1759), Earl of Leicester, and Sir William Wyndham (c.1688-1740), as well as Lords Cowper, Castlemaine, Cholmondeley, Conway, Cobham and Essex. Sir Robert Walpole’s long-standing agent John Ellis (1701-1757) was present to purchase on his behalf, and acquired Rembrandt’s \textit{Portrait of an Old Woman} (then called \textit{Rembrandt’s Wife}) for £58.16s (lot 279) and lot 401, described as ‘Venus with Cupids, Chariot and Doves, all the Boys from Models of Fiamingo, by A. Sacchi’, for £52.10s (chapter 2, fig 2g). These last two works, now in the Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, are the only items from Jervas’s vast collection which retain their provenance.\textsuperscript{136}

Several contemporary artists also made purchases at the sale; George Knapton (1698-1778) bought three small models,\textsuperscript{137} and Bartholomew Dandridge four lots including a set of Jervas copies of the Hampton Court Raphael cartoons.\textsuperscript{138} Gerard Vandergucht and Arthur Pond (1701-1758), both being artists and dealers, made several purchases each, as did the architect James Gibbs (1682-1754) who was in Rome with Jervas at the start of the century. Presumably a number of other buyers were professional art dealers, though the surnames Baldwin, Meredyth, and Whalley also recur, and may represent members of the deceased artist’s family.\textsuperscript{139}

\textsuperscript{135} SM 1536, Glasgow University. Copies of this catalogue, Lugt no. 498, can also be found in the British Library ref. C.199.h.3.14 and the Frick Art Reference Library, New York. Some of the prices and buyers are recorded in the Houlditch MSS ‘Sale Catalogues of the Principal Collections of Pictures sold by auction in England within the years 1711 – 1759’, bound volumes, pressmark 86.00.18, vol. 1. National Art Library, V&A Museum.


\textsuperscript{137} Lots 620, 621 and 625.

\textsuperscript{138} Lots 383, 392 (the cartoons), 431 and 649.

\textsuperscript{139} For Jervas’s relations to Baldwins, Meredyths, and Whalleys, see family tree fig b.
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The sale of prints and drawings commenced immediately after the paintings sale, on Monday 24 March 1739/40, the catalogue mapping out twenty five successive days for the sale of these items. Heath’s sale of the prints and drawings, however, was halted after the third day, and a third and final sale of Jervas’s collection was held on the premises of the renowned auctioneer Christopher Cock in Covent Garden a year later, on 2 April 1741. Cock was a pioneering salesman, successfully establishing his auction house in the early 1720s, and handling estates sales of Kneller (1726) and Thornhill (1734), as well as other artists, professional collectors and members of the nobility. Cock’s sale reused Heath’s prints and drawings catalogue, announcing on the cover that the sale was, ‘beginning with the Fourth Day’s Sale’, and was held on the successive twenty-two days, starting each day at 5.30pm.

Vertue, while silent on the subject of Jervas’s picture sale, was clearly impressed by the later prints and drawings sale. He notes that Jervas had boasted, ‘to all persons of Quality &c.’, that his collection of drawings was worth ten thousand pounds, but that ‘he had not time to look into them nor leisure to shew them – they wanting order, and digestion, therefore they cou[l]d not be seen’. Vertue surmised, however, that Jervas himself had catalogued the collection for sale, a formidable undertaking in view of the sheer quantity of items. The prints and drawings sale, over twenty-five days, offered

---

140 Copies of Heath’s prints and drawings catalogue, Lugt no. 513, can be found in the British Library C.199.h.3.15 and the Bibliothèque Nationale de France.
141 Vertue confirms that Jervas’s ‘sale of Drawings being refered from the last year tho begun at his house were all sold at Cocks….the sale of these drawings began in the begining of April and finishd the first of May 1741’ (Walpole Society, Vertue Notebooks, (vol. 3), pg. 102-103). All previous accounts of Jervas’s sales have been confused as to the dates on which they took place, presumably caused by the year-long postponement, change of venue, and Christopher Cock’s re-issue of Heath’s drawings catalogue. Harold Williams (ed.) in Jonathan Swift. Journal to Stella, Oxford, 1948, vol. 2, pg. 696, states that the ‘remainder’ of Jervas’s works were sold in April 1747, after Penelope Jervas’s death, but no source is given, and no further evidence of such a sale has yet been found. Walpole in Anecdotes of Painting, vol. 4, pg. 14 also noted that ‘the rest’ of Jervas’s collection was sold after his widow’s death.
143 The following analysis of Jervas’s prints and drawings sale combines the first three days sale executed by John Heath 24-26 March 1740 and the twenty-two days sale executed by Christopher Cock 2 April-1 May 1741.
144 Walpole Society, Vertue Notebooks, (vol. 3), pg. 102.
145 Ibid, pg. 102-103.
2,454 lots, and as most lots comprised multiple items these represented an extraordinary
16,267 separate art works. Large numbers of sketches attributed to Maratti (‘unfinisht
thoughts of which Jervis was very fond’), according to Vertue,\(^{146}\) and his
followers Chiari and Berrettoni were offered. As in the paintings sale, sketches
attributed to and after Raphael, Titian, Poussin, Michelangelo, Rubens, Rembrandt, and
many other old masters form the main body of this sale. Interspersed among these are
202 lots of drawings credited to Jervas. Among the engravings are many series, such as
‘The Luxembourg-Gallery, compleat, 1710’,\(^{147}\) and various published set of the Hampton
Court cartoons.\(^{148}\) Vertue noted how Jervas bought ‘heaps of drawings’ of mixed quality
while on the continent, which, when displayed to potential buyers at this sale, were ‘so
numerous that they quite disgusted allmost all the Curious Collectors and [that] was a
reason they came not to the salle for fear of loading themselves with so much trash’.\(^{149}\)
Only a single item from the prints and drawings sale can be firmly identified, described
by Vertue as a quick sketch of ‘a Family piece by Vandyck’, which is now in the
Stedelijk Prentenkabinet in Antwerp (fig p).\(^{150}\) That lot was bought by Lord Pembroke,
but no other buyers are recorded. The final day’s sale was comprised entirely of studio
equipment; brushes, canvases, cartons of paper and many parcels of colours.\(^{151}\) Vertue
uncharitably remarked that Jervas’s, ‘Irish Callculation only differd from 10 thousand to
short of 10 hundred for all his drawings, prints, Colours and painting Utensils’,\(^{152}\) while
the paintings sale had made £4,284.13s.6d.\(^{153}\)

\(^{146}\) Walpole Society, *Vertue Notebooks*, (vol. 3), pg. 103.
\(^{147}\) Day 14, lot 510.
\(^{148}\) For example, ‘The Cartoons of Raphael, by Griblin’ (day 6, lot 276) and ‘[The Cartoons of Raphael]
Metzotinto’s, by Simon’ (day 8, lot 327). Jervas had also acquired a hundred of Dorigny’s preparatory
drawings for his superior engraved set of the cartoons, having bought them from the artist’s posthumous
sale (Walpole Society, *Vertue Notebooks*, (vol. 3), pg. 103).
\(^{149}\) Walpole Society, *Vertue Notebooks*, (vol. 3), pg. 102.
\(^{150}\) Vertue copies the sketch into his notebook, which has enabled identification. The sketch was sold at the
Wilton House sale in 1917, and bought by C. Fairfax Murray. John Rowlands, ‘Sketch for a Family Group by
Van Dyck’, *Master Drawings*, vol. 8, no. 2 [Summer 1970], pg. 162-166, 224.
\(^{151}\) Most of the artists’ equipment is transcribed in M. Kirby Talley, ‘Extracts from Charles Jervas’s ‘Sale
Catalogues’ (1739): An Account of Eighteenth-century Painting Materials and Equipment’, *Burlington
magazine*, vol. 120. no. 898 [January 1978], pg. 6-11.
\(^{152}\) Walpole Society, *Vertue Notebooks*, (vol. 3), pg. 103.
\(^{153}\) The total is recorded in SM 1536, Glasgow University.
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The sale catalogues demonstrate that Jervas’s collection, the bulk of which appears to have been acquired on the continent, was composed of art works by established old masters and their schools. They, and the numerous oil and sketch copies by Jervas, must have served both as material for sale and as study aids for his own artistic practice. The inclusion of so many packets of colours and other equipment may also point to his having supplied other artists with these materials, or perhaps indicates the scale of his studio.

Artistic training, influences and conventions

Unfortunately little is known of Jervas’s artistic training. There is no evidence to suggest that it began in Ireland, and no apprenticeship was ever registered with the Guild of St. Luke’s in Dublin.\textsuperscript{154} Vertue recorded, cryptically, that Jervas ‘learnt or rather dwel’d with Kneller, one year’, adding that it was with Kneller that ‘he first was put to study painting’ (my emphasis). Certainly no apprenticeship was established, with Kneller or any other master, via the London Guild of St. Luke.\textsuperscript{155} Assuming that the brief period with Kneller was just before or during Jervas’s access to the royal collection’s Raphael cartoons in 1694,\textsuperscript{156} it coincides with a particularly frenetic period in Sir Godfrey’s career. The latter had held the post of sole Principal Painter to the King and Queen since 1691, and also managed London’s pre-eminent private practice, holding fourteen sittings in a single day in June 1693.\textsuperscript{157} A sizeable and organised studio must have supported his enormous output, though very little is known of its extent or makeup. By March 1695,


\textsuperscript{155} Ms 5669, Worshipful Company of Painter-Stainers. Register of apprentice bindings, vol 1 (1666-1797). Ms 5668, Worshipful Company of Painter-Stainers. Register of freedom admissions (1658-1820). Both London Guildhall. Kneller does not appear to have used the Guild to formalise apprenticeships. In George Goldsmith’s legal deposition made in Philadelphia in 1751 (see pg. 7), Goldsmith stated that Charles Jervas was ‘bound an apprentice’ to a limner in London; this may be a reference to his training with Kneller. Myers, \textit{Immigration of the Irish Quakers}, pg. 386, 3n.

\textsuperscript{156} See chapter 3, pg. 156-158.
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Jervas had established himself as an independent practitioner, with a studio on Long Acre in Covent Garden (fig q).\textsuperscript{158}

Kneller was, for Jervas and all this contemporaries, an overwhelming influence, ‘the Morning star for all other Portrait Painters in his Time to follow’.\textsuperscript{159} Jervas did not challenge the conventions which his one-time master had established, and drew heavily on the latter’s example for settings, poses and group compositions. Vertue believed that early in his career Jervas was influenced by Gerard Soest (c.1600-1681), and ‘immitated [his] manner much in drawing and colouring remarkably – in many of Mens heads by the life’.\textsuperscript{160} With one exception [CR P17], Jervas’s early oeuvre (pre-1709) is now lost so it is impossible to assess this comment, but Soest’s distinctive handling of paint and sensitive, solemn, characterisation appear distant from Jervas’s more formulaic society portraits. Jervas’s bold use of colour contrasts however may owe something to the Dutch painter (e.g. CR S1, W3). More obvious stylistic influences include Van Dyck and Titian for thinly painted opalescent fabric effects (e.g. CR N3, Y1). Vertue also comments that Jervas’s studies after Guido Reni, made in Rome, ‘had made so strong an impression in his mind – that he generally applyd those Ideas [to] most portraits of Ladyes’\textsuperscript{161} He continues that owing to Jervas’s reliance on these sketches and copies, and ‘for want of true drawing of Nature, his pictures wanted just likeness and natural Tincture of colouring, so much the principal & most valuable part of portrait painting.’ Many other contemporaries offered harsh critiques of the artist’s work. Vertue likens this style to, ‘fan painting…of beautiful colours but no blood in them or natural heat or warmness.’\textsuperscript{162}

Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, a patron, jested in a letter from Adrianople that on visiting a female \textit{bagnio} in Sophia and seeing the bathers;

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{158} ‘Mr. Jarvis, Long-Acre’ appears in an advertisement listing London’s ‘Life’ [portrait] painters, the advertisement appearing in the newspaper \textit{Collection for Improvement of Husbandry and Trade} on 29 March, 26 April and 16 August 1695.
  \item \textsuperscript{159} Walpole Society, \textit{Vertue Notebooks}, (vol. 2), pg. 121.
  \item \textsuperscript{160} Walpole Society, \textit{Vertue Notebooks}, (vol. 4), pg. 166.
  \item \textsuperscript{161} Walpole Society, \textit{Vertue Notebooks}, (vol. 3), pg. 99.
  \item \textsuperscript{162} \textit{Ibid}, pg. 17.
\end{itemize}
in the state of nature, that is, in plain English, stark naked.... I had wickedness enough to wish secretly that Mr Gervase could have been there invisible. I fancy it would have very much improved his art to see so many fine women naked, in different postures, some in conversation, some working, others drinking coffee or sherbet, and many negligently lying on their cushions...\footnote{Letter to an unidentified recipient, dated 1 April 1717. Jack, Malcolm (ed.), \textit{Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, The Turkish Embassy Letters}, London, 1994, pg. 59.}

A rare insight into another patron’s experience is given by Lady Strafford in a letter to her husband in 1711. On returning from a visit to Jervas’s studio she wrote of their portraits, ‘I like them worse than ever I did, for he has made a Dwarf of you and a Giant of me, and he has not touched the dressing of them sence you went.’ She reported four months later that, ‘he has mended them [the portraits] both extremely and has made yours a good deal taller and the robes are well of them both’.\footnote{Letters dated 27 November 1711 and 21 March 1711/12. James J Cartwright, \textit{The Wentworth Papers 1705-1739}, London, 1883, pg. 213, 279.} Kneller supposedly quipped, on hearing that Jervas had purchased a new coach, ‘Ah, mein Gott, if his horses do not draw better than he does, he will never get to his journey’s end’.\footnote{Richard Goulding and C K Adams, \textit{Catalogue of the Pictures belonging to His Grace the Duke of Portland, K G}, Cambridge, 1936, pg. 453.} Horace Walpole was characteristically savage in his assessment, declaring that Jervas was ‘defective in drawing, colouring, composition, and even in that most necessary, and perhaps most easy talent of a portrait-painter, likeness’.\footnote{Walpole, \textit{Anecdotes of Painting}, vol. 4, pg. 12.}

Jervas’s figures do often have a stiff, flat quality, and he relied on a small repertoire of poses and props which recur within his oeuvre. Certain unique motifs are used repeatedly, such as ‘folded’ (rather than curled) fingers (e.g. CR M16), and a triangular toe of slipper peeping from beneath a gown (e.g. CR D21, S4). His male sitters are generally depicted in contemporary dress (or official/honorific robes), most commonly in a three-quarter length format with a limited number of conventional poses and backgrounds (frequently including a distant vista). The individuality often found in his
male sitters is generally subsumed in his female portraits, which conform to a recognisable ideal, and are also therefore more identifiably by his hand (or studio). The origin of his female archetype was widely recognised by his contemporaries; Lady Strafford believed the unsatisfactory progress in Jervas’s portraits of her and her husband was due to his being, ‘so ingaged with the Marlborough daughters that he minds no body else’. 167 The four daughters of the 1st Duke and Duchess of Marlborough, Henrietta (1681-1733), Anne (1684-1716), Elizabeth (1688-1714) and Mary (1689-1751) were famously beautiful society ladies. Jervas portrayed each (and their husbands and children) many times, 168 but contemporary accounts reveal that the short-lived Elizabeth, Countess of Bridgwater, was the epitome of femininity for her generation, and was revered by Jervas. Horace Walpole suggested that the artist, ‘ventured to look on that fair one with more than a painter’s eyes’, continuing that, ‘so entirely did the lovely form possess his imagination, that many a homely dame was delighted to find her picture resemble lady Bridgwater’. 169 William Ayre recorded this anecdote in 1745;

[Jervas] once drew the Picture of a Lady of Quality, who return’d it on his Hands, as not thinking it so handsome as she herself was, and he painted another Portrait for her, with which she was exceedingly pleas’d, for it was very beautiful; Mr. Jervas confess’d, that except the Colour of the Hair, and a few Reiterations, (that there might be, though ever so distant, some Resemblance) he had taken it from one of his own Pictures of the Dutchess [sic] of Bridgewater, one of the Duke of Marlborough’s Daughters, and esteem’d at that Time a finish’d Beauty. 170

Jervas even included his own self portrait in a whole length portrait commission of Lady Bridgwater (CR E6).

168 CR G57-G60; E1-E12; M21-M34; S14-S20; Group1.
The uniformity among Jervas’s female sitters can be evinced in the distinctive profile of the hair, usually including a short lock over the forehead and curling tresses following the contour of the neck (e.g. CR S1, W37). As with his male sitters, the female poses are limited, though the more animated forms or gestures serve to emphasise their strained, frozen nature. The facial features, particularly the eyes and chin, are depicted in a uniquely characteristic manner, in both form and painterly style; Jervas sculpting the face with many tones for a soft, blended effect. In accordance with the convention practised by Kneller, D’Agar, Aikman, Dahl, Richardson and other contemporaries, Jervas clothed his female sitters in loose, monochrome robes, sometimes with the addition of a mantle around the shoulders to add extra colour and depth. Walpole scorned this fancy, writing that these women appeared to have ‘just risen from the bath, and ...[have] found none of their cloaths to put on, but a loose gown’.171 Jervas occasionally added a metal girdle or jewelled fastening to these otherwise unadorned gowns. Also in accordance with established modes, his female sitters had the liberty to assume fanciful personae, and Jervas enjoyed particular fame for his ‘shepherdesses’. Two of his earliest portraits, executed between his return from Italy in the winter of 1708-1709, and April 1709 were of ‘Clarrisa’ (probably Honora Chetwynd CR C67) as a shepherdess and ‘Chloe’ (probably Mary Hales CR C66) as a ‘country girl’.172 This vogue can be traced to Van Dyck and Lely, but also aligns with the imagery of the Roman noblewoman St. Agnes, patron saint of the betrothed, whose attributes include a lamb. Jervas’s adoption of this bucolic mode may also allude to his friend Pope’s Pastorals (first published in May 1709) in which Virgil’s Arcadia is transferred to the banks of the Thames;173 the conceit may lie in Jervas ‘populating’ this English idyll. An additional attraction may have been the obvious incongruity of depicting noblewomen (Lady Mary Pierrepont CR M38, the Countess of Bridgewater CR E10) and urban socialites (Mrs. Raines CR R1) as picturesque peasants. Rural guises were popular at contemporary

171 Walpole, Anecdotes of Painting, vol. 4, pg. 2.
172 The Tatler, 19 April 1709.
masquerades, which first gained popularity in the 1710s, where again the ‘top-side turvy’ reigned; ‘Women changed into Men, and Men into Women, Children in Leading-strings seven Foot high, Courtiers transformed into Clowns, Ladies of the Night into Saints, People of the first Quality into Beasts or Birds, Gods or Goddesses’.\textsuperscript{174}

Ladies in Turkish-style dress form another small group within Jervas’s oeuvre, instigated by the colourfully descriptive letters from Lady Mary Wortley Montagu when based in Istanbul 1716-1718. These manuscripts were circulated privately, and as some were originally addressed to Pope they would inevitably have been seen by Jervas at an early date. On her return to London, Montagu occasionally adopted Turkish dress, and was thus portrayed by many artists including Jervas (CR M35-M37). As well as the clothing and accessories Lady Mary had brought to London, artists were assisted by Jean-Baptist Vanmour’s illustrated \textit{Recueil de Cent Estampes representant differentes Nations du Levant}, first published in Paris in 1714.\textsuperscript{175} For Lady Mary, donning exotic costume, particularly pantaloons, was a daring political statement, a declaration of her belief that Turkish women were ‘the only free people in the Empire’ in view of their (limited) financial and marital rights.\textsuperscript{176} When adopted by other English aristocratic sitters, such as Mary, Duchess of Montagu (e.g. CR M26) and Jemima Countess of Ashburnham (CR A14), the same intention cannot be assumed, particularly as \textit{Turquerie} swiftly became another popular masquerade ensemble. The employment of these fantastical costumes, which also included ‘Van Dyck’ dress (e.g. CR C93, D21, O3), served in addition to eschew the inherent problem of portraits appearing swiftly dated as fashions ebbed and flowed, a point acknowledged in \textit{The Spectator} in 1711.\textsuperscript{177}


\textsuperscript{175} One hundred of these engravings was offered in Jervas’s prints and drawings sale, day 14, lot 523.


\textsuperscript{177} ‘Great Masters in Painting never care for drawing People in the Fashion; as very well knowing that the Head-dress or Periwig that now prevails and gives a Grace to their Portraiture at present, will make a very
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Jervas did venture beyond the genre of portraiture. He informed his old friend Bishop Hough in 1725 that, ‘I employ my time very agreeably since I find some intervals for history painting & sequester so many weeks for mending my former performances’.

No works which could be described as history paintings can now be attributed to him, though evidence of still lifes has survived. Vertue records that in his later years he and his studio produced increasingly large numbers of copies after famous ‘old master’ paintings, which is presumably a reflection of market interest.

An unavoidable theme among contemporary commentators is Jervas’s perceived vanity and immodesty. Joseph Addison met the artist in Rome, and wrote to their mutual friend Bishop Hough in 1701 that, ‘tis thought [he] will be an extraordinary Artist. He begins already to pity Titian’. His battle with the Vatican over ownership of the Transfiguration cartoon the following year, and Jervas’s inflated belief in the political significance of the contretemps certainly betrays an extraordinary self-confidence. On his return to London, Vertue recorded that, ‘by his [Jervas’s] talk & boasting manner he had a great run of business’, surely hinting that this alone was the reason for his success.

Swift, famously irascible even with his friends, wrote to one such friend Charles Ford in Dublin, asking; ‘I presume you and Jervas meet there sometimes, and do you bridle [at] his Eloquence and vanity?’ And an anonymous ballad called A Session of Painters (1725), which imagined Apelles descending from the heavens to appoint a worthy successor to Kneller and interviewing a variety of prospective candidates. The hopefuls are known only by initial, but ‘G----’ almost certainly represents Jervas, the audience going as follows;

odd Figure, and perhaps look monstrous, in the eyes of Posterity. The Spectator, 28 July 1711, The Spectator, Philadelphia, 1836, vol. 1, pg. 196.
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Stiff, as his Works, elaborate G------ came,
And thus began to sue;
The Greatest Nobles long have known my Fame,
Nor is it strange to you?
The God reply’d: Thy Hand preferr’d shou’d be,
Had it more Praise from Others, less from Thee.\textsuperscript{183}

Yet a study of his biography and career reveal many (mainly silent) supporters and friends, among them John Norris in the royal household, Dr. Clarke in Oxford, Bishop Hough, Kneller, Robert Walpole, and the most vocal among them, Pope. The general impression given is of a certain pomposity, pretentiousness and disproportionate self-belief; attributes which must surely have enabled his thoroughly successful infiltration of the Whig nobility. Amongst his friends’ correspondence, these same characteristics evidently provided gentle amusement.\textsuperscript{184}

\section*{Jervas scholarship}

Unfavourable responses to Jervas’s oeuvre, and especially his personality, dominate contemporary annals, and accounts for much of his subsequent neglect. This negative bias was enshrined by Horace Walpole in his influential \textit{Anecdotes of Painting in England}. In his fourth and final volume of the series (1771), Walpole treats of the medium during the reigns of King George I and II, a period in which, the author immediately declares, ‘the arts were sunk to the lowest ebb in Britain’. The author’s virtual tirade against both artists and patrons is exemplified by his treatment of Jervas. With some vehemence, Walpole remarks that, ‘One would think Vertue foresaw how little curiosity posterity would feel to know more of a man who has bequeathed them such wretched

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{183} Anon, \textit{A Session of Painters, occasion’d by the death of the late Sir Godfrey Kneller, Inscribed to his Widow Lady Kneller}, London, 1725, verse 4.
\item \textsuperscript{184} See for example pg. 21-22, Knightley Chetwode to Swift, 10 September 1729. Williams, \textit{The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift}, vol. 3, pg. 344-345.
\end{itemize}
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daubings’.\textsuperscript{185} Walpole, who must inevitably have known the artist well, harboured an acute dislike, which suffuses his entry on Jervas; his paintings were ‘wretched daubings’, ‘his vanity knew no encomium disproportionate to his merits’, and he provides two anecdotes designed to illustrate the latter point. Added to this personal acquaintance with Jervas, was Walpole’s extensive knowledge of contemporary private collections, and his privileged access to Vertue’s notebooks, and it becomes clearer why his judgement of the artist has been granted such authority, and persisted so long.

Subsequent scholars have frequently adhered to Walpole’s low opinion, and paraphrased his summation of the arts of the period. Redgrave and Redgrave’s \textit{A Century of Painters of the English School} (1866) reiterate exactly Walpole’s themes by dismissing the artist as ‘…the vain head of the poor mediocrities of his time, but nevertheless a scholar and a gentleman’\textsuperscript{186} The authors seem to suggest that the artist was apparently redeemed from ignominious oblivion by his literary pursuits and the social status achieved by his financially fortuitous marriage. Such an assessment is taken to a new level by Edmund Gosse in \textit{British Portrait Painters and Engravers of the Eighteenth Century} (1906) when he states that, ‘Jervas – although, like that of [Simon] Verelst in the previous century, his vanity savoured somewhat of unsoundness of brain – seems deliberately to have cultivated the airs of a dictator of fashion’\textsuperscript{187}

Walpole’s shadow reached far into the twentieth century, with Ellis Waterhouse in \textit{Painting in Britain 1530-1790} (1953) summarising Jervas as an ‘astute painter who married money’, and who prospered by cultivating friendships with men of letters, but is otherwise ‘fitfully remembered’.\textsuperscript{188} Once again focusing (briefly) on Jervas’s connection with Pope and on his painterly style (‘His women all look astonishingly alike and resemble a robin or one of the birds of the finch tribe’), the author goes on to compare the artist and his contemporaries unfavourably with Wilson and Reynolds. In

\textsuperscript{185} Walpole, \textit{Anecdotes of Painting}, vol. 4, quotes from pg. 1 and 12.
\textsuperscript{186} Richard Redgrave and Samuel Redgrave, \textit{A Century of Painters of the English School}, London, 1866, pg. 41.
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the same author’s *Dictionary of 18th Century Painters in oils and crayons* (1981), a similar tone continues to ridicule.189

These publications deal exclusively with Jervas’s perceived personal failings and attribute his success to his marriage and a talent for friendships. While these are naturally themes of interest, they are treated in a curiously unscholarly manner. They perpetuate (and solely rely on) the scathing assessment first offered by Horace Walpole, without subjecting it to analysis or recognising its value and bias. Not surprisingly, Jervas’s reputation has been explored more thoroughly than any other aspect of his life or career, and is a case study in art historiography in itself.

Before exploring the extent to which scholars have been interested in Jervas in his artistic context it is worth examining the biographical details which have been made available. Until the publication of Vertue’s notebooks (1929-52), Walpole’s *Anecdotes* were relied on and frequently quoted. Vertue’s idiosyncratic jottings, now widely accessible, have a value related to his personal and profession knowledge of Jervas, some of whose paintings he engraved under the latter’s supervision. Strickland’s *A Dictionary of Irish Artists* (1913) contains a refreshingly unbiased entry on the artist (considering the date of publication), focusing on known biographical details and archival sources. It is frustratingly without foot- or end-notes, and lists his ‘Principal works’ without giving the criteria for this selection of highlights, but offers a biographical outline which would be repeated almost verbatim by many later twentieth-century publications.190 The two most obvious source of biographical information, *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* and *The [Grove] Dictionary of Art* are reflective of the dearth of Jervas scholarship. The entry in the 2004 edition of the former is by Edward Bottoms, the author of an excellent study of Walpole’s patronage which will be mentioned later, and this area of interest provides the basis of ODNB entry. The current *Grove Dictionary* entry
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is riddled with odd, disparaging remarks. In sharp contrast, *A Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy* (1997) maps out with meticulous care the movements of visitors to Italy in the eighteenth century. Nicola Figgis brilliantly outlines the chronology of Jervas’s two visits to Italy, his acquaintances and activities. His first visit in 1698-1708/09 had been previously unresearched, and so Figgis’s range of primary sources was an important development. Figgis collaborates with Brendan Rooney in the vast *Irish Paintings in the National Gallery of Ireland* (2001), which stands alone as probably the most comprehensive and valuable publication to include Jervas. A faultless footnoted biography precedes equally detailed entries on the four paintings (and one studio canvas) by the artist in the NGI, displaying fresh research on the artist and sitters, as well as a complete knowledge of previously published literature. Also published in 2001, Jane Fenlon’s article “Until the heats of Italy are over: Charles Jervas writes from Paris in 1698” analyses a single manuscript letter from Jervas in Paris, May 1698. The article transcribes the full document, replete with interesting references to his companions, activities and opinions, which remain under-explored in the article.

Jervas most frequently appears in literature as part of a wider discussion about the contemporary arts in England and Ireland, either in survey literature, dictionaries or exhibition catalogues. It is in these publications that his relationship with his contemporaries and his ‘place’ in late Stuart/early Georgian art history is assessed to a greater or lesser degree. Several have been mentioned and their heavy bias renders them of limited value. More recent scholarship, attending to empirical details and demonstrating an interest in the social production of the period, has produced a fairer examination and a greater use of primary sources. The modest illustrated catalogue which accompanied the exhibition *Irish Portraits 1660-1860* (1969) by Anne Crookshank and the Knight of Glin is a largely biographical study of a succession of artists,

emphasising in the entry on Jervas his work in Ireland and his Irish sitters. The exhibition, held in the National Gallery of Ireland, the National Portrait Gallery, London, the finally the Ulster Museum, Belfast, included four key portraits by Jervas which assist in the biographical narrative of his life. They illustrate, literally, his friendship with Pope and Pope’s muses the Blount sisters, one of the families by whom he was heavily patronised, and lastly an example of his Irish patrons.\(^{194}\) Depending heavily on direct quotes from Vertue, *Irish Portraits* is an important initial survey in relation to Jervas study and Irish art history more generally. The same authors’ *Ireland’s Painters 1600-1940*, (2002) is a significant survey of a little-studied field.\(^{195}\) Primary source research has been used to add important details to those already established by Strickland, and Jervas’s biographical details draw on earlier literature and new archival sources. The scope of the publication includes a rare study of the arts in Ireland during the Restoration period, and a valuable chapter entitled ‘Patronage and Dealing in the Eighteenth Century’.

Although not making direct reference to Jervas, Fenlon’s article ‘The Painter Stainers Companies of Dublin and London’ (1987) is a rare study of artistic practice in Ireland in the late seventeenth century.\(^{196}\) Her examination of the records of the Dublin Guild of St. Luke provides a wealth of information as to methods of apprenticeship as well as those artists working in and visiting the city. As Jervas does not feature in the records during his visits there in the 1710s, ‘20s and ‘30s, it would suggest his independence from the already antiquated guild system, and reliance on established patronage and personal contacts.

---


Putting Jervas in a British context is *Manners and Morals: Hogarth and British Painting 1700-1760* (1987). An interest in teaching methods, studio structure, early academies and painting technique characterise this exhibition catalogue. Jervas is once again approached via his relationship with Pope, the painting focus here being the double portrait of Martha and Theresa Blount (1716) from Mapledurham (CR B18) The author (Elizabeth Einberg) draws an interesting comparison between the manner in which Jervas represented these sitters in paint and Pope in verse, neatly emphasising the men’s friendship and shared interest in visual art and literature. A spartan catalogue to the exhibition ‘Painting and Sculpture in England 1700-1750’ at the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool in 1958 solidly represents the leading and more minor artists of the period. Jervas is represented solely by one of his versions of the portrait of Catherine Hyde, Duchess of Queensberry (CR D9), and the brief entry on both artist and subject tends towards the anecdotal. However, the principal value of this publication lies in the short but dense introduction by John Jacob in which he takes for his theme the contemporary influence of and reaction against French and Italian art, Richardson’s and Hogarth’s ‘anglomania’, and the fledgling academies.

By their nature, inventories and accounts of private collections offer an uncritical overview of Jervas’s output and more specifically the nature of his patrons. As one might suspect, Horace Walpole’s 1748 *Ædes Walpolianæ* is a fascinating glimpse into Sir Robert’s collection, though the extent of Jervas’s involvement in the acquisition or nature of the collection is not outlined by the author. Family portraits, including those by Jervas, are dutifully listed, but only those works by the Italian, French and Flemish Old Masters are annotated or discussed. Walpole’s *A Description of the Villa of Horace Walpole….at Strawberry-Hill* (1774) is something of a sequel to the above, showing the
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movement of many family items formerly at Houghton to Horace’s Twickenham home, noting a total of twenty four paintings by Jervas, and others painted after Jervas. The much-deserved analysis of the Houghton collection is the work of Dukelskaya and Moore in A Capital Collection (2002), a most in-depth examination of each work formerly owned by Sir Robert, including discussion on their acquisition or commission, arrangement and subsequent ownership.200 Jervas’s work as agent is touched upon, and portraits catalogued in superb detail. Further published catalogues and inventories of collections, both dispersed and intact, illuminate patterns of patronage in the clearest manner, such as that for Althorp by K J Garlick (1976).201

Few authors have shown any interest in Jervas’s patrons, merely reiterating the basic details of his appointment as Principal Painter to the King in 1723, and his gradual ‘fall from grace’ when he was judged to have disappointed Queen Caroline’s expectations in the early 1730s. Whitley in Artists and their Friends in England 1700-1799 (1928) tries to explain this, entirely speculatively, by suggesting that the Queen’s admiration for Holbein would preclude any sympathy with the ‘feeble’ work of Jervas.202 The only serious attempt to evaluate the extent and nature of Jervas’s patronage has been Edward Bottoms’s article Charles Jervas, Sir Robert Walpole and the Norfolk Whigs (1997).203 Here, the author makes excellent use of archival sources to trace the motivation behind the Walpole-Jervas relationship (he suggests a shared love for the works of Carlo Maratta), the contribution of Jervas to the formation of his collection, and the artist’s patronage by Walpole, his son-in-law Charles Townshend at Raynham Hall, and other Whig allies. Although schematic on biographical detail and artistic context, the article draws together many pertinent themes and draws on previously fresh archival sources.
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The most overlooked aspect of Jervas’s life has been his obvious ambitions outside the realm of painting. Most frequently referred to is his friendship with Pope, which many authors believe is the sole reason he is now remembered. Jervas actively supported and promoted Pope’s work, and this theme is explored in Brownell’s *Alexander Pope and the Arts of Georgian England* (1978).\(^{204}\) Their painting lessons, collaborative editorial work, and mutual support and promotion are detailed, forming a valuable insight into Jervas’s character and motivations as well as the contemporary relationship between the literary and visual arts. On a similar theme, *The Portraits of Alexander Pope* (1965) looks at Pope’s interest, and participation, in the visual arts and how he forged his public image in tandem with his evolving career.\(^ {205}\)

Jervas’s private collection is detailed most interestingly in the posthumous sale of his studio, but has evaded examination to date. Kirby Talley’s article *Extracts from Charles Jervas’s Sale Catalogues (1739)* (1978) relies on now-familiar phrases from Walpole and Waterhouse to introduce the artist, clearly implying that contemporary readers of the *Burlington Magazine* would have not prior knowledge of Jervas.\(^ {206}\) The body of the paper contains certain highly edited extracts from Jervas’s sale of chattels, focusing on painting materials, studio equipment and furnishings. The value of this article lies in its making available some parts of the sale catalogues, and translating or explaining some of the more obscure materials listed.

Walpole’s mocking tone apparently permitted later writers to portray Jervas as a figure of comedy. An historian in 1908 astutely remarked that ‘as an artist, Jervas’s fate is that of the over-praised, on whom the world takes vengeance by undue disparagement.’\(^ {207}\) When satire was finally considered inappropriate, scholars persisted in an over-reliance on earlier material, so perpetuating the belief that Jervas was a minor figure of no

---


\(^{206}\) Talley, ‘Extracts from Charles Jervas’s ‘Sale Catalogues’, pg. 6-11.
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substantial interest. Clearly, more original research and objective re-evaluation of Jervas have been published in the past ten years than ever before that, and reflect a new interest in this artistic period in both Britain and Ireland. A host of themes, however, have hitherto gone untouched and their omission must reflect an attitude held both by scholars and the publishing community. The present thesis aims to provide a rounded study of Jervas’s life, profession and artistic context to add to this body of Jervas scholarship.
Jervas’s decision to leave London for prolonged study in Italy appears predictable given the contemporary dearth of esteemed art collections or opportunities for formal artistic education in England. Indeed, the successful careers of Sir Anthony van Dyck, John Michael Wright, Michael Dahl, and his own teacher Sir Godfrey Kneller, who had each studied in Italy at an early stage in their careers, acted as compelling advocates of this course of action. So too, amongst a store of Italophile travel literature, was William Aglionby’s *Painting Illustrated in three Diallogues* (1685), in which the learned protagonist, significantly known at the ‘Traveller’, laments the fact that, ‘The World here in our Northern Climates has a Notion of Painters little nobler than of Joyners and Carpenters, or any other Mechanick’, before recommending a visit to Italy for both potential patrons and artists. Jervas had, however, by the time of his departure in the spring of 1698, already received an apprenticeship with Kneller in unquestionably the country’s premier studio, both artistically and socially, and enjoyed privileged access to the royal collection where he had impressed John Norris (fl. 1667-1714), the widely-patronised ‘frame Maker & picture keeper at Court’. He had also established an independent studio in Long Acre, Covent Garden by at least 1695, and, on the evidence of his correspondence from the very outset of his travels, garnered the admiration and

---

2 Van Dyck was in Italy 1621-1627; Wright 1642-early 1650s; Dahl c.1685-87, and Kneller 1672-75.
4 William Aglionby, *Painting Illustrated in three Diallogues, containing some choice observations upon the Art*, London, 1685, pg. 97. Aglionby’s target audience was the English nobility whom he chastises for their perceived cultural apathy and tendency to drunkenness.
5 Walpole Society, *Vertue Notebooks*, (vol. 3), pg. 42. Norris’s workshop was in Long Acre, Covent Garden, the same street in which Jervas had his studio. Norris worked extensively for the royal collection, as well notable clients such as the Dukes of Northumberland, Lauderdale and Dorset (see Jacob Simon, *The Art of the Picture Frame – artists, patrons and the framing of portraits*, exhibition catalogue, London, National Portrait Gallery, London, 1996, pg. 130-131).
6 *Collection for Improvement of Husbandry and Trade* [newspaper], issue no. 139, 29 March 1695, unpaginated.
goodwill of a small but elite group of art lovers. From this basis Jervas could arguably have nurtured a viable career in London, but instead embarked, at around the age of thirty, on the expensive and frequently incommodesious journey across the Continent. By transferring to Italy and accepting its attendant risks (professional, financial, even physical), Jervas was inevitably reflecting the extent of his self-confidence and ambition, fanned by the encouragement he had received from Norris (‘a great promoter & encourager’), and the connoisseur George Clarke of Oxford (‘a great Friend & patron’), as well as acknowledging the supreme influence of Italian culture on the evolution of English artistic tastes.

The logistical challenges of contemporary travel required that Jervas should have a ready fund of money to meet the considerable costs involved, and letters of introduction, ideally to English officials abroad, which would ensure a level of protection, and a social entrée. Vertue recorded that Clarke lent the artist fifty pounds towards his travel expenses, which was probably supplementary to an inheritance from his deceased father. On 7 February 1697/98, the Prerogative Court of Dublin granted probate to Jervas, as the eldest son, for his father’s intestate estate. The original documentation has not survived, but it can be assumed that he benefited to some degree, as he departed for the Continent a mere three months later. Another source of funding may be implied in a payment of £240 made by Jervas to William Digby, 5th Baron Digby of Geashill, Co.

7 As noted by George Vertue. Walpole Society, *Vertue Notebooks*, (vol. 3), pg. 42.
9 Walpole Society, *Vertue Notebooks*, (vol. 3), pg. 42.
10 Only two 19th century abstracts of the court documents survive, both very sketchy, the originals having been destroyed in Dublin’s Custom House in 1921. Thrift Abstracts of Wills, ref. no. 2852, and Betham’s Handlist of Abstracts, series II, vol. 27 (I and J 1661-1759) MF 38/13, pg. 69. Both abstracts are in the National Archives, Dublin.
11 See Introduction pg. 7-8 for discussion on the death of Jervas’s father, and the conflicting documents.
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Offaly, in October 1705, when he was still in Italy, and quite feasibly represents the cancellation of a loan.\textsuperscript{12}

A letter of introduction was provided by John Ellis (1646-1738), a copy of which survives among his voluminous official correspondence. The letter is dated 29 April 1698, at which time Ellis was under-secretary to the secretary of state, James Vernon (1646-1727). Ellis was a graduate of Oxford University (Christ Church, 1664), and enjoyed the patronage of Sir Leoline Jenkins (1625-1685), principal of Jesus College, Oxford, early in his career. As Jervas was an acknowledged protégé of George Clarke, fellow of All Souls College and former MP for the University (1685-87), Clarke may have been responsible for first introducing the artist to Ellis. Alternatively, it is possible that Jervas (or his relatives) and Ellis became acquainted when the latter was in Ireland as secretary to the Irish revenue commissioners between 1682 and 1688.\textsuperscript{13} The recipient of Ellis’s letter was Sir Lambert Blackwell (c.1665-1727), and it commends the artist in the following manner:

Mr. Charles Jervas, who will present you this, being an Ingenious Painter, and going into Italy, the great schole of that art, in order to the perfecting himself in his profession, and having desired mee to recommend him to some person there, where he is a stranger, whose favour & Protection he might depend upon, it was not possible for mee to think I would more properly apply to any one on this occasion, or with more hopes of succeeding, then to your self, who have the understanding requisite to encourage an artist, authority to protect him, and good Nature to pardon mee the trouble of asking it, and that you would please to permit him sometimes to give his Letters the safeguard of your Cover, which I presume he will make a modest use of.\textsuperscript{14}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{12} Hoare’s Archive, London, ledger books for William, 5\textsuperscript{th} Baron Digby (1661/2-1752), entries for 2\textsuperscript{nd} (£200) and 15\textsuperscript{th} (£40) October 1705. See chapter 4 for an in-depth discussion of Jervas’s relationship with Lord Digby and his family.


\textsuperscript{14} Add. 28,882 f244r. British Library.
\end{flushright}
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Blackwell was originally a merchant who was engaged by William III as consul to the Tuscan court (1689-96), based at Leghorn (Livorno). He returned briefly to England in 1697, when he was knighted and appointed diplomatic envoy to Genoa and Tuscany.\(^{15}\) When Ellis wrote his letter in the spring of 1698, Blackwell was returning to Italy, where he was to be based in Florence for the next seven years, and would have provided a most valuable contact for Jervas. ‘An Envoy that is obliging is a mighty advantage to a Stranger in introducing him into company at Conversations every night’,\(^{16}\) noted an English traveller in Genoa shortly afterwards, and the embassy in Paris also sought to offer assistance to English visitors, the secretary Stanyan remarking to Ellis in 1699 that, ‘all that don’t make Acquaintance at first with Our family [the embassy] are in danger of falling into the hands of the St Germain beggars, who make a prey of all the Young Gentlemen they get into their Clutches, & debauch ym of their principles besides’.\(^{17}\) Given the importance to travellers of being known to their diplomatic compatriots, it is therefore likely that Ellis provided Jervas with another letter of recommendation, addressed to the poet and diplomat Matthew Prior (1664-1721), Stanyan’s predecessor as secretary at Paris. When Prior was based in the Hague in 1697, Ellis had provided the Dublin-born artist Hugh Howard (1675-1737) with a warm letter asking Prior to, ‘give the young man, who is so modest he will not be troublesome, such countenance and protection as he shall stand in need of for the better prosecution of his design at The Hague’.\(^{18}\) Jervas was certainly known to Prior from the time of his arrival in Paris


(asking Ellis to direct his post via the embassy), and executed a number of portraits of the secretary, one of which is in the Duke of Portland’s collection and has the significance of being his earliest surviving art work (CR P17) (fig 1a).

Jervas’s first destination was naturally Paris, easily reached from Dover in three days, where he had arrived by the end of May 1698. The city was a vibrant centre of courtly patronage, social and artistic diversions, and acclaimed as the ‘centre of civilisation’. Tourists from England tended to be strongly impressed by the majestic royal building projects such as those at Versailles (‘the noblest house in the world and the beauty of the Parter and Parck and water workes is inexpresable’) and Les Invalides, the modern urban architecture, ecclesiastical buildings, and profusion of luxury goods, but each traveller’s experience was naturally dependent on his or her funds, contacts and interests. The observations of another visitor in 1698 are perhaps typical of the less-privileged traveller subjected to mundane Parisian experiences. John Steyer complained of:

> ye extravagant prices of every thing, & a very stinking & disorderly town, in no respect either for beauty[,] wealth, bigness, or good government to be compared to London. The streets are soe scandalously narrow thro ye whole town, that there is not roome for posts to protect ye people that [walk] from being overrun by coaches…’t’would be too tedious to enumerate every particular thing that we outdue ’em [the French] in there, but in a word ye prices & badness of every thing is intolerable.22

---

22 Letter from Steyer in Paris, dated 24 September 1698. The recipient is apparently a ‘Dr. King’, but the letter is among John Ellis’s papers. Nothing is known of Steyer, or the purpose of his sojourn in Paris. He goes on to ask his correspondent to send him ‘worsted stockings’, tea and coffee, as these commodities are too expensive for his budget. He admits however that ‘I’m pretty well appeasd in an hour or twos time’, with the burgundy wine available in the Paris taverns. Add. 28,901 f424. British Library.
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Jervas’s travel itinerary throughout his decade on the Continent mirrored that of the Grand Tour travellers, who were then still relatively few in number, on account of the shared admiration for the sights of Paris and Rome, and considerable practical problems encountered in straying from the established pathways through Europe. His purpose however was predominantly to study in Italy, intending to stay in Paris only through the summer of 1698, ‘til the heats of Italy are over’. Writing to Ellis on his arrival in the French capital, he remarked that, ‘I am already at Rome for I have the Privilege of the Academy at the Louvre, where all the Antique Statues are very well cast in Plasiter of Paris, w[hi]ch will do my business for the present as well as the Originals’. In the same letter of 26 May 1698 he discusses his other important occupation during his time in Paris – dealing in engravings – which must have been a crucial source of income: ‘Mr. Pooley shewd me yr letter, I went with him to choose the Prints, & went to several other Shops before hand that I might find the best impressions & the easiest rates’. Robert Pooley (c.1644-after 1699), brother of the Irish artist Thomas Pooley (c.1640-1723), had previously sent Ellis in the middle of April ‘…yo[u]jr friends paper wth ye prices affixd to it of each print’, and Ellis responded on 1 May with a list of prints which his unidentified acquaintance wished Pooley to buy on his behalf, most of them after paintings by Nicholas Poussin. Impressively, however, Jervas appears to have found a

23 The Duke of Shrewsbury entertained all the English gentlemen then in Rome on 9 November 1704, ‘wee were 14 at table’, he noted in his diary (Montagu Boughton vol. 65. A Journal by his Grace Charles Duke of Shrewsbury, 1700-1706, pg. 369. Northampton Record Office).


26 Ibid.

27 Ibid.


ready clientele for his own expertise, in spite of having arrived in the city so recently, claiming in May: ‘I have bought some [prints] for Mr. George Clarke & some for Pereyra & a great many for our English gentlemen now in Town’. ‘Pereyra’ is probably Isaac Pereira (c.1658-1718), the immensely wealthy Portuguese merchant who had amassed his fortune by providing William III’s army with essential supplies and equipment during his Irish campaign in 1691. Jervas continued to purchase for clients, probably a combination of prints, paintings and books, and would later remark from Rome that, ‘I am not here as at Paris, where I could take up hundreds of sterling without staying for bills or letters’, indicating the scale of his work as an intermediary.

His role as agent, fulfilled by many travellers, was essential to English virtuosi, given the embryonic state of the indigenous art market; auctions were still a rarity, and the protectionist law forbidding the importation of foreign art works had not been repealed until 1695 (replaced by a 20% duty). In Paris, Jervas was perfectly placed to source the modern French prints prized by collectors for their superlative quality and range of subject matter. He also embarked on an ambitious project in collaboration with his benefactor George Clarke, an avid collector of engravings. Clarke had purchased the artist’s copies after the Raphael cartoons in Hampton Court, and sent them to Jervas in Paris with a view to having them engraved and published. Jervas engaged the most accomplished master of the medium, Gérard Audran (1640-1703), who completed only

36 See chapter 3, pg. 88.
two plates from the set of seven cartoons (fig 1b, 1c). As Jervas left Paris for Rome at some stage in 1699, probably late summer, it may have been his absence from the city that stymied the project, or possibly Audran’s other commitments or ill health. Vertue notes that following the resumption of hostilities with France in 1701 (the War of Spanish Succession), Clarke ‘had much difficulty’ in retrieving Jervas’s drawings from Audran’s studio, though they are now untraced. While Jervas was still abroad, a popular set of engravings after the Raphael cartoons was published in England in 1707 by Simon Gribelin, followed by two further sets around 1710. These productions were soon eclipsed by the superior set produced by Nicolas Dorigny (1658-1746), who worked on them between 1711 and 1719, and for which he was granted a knighthood by George I. These rival productions, along with Jervas’s burgeoning portrait practice, may have deterred him from resuming the scheme on his return from the continent.

On leaving Paris, Jervas could have reached Rome, by land via Dijon, Lyons, through the Alps at the Mont Cenis pass, and so to Turin, or by sea from Marseilles to Leghorn. Having extended his stay in Paris well beyond the summer of 1698 (for his extant portrait sketch of Prior is inscribed ‘Paris 1699’), he probably set out for Italy in the autumn of 1699, again to avoid the infamous Italian summers described dramatically by one visitor as ‘violent’, and another as ‘so very scorching [that] it set fire to straw [that]

---

37 An example of these two prints is still in Clarke’s collection, preserved at Worcester College, Oxford. Dr. George Clarke print collection, vol. 3, items 7 (Death of Ananias, plate size 59.6 x 72.5 cm) and 10 (Paul and Barnabas at Lystra, plate size 59 x 70.1 cm). The prints are undated, and neither Clarke nor Jervas are mentioned in the inscriptions.
38 Walpole Society, *Vertue Notebooks*, (vol. 3), pg. 42.
39 The current entry for Jervas in Turner, *The Dictionary of Art*, vol. 17, pg. 507 and cited in Nicola Figgis, ‘Raphael’s ‘Transfiguration’; some Irish Grant Tour associations’, *Irish Arts Review Yearbook*, vol. 14 [1998], pg. 53, states that these drawings are in the Codrington Library at All Souls College, Oxford. On application to the Codrington Library in 2009 however, the library was unaware of these works (Dr. Norma Aubertin-Potter, Librarian in charge).
lay in ye streets’. Italy was the ultimate destination of virtually all tourist itineraries, Joseph Addison, who visited at the same time as Jervas, writing that, ‘it is the great School of Musick and Painting, and contains in it all the noblest Productions of Statuary and Architecture both Ancient and Modern. It abounds with Cabinets of Curiosities, and vast Collections of all Kinds of Antiquities’. Rome’s highly developed cultural life, artistic bounty, and relics of classical civilisation provided the pinnacle of any visit, and from here Jervas wrote shortly after his arrival: ‘I am perfectly in my Element’. From the beginning he intended to stay for a period of several years, and later told Vertue that ‘haveing learnt the art of painting at the wrong end...he began then [at Rome] to draw as if he had never learnt before’. Unlike his contemporary visitor Hugh Howard who was receiving instruction from the leading artist in Rome Carlo Maratti, or the later visitor William Kent who studied under Maratti’s protégé Giuseppe Chiari (1654-1727), Jervas’s studies were self-directed, and focused on copying celebrated masters. On arrival, he visited the Vatican daily, declaring in November 1699, ‘I dont intend to do any thing else till I have drawn every thing of Rafael over & over’.

---

43 Joseph Addison, Remarks on several parts of Italy, &c, in the years 1701, 1702, 1703, London, 1715, from the Preface, unpaginated.
45 Ibid.
46 Walpole Society, Vertue Notebooks, (vol. 3), pg. 16.
47 Nicola Figgis, ‘Hugh Howard (1675-1738), eclectic artist and connoisseur’, Irish Architectural and Decorative Studies, vol. 10 [2007], pg. 114. Howard was in Rome when Jervas wrote from there in November 1699, the latter boasting that, ‘Mr. Howard indeed has done more Since I came, than in all his time before, & now he begins to see his fault his father recalls him’ (Letter from Jervas to George Clarke, dated 28 November 1699. Ms 181 f.514r. Worcester College, Oxford.).
48 Cinzia Maria Sicca, ‘On William Kent’s Roman sources’, Architectural History, vol. 29 [1986], pg. 136-137. Kent was in Italy 1709 to 1719.
49 Letter from Jervas to George Clarke, dated 28 November 1699. Worcester College, Oxford, Ms 181 f.514r. In the same letter Jervas defends Michelangelo’s *Last Judgement* in the Sistine Chapel, remarking that ‘Criticks have been too Severe upon that vast performance...’tis rarely drawn, I will venture to say beyond Raphael for the naked, the Antique finely expressed, & not so ill coloured as common fame will have it’. 

---
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situated, and presuming that Clarke had prints of the individual compositions (fig 1d).\(^50\) A year later Jervas was equally resolved, but had broadened his curriculum, confiding to Matthew Prior, ‘to tell you the truth I am so intent upon going through a regular course of study, and am so pleased with the opportunity…[I] intend this year too for drawings and then something of Guido [Reni], Titian or Correggio for the colouring, etc…and if I can make progress answerable to my industry, something may be done’.\(^51\) In the same letter he gently mocks his own industry: ‘There are two or three damned things that disturb me mightily in the Poets. O imitators servum pecus! Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus’ (approximately ‘O imitators, you herd of slaves!’ and ‘The mountains are in labour, a ridiculous mouse will be born’, i.e. the result is not always commensurate with the exertion).\(^52\) The self deprecating tone was fleeting, and Jervas’s endeavours bore dividends, as Joseph Addison wrote to a mutual acquaintance the following year (1701): ‘Mr. Gervaise makes very great Improvements, tis thought will be an extraordinary Artist. He begins already to pity Titian and is so well vers’d among the ancient statues that he talks as familiarly of Phidias’s and Praxiteles’s Manner as he w[oul]d do in England of Knellars and Cloistermans’.\(^53\)

The evidence, though sparse, suggests that Jervas continued his studies in this manner throughout his years in Rome. The Duke of Shrewsbury wrote in his journal of 24 April 1703, ‘I went out this mor.[ning] & found Jervaise at the Fr.[ench] Academy, where looking upon the cast statues, he shewd me severall very inst.[ructive?] observations not

\(^{50}\) Worcester College, Oxford, Ms 181 f.515v-516r, annotated on the reverse ‘This is Mr. Jervas’s account of these Chambers, sent from Rome 28 Nov. 1699’. An untidier version of the same diagram was sent by Jervas to Clarke the following year, annotated ‘The manner in w[h]ich Raphaels paintings stand in The Chambers in the Vatican. Mr. Jervas. 1700 from Rome’ (Worcester College, Oxford. Dr. George Clarke print collection, vol. 1, unpaginated loose sheet at the front of the volume).


\(^{52}\) Both quotations are from Horace, the first is from Epistles I, xix, 1; the second is from Epistles II, iii, Ars Poetica, line 139.

onely upon the difference of the shape betwixt men & women but betwixt a man of quality & Countrey men, which the old Statuarys always observed’.54 The attraction of the French Academy in Rome to aspirant artists is evident in the account of it given by Jonathan Richardson jr.:

There is One Circumstance that makes this place [the French Academy] as well worth visiting as almost Any in Rome: Here are Casts of all the principal Statues; Many of which are Thus seen much better than by the Statues Themselves; I mean Those that are in Disadvantagious Lights or Positions. Besides Here one has the Conveniency of Steps, so that one may come Near any part, how remote soever from the Eye as one stands on the Ground; and Here moreover All these fine Things are brought together, and Seen at Once, and so may be Compar’d one with another, as I did with a great deal of Pleasure.55

Later in the year Shrewsbury again happened upon Jervas during his studies, at the Villa Borghese, where the artists, he noted ‘made me observe among the bass rilievoes[,] the statues & particularly the bustos severall never before observed’.56 Jervas’s posthumous sale catalogue includes hundreds of his sketches and oil copies made in Rome after antiquities, and demonstrates that he was sketching in situ at the Vatican, Villa Franca, Villa Medici, Monte Cavallo and Villa Spada, amongst other venues. Vertue saw the array of items for sale, commenting that they were:

…very numerous, mostly after famous paintings in Italy – many after antient Statues drawn with red chalk on paper – most neatly hatch - and laborious but not so grand in Tast[e] or Judgement, it shows if he had taken pains without true rudiments, or principals – of a masterly manner – by those drawings one may see

---

55 Jonathan Richardson snr., and jr., An Account of some of the statues, bas-reliefs, drawings and pictures in Italy, London, 1722, pg. 325.
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Where he drew his airs of heads – and what sort of Beauty he imitated in Guido –
&c. Carl[o] Morat.57

None of these studies have been located, though some surely survive unidentified. They
may be comparable to the red chalk drawings made contemporaneously in Rome by the
Irish artist Henry Trench (c.1685-1726) and submitted as competition pieces to the
Accademia Nazionale di S. Luca, where they remain.58

As a natural extension of these studies, Jervas and his contemporaries catered to the
tastes of visiting *milordi*, producing and selling copies after famous Italian art works
(ancient and modern), and views of Rome. The Duke of Shrewsbury commissioned
copies during his sojourn, including one by Jervas after Poussin’s *The Death of
Germanicus* (1627), then in the Barberini collection (fig 1f).59 The latter’s portraiture
practice was simultaneously developing, and Shrewsbury was again a patron,60 as were
the antiquary John Talman (1677-1726), and tourist John Scudamore (c.1687-1713).61
Jervas also engaged in the related activity of picture cleaning for Shrewsbury, and
‘mended’ a painting for him in September 1704, possibly the ‘damaged Landskip of
Poussine’ which the Duke had bought that summer.62

57 Walpole Society, *Vertue Notebooks*, (vol. 3), pg. 103. Lot 1938 of Jervas’s sale is, for example, ‘Two [views] of
the Faunus at Borghese; two of the Venus at Farnese; two of Apollo at Belvedera’.
222.
59 Montagu Boughton vol. 65. A Journal by his Grace Charles Duke of Shrewsbury, Northampton Record
Office, pg. 298 (diary entry for 3 March 1704). Anthony Blunt called *The Death of Germanicus* ‘one of
Poussin’s most popular and most frequently copied compositions’, and listed 27 known copies after it, none
of which is obviously from the Duke of Shrewsbury’s collection (Anthony Blunt, *The Paintings of Nicolas
Poussin. A critical catalogue*, London, 1966, text volume pg. 113-114). The original is now in the Minneapolis
Institute of Arts, Minnesota.
60 Montagu Boughton vol. 65. A Journal by his Grace Charles Duke of Shrewsbury, Northampton Record
Office, pg. 212, 216. The sittings took place in February 1702/03; the portrait is untraced.
61 The portrait drawings were included in Jervas’s posthumous sale catalogue, along with one of an
unidentified Mr. Breur, day 15, lot 1067. Talman was in Rome between 1699 and 1702; Scudamore, son of the
2nd Viscount Scudamore, was in the city between October 1704 and April 1705 (Ingamells, *A Dictionary of
British and Irish Travellers*, pg. 924-926, 844). It is likely, though not certain, that these portraits were executed
at Rome.
62 Montagu Boughton vol. 65. A Journal by his Grace Charles Duke of Shrewsbury, Northampton Record
The governors of the young *cavalieri inglesi* visiting Rome routinely sought the services of locals to supplement their knowledge in particular fields, the ‘bear leader’ Henry de Blainville, for example, engaging Italian language, arithmetic and architectural tutors for his teenage charges in 1707. Jervas and his fellow expatriate artists in Rome were particularly useful to this transient aristocratic community, especially when they assumed the role of *cicerone*, able to provide guided tours, translation, practical assistance, and, by no means least, shrewd advice when buying art works from native dealers or artists.

Shrewsbury enjoyed great prominence and favour as the leading Whig politician under William III, renowned for his sensitive diplomacy and charisma (fig 1f). He nonetheless protested frequently at the burden of responsibilities his many offices entailed, and somehow managed to combine outstanding ability and talent with a permanent air of reluctance. He disentangled himself from his public duties in 1700 and travelled in a leisurely manner to Rome, where he arrived in November 1701, primarily seeking relief from persistent ill health. He documented his three and half years in the city in a daily diary, which provides an insight into his activities, relationships and interests, and is also an important source of information on Jervas’s residence in the city. On his arrival in Rome, Shrewsbury took a polite interest in the host of artistic opportunities it offered, assiduously visiting the Vatican, Palazzo Borghese, numerous private palaces and churches, and remnants of the ancient city in his first few weeks. His diary charts the gradual improvement of his respiratory ailments, and morale, as well as his budding...
interest in architecture and painting, noticing after ten months residence, ‘greater nobleness & magnificence than I remarked at first or than I think can be seen in any Town in Europe, the Churches, publick buildings, antiquitys, and vast number of Palaces give it a majesty not to be equalled’.\(^{66}\) His personal transformation surprised and amused his correspondents, as one teased: ‘I am very glad you are grown so great a virtuoso; I shall have much more pleasure in that sort of Conversation than in the field-sports you admired when you went from hence’\(^{67}\). At the behest of these same correspondents Shrewsbury made purchases of various books, prints, paintings, and bustos on their behalf, with increasing confidence in his own judgement.\(^{68}\) He returned to England in 1706, a newly-minted connoisseur, with an Italian bride, an enviable collection of objects d’art, and the plans for a baroque palazzo which he built at Heythrop in Oxfordshire.\(^{69}\)

Jervas, who first called on the Duke in December 1701, must be apportioned a degree of credit for encouraging his virtuosity. He quickly became Shrewsbury’s most frequent companion for visits to artists’ studios, print shops, and dozens of famous sites in or near the city. The following diary entries sketch out the nature of their activities over a few days:

7 February 1702: This mor.\[ning\] I went with Mr. Dryden & Gervais to see pictures of an Oratorian at Chiesa Nuova. They dined with me, wee went to St. Gregoires & other churches.

8 February 1702: This mor.\[ning\] I went with Mr. Gervaise to see Pictures & statues to buy. He dined with me.


\(^{67}\) Letter dated 10 November 1704. Montagu Boughton vol. 53 (no. 9), document no. 9. Northampton Record Office. The sender was Charles Montagu (1661-1715), Baron Halifax (later Earl of Halifax).


\(^{69}\) Heythrop was designed by Paolo Falconieri (1636-1704).
11 February 1702: …went with Mr. Gervaise to see some Pictures, to Palazzo Barbeirn [Barberini], to Villa Borghese…

Jervas could write to Bishop Hough of Oxford the following year that the Duke, ‘takes a great deal of notice of our arts, architecture, sculpture, painting &c; his gusto is extraordinary in evrything, & he is come to a good pitch of knowledge in ym[i.e. them]’, adding, ‘they say I have ye fortune to be very well with him’. Being well with the Duke brought its own prestige as well as introductions to those in the Duke’s impressive social milieu. Amongst the visiting Grand Tourists were Shrewsbury’s young cousins George (1685-1732) and James (c.1687-1746) Brudenell who visited with their governor, George inheriting the Earldom of Cardigan while he was there. Lord Halifax’s nephew George Montagu was also there, and frequently socialised with both Shrewsbury and Jervas between the springs of 1703 and 1704. Other tourists prioritised a call on Shrewsbury as soon as they arrived in Rome, acknowledging his social prominence. Shrewsbury was also acquainted with prominent Romans such as the architect and collector Paolo Falconieri, whom he commissioned to design the new Palace of Whitehall, and plans for which he inspected with Jervas in June 1703.

Such social flexibility was characteristic of expatriate colonies, the opportunities it presented being aptly described by Joseph Spence in 1741: ‘One of the great advantages of travelling, for a little man like me, is to make acquaintances with several people of

---

70 Montagu Boughton vol. 65. A Journal by his Grace Charles Duke of Shrewsbury, Northampton Record Office, pg. 150. ‘Mr. Dryden’ is John Dryden jr., son of the poet and dramatist, who died in Rome on 16 April 1703.
72 George Montagu (c.1684-1739) and his governor were back home in England by November 1704. Montagu does not have an entry in the Ingamells Dictionary but I believe that the entry for Edward Wortley-Montagu (1678-1761) is an amalgam of facts related to both young men, who were distant cousins. George Montagu has an entry in Cruickshanks, Handley and Hayton, The House of Commons 1690-1715, Cambridge, 2002, vol. 4 [Members G-N], pg. 887-888. Several portraits of George Montagu by Jervas, executed after both returned to England, have survived CR M18-M20.
higher rank than one could well get at in England’. Indeed, amongst the English aristocracy who sojourned in Rome during Jervas’s residence there, ten are known to have commissioned portraits of Jervas when all the parties had returned to London. The valuable social and material gains to be made by travellers like Jervas, with artistic expertise and local knowledge, ensured that there was rivalry between his contemporaries. The Scottish architect James Gibbs (1682-1754) was in Rome at the same time as Jervas, and is known to have provided architecture lessons to young aristocrats; he notes the competitive ambiance in a letter to Sir John Perceval: ‘...things go so ill here, and there is such a pack of us, and so jealous of one another, that the one would see the other hanged, that for my part, if it please the stars, I will make my stay as short as possible’. Jervas was inevitably part of this ‘pack’, dependent on affluent visitors for their livelihoods. Writing to Matthew Prior in 1700, who was then back in England, Jervas hints at a collaboration between the two in managing the acquisitive ambitions of Grand Tourists:

I am glad to hear that you propagate the virtuoso faith; I shall endeavour to confirm your disciples in it by disposing of their money with all possible care. I must take the more time because I can’t yet guess at Mr. Montague’s gusto. Some general hints as to subjects would be of service, and it is convenient too, to order your or their banker to send me a credit to Leghorn, that cash may be ready upon occasion.

The unavoidably predatory tone of his words is significant in view of the insight granted into his activities by a series of letters from one Thomas Gaugain to Lord Halifax, at the

---

74 Ingamells, A Dictionary of British and Irish Traveller, pg. 881.
75 They are Joseph Addison CR A2-A6; Peter Bathurst CR B7-B9; Scroop Egerton, later Earl of Bridgewater CR E1-E12; George Brudenell, Earl of Cardigan CR B27-B30; Robert Furnese CR F15; Edward Machell Ingram, Viscount Irwin CR I2; George Montagu, Earl of Halifax CR M18-M20; Edward Wortley Montagu CR M15-M16, M35-M41, William Pulteney, later Earl of Bath CR P18-P19; and James Scudamore CR S3-S4. Dates when each were in Rome are given in Ibid.
76 Brinsley Ford, ‘The Blathwayt Brothers’.
78 Letter dated 25 December 1700. Rigg, Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath, (Prior Papers), 1908, pg. 432. ‘Mr. Montagu’ here may refer to Edward Wortley-Montagu (1678-1761), future husband of Lady Mary, who was then in Padua en route to Rome.
time when the latter’s nephew George Montagu was in Rome with his governor.

Gaugain appears in the Duke of Shrewsbury’s diary frequently, being usually in the company of Montagu and Jervas, and was possibly an aspiring artist, or guide. Gaugain wrote to Lord Halifax in November 1703 that Jervas was offering practical guidance in sourcing paintings, clearly for Halifax’s collection, adding that he (Jervas) had ‘interests in diverse matters; therefore one can employ him more profitably than other [advisors]....If I see it is necessary to offer him some recompense to make him act with integrity I will do so on your behalf’. The next extant letter from Gaugain is, as he admits, ‘toute de marbre, de Bustes & de peinture’. Jervas, he relays, has ‘found for us 4 pieces by [Salvator] Rosa....two with goats, and some rocks. The two others with dogs fighting a bull. We could have these four pieces for 40 Ecus, i.e. 13 Pistoles. He himself gets paid 20 Ecus on each, & even more, now that he is employed by the Ambassador of the Emperor’. Halifax’s reply does not survive, but he clearly advised caution, as Gaugain’s final letter demonstrates:

The one word you pleased to tell me which was if Gervais wanted to serve us honestly, &c, made me open my eyes; which I had not done when we had not needed his integrity; we have found out that he is a Pellerin of the first order. We have discovered his nets set in a hundred places; he realised; we did not say anything openly to him in order to get the best advantage of the situation. We tried everything to make him an honest man, but in vain. Finally we duped him having obtained through other means some things at much lower prices than he was tempting us with, & he lost the profit he was expecting. I beg you My Lord to keep secret the information on this [‘]honest man[’] because the Duke of

---

79 ‘Il pourroit avoir son interest dans plusieurs affaires; ainsi on peut l’employer plus sûrement qu’un autre....si je voy qu’il soit nécessaire de lui proposer quelque recompense pour le faire agir avec une entiere equité, je le feray de vôtre part’. Letter dated 4 November 1703. Egerton Ms 929 f49v-50r. British Library.
80 Letter dated 12 January 1704. Ibid, f55r.
81 Ibid, f56r. The Emperor was Leopold I, Holy Roman Emperor (1640-1705)
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Shrewsbury uses him as best he can…Our wariness of him [Jervas] wasted us much time.\textsuperscript{82} Gaugain appears not to have shared his experience of Jervas’s ‘ruses and rapacity’,\textsuperscript{83} with Shrewsbury, and the latter did indeed continue to trust Jervas to act for him in the purchase of art works. The same month in which the latter describes Jervas caustically as ‘an honest man’, the Duke records in his diary that ‘I gave him [Jervas] bills for 200 Crowns & my Bustos which cost me 100 to lay out for me as he thought good in Pictures’.\textsuperscript{84}

As well as assisting visitors in their purchases and commissions, Jervas was, as at Paris, buying to order for his correspondents in England. An extensive list of engravings kept with Jervas’s letter of 1699 to Dr. Clarke at Worcester College, Oxford, is probably a form of shopping list for the artist, which includes several luxurious series of prints such as ‘All the things of Salvator Rosa, that are etched by himself. I think about 50 sheets’, ‘The Pictures in the Chambers of the Vatican’, and ‘All that of Raphael that’s etched by Pietro Santi Bartoli’.\textsuperscript{85} Another, and yet more prestigious, patron of Jervas was the Duke of Marlborough himself who had embarked on an ambitious programme of acquisition in order to furnish Blenheim Palace, the foundation stone of which was laid in June 1705.\textsuperscript{86}

\textsuperscript{82} ‘Le seul mot qu’il vous plut de me dire, que si Gervais vouloit nous server sincerement &c, me fist ouvrir les yeux; ce que je n’avoy pas fait quand nous n’avoyons point besoin de sa droiture; nous avons avoy qu’es un Pellerin qui en fait long. Nous avons découvert ses filets tendus en cent endroits; il s’en est aperçu; nous ne lui en avons rien marqué ouvertement, pour en tirer toujours le meilleur parti. Nous avons tout tenté pour le render honnête homme; mais en vain. Enfin nous l’avons duppé ayant û par d’autres voyes, des choses à bien plus bas prix qu’il ne nous les faisoit esperer,…Le Duc de Shrewsbury se sert de lui du mieux…La defiance, à son [Jervas] égard, nous a bien fait perdre du tem[ps]. Nous avons, depuis peu, trouvé quelques voyes sures, & des secours que le tem[ps] seul donne’. The underscoring is Gaugain’s. The reference to Pellerin is as yet untraced, but may refer to a fictional character, presumably villainous. Letter dated 14 April 1704. \textit{Ibid}, f58v.

\textsuperscript{83} ‘…par ses ruses & par sa rapacité, qui sont egales chez lui’. \textit{Ibid}, f59r. With many thanks to Carol Blackett-Ord for her translations.

\textsuperscript{84} Montagu Boughton vol. 65. A Journal by his Grace Charles Duke of Shrewsbury, Northampton Record Office, pg. 306 (diary entry for 11 April 1704).


While Marlborough continued his campaigns in Europe against Louis XIV and his Spanish allies, the Duke of Shrewsbury, back in England from January 1706, wrote to him with regular and encouraging updates on the building works. Shrewsbury, now a respected connoisseur, is likely to have recommended his Roman acquaintance, Jervas, as an astute means of accessing the Italian marketplace. Jervas consequently wrote to Marlborough in August 1706, with an enticing offer: ‘Don Livio Odescalchi resolves to sell his Collection & sent his Agent to me to know whether I coud treat for ym[them]. I promis’d to acquaint my friends in England that here are about a hundred pieces of the best Authors & most of ym in the best condition of any of the several kind[.] I believe there may be a Thousand in all, but I reckon about a hundred fitt for yr. Grace’, adding pointedly, ‘I am sure the French king never has such an Opportunity….’ Prince Livio Odescalchi (1652-1713) was the nephew of Pope Innocent XI (pontiff 1676-1689) and had purchased en masse from her heirs the famous art collection formed by Queen Christina of Sweden (1626-1689). He had also acquired the estate at Bracciano, near Rome, and its ducal title, and it is as the Duke of Bracciano that he frequently appears in a social context in Shrewsbury’s Roman diary. Jervas’s letter urges ‘an Answer imediatly’, but no further documentation survives, and Odescalchi’s collection was dispersed only after

---

87 Shrewsbury’s new house at Heythrop, begun in 1707, was close to Blenheim. Add. 61,131, f34-35 [May 1706]. f36 [August 1706], f51-52 [July 1707]. British Library. Letters from the Duke of Shrewsbury to the Duke of Marlborough relating to Blenheim Palace.

88 Letter dated 21 August 1706. Blenheim Papers Add. 61,365 f9. British Library. At this date, Marlborough was laying siege to the town of Menen in modern-day Belgium (David Chandler, Marlborough as military commander, Tunbridge Wells, 1989, pg. 181-182.


91 Odescalchi showed the Duke of Shrewsbury precious jewels from his collection in December 1704, including a stone ‘rather biger than a fresh almond’ [diary pg. 381], and ‘all his Pictures & Arras hangings, the last I had never seen & are wonderfull fine’, in April the following year [diary pg. 409]. In October 1702, Shrewsbury, Jervas and others had taken a three day jaunt in the Roman campagna, taking in Caprarola, Bassano and Bracciano [diary pg. 188]. Montagu Boughton vol. 65. A Journal by his Grace Charles Duke of Shrewsbury, Northampton Record Office.
his death; ironically enough the highlights were purchased in the 1720s by the royal houses of France and Spain.\(^9\)

Jervas had partial success with an even greater, speculative, purchase which he made with the expectation of selling to the English crown. Having copied the Raphael cartoons in the royal collection in the 1690s, Jervas opportuneelly purchased another which he intended ‘for one end of the famous Hampton Court Gallery’.\(^9\) This was the cartoon for the lower half of that artist’s \textit{Transfiguration} painting (1516-1520), the ‘Universally admired’\(^9\) altarpiece in S. Pietro in Montorio, Rome (fig 1g). Jervas described it as ‘black and white upon blue paper: all critics and judges of the art esteem it beyond any of his works, and ‘tis the greater relick being the last design of that famous author’.\(^9\) He soon encountered problems however when Pope Clement XI (pontiff 1700-1721) imposed an export embargo, Jervas’s version of the ensuing affair being dramatically recounted in a letter of February 1703 to his life-long friend Bishop Hough (1651-1743).\(^9\)

‘The Design was expos’d to public sale for payment of Marquess Nerli’s debts, & I bought if fairly’ in March 1702, stated Jervas to his correspondent.\(^9\)\(^7\) He believed that the death of King William III on the 8\(^{th}\) of that month, prompted ‘the Chamberlains officers,
soldiers, *sbirri* [police &c.],

98 to confiscate the cartoon on behalf of the papacy. Jervas alleged that the Vatican took the opportunity of the interregnum in order to seize the cartoon, expecting that, ‘the Affaires of England would have been imbroild in that nice conjecture’; by extension, he is confirming that both he and the papacy expected the English crown, in normal circumstances, to intervene on his behalf. In reality, Jervas found no intimations of support from the new monarch, nor his compatriots in Rome, ‘had the rest of our Gentlemen here stood up with me for the honor of England, his Holiness had burnt his fingers, but either out of fear or neglect they lost a very handsom opportunity to make this Government more civil to us than they are likely to be’. Even the Duke of Shrewsbury does not escape criticism, though it is primarily directed at the English crown and politicians; he wrote that the Duke, ‘is too much a statesman to engage in this business without Orders’.99 The real reason for the cartoon’s seizure was more mundane; the new pope was, according to Addison, ‘a Master of Polite Learning, and a great Encourager of Arts’.100 In April 1703 he similarly intervened in the sale of Carlo Maratti’s collection of drawings to the painter John Closterman (1660-1711), who was acting on behalf of an ‘English Lord’.101 Having agreed a deposit of 1,000 scudi (approximately £250) and final payment on delivery of 4,000 scudi (approximately £1,000), ‘the Pope hearing of it, secur’d the drawings; order’d Mr. Closterman his money again, with interest, and annul’d the bargain’.102

98 Ibid.

99 Ms. Eng. Lett. c.275 f18v, Bodleian Library, Oxford. In his diary, the Duke does not dwell on the affair, which further suggests that Jervas is exaggerating the political significance of the episode. On 9 July, the Duke records: ‘This mor.[ning] I was visited by [a] Carmelite Fryar, who came with Mr. Burrows about Mr. Jervaise Carton’ (Montagu Boughton vol. 65. A Journal by his Grace Charles Duke of Shrewsbury, Northampton Record Office, pg. 171. John Burrows was a merchant at Leghorn wth consular responsibilities (Ingamells, *A Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers*, pg. 162-163).

100 Addison, *Remarks on several parts of Italy*, pg. 365. Jervas had made a similar observation in 1700, when an apparent scheme to gain patronage for the sculptor Jean-Baptiste Théodon (1645-1713) in England was thwarted by the Pope, ‘his present Holiness is a lover of art’, wrote Jervas, ‘and consequently does not let him leave this town’ (Letter from Jervas to Matthew Prior, dated 25 December 1700. Rigg, *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath*, (Prior Papers), pg. 432-433).


102 Richardson snr., and jr., *An Account*, pg. 289. Maratti’s drawing collection entered the British royal collection in 1762.
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An interview with the pope was granted to Jervas, Carlo Maratti ‘principal painter & superintendent being present’ presumably in an advisory capacity, at which Jervas, ‘complain’d of so notorious an injustice & affront, his Holiness promisd me all the satisfaction I cou’d desire, by w[hi]ch I understood my carton or such a price as woud silence me, but when they heard it would yield a thous[an]d ster.[ling] in England, they were unwilling to part with such a summe’. The pope compensated Jervas by the figure he had paid for the cartoon, believed by a slightly later commentator to be 400 crowns (approximately £100), by placing the sum in a bank account for him. Jervas railed at the ‘mean tricks’ to which he was subjected, ‘to make me take my Mone & timorous People wonder how I dare contest with the Pope upon his own ground, but I am resolv’d to stand up for the honor of ye Nation; they can’t deny but ’tis mine as lawfully as my Coat’. Jervas met too with Cardinal Giuseppe Sacripante (1642-1727), whom he calls ‘a mean sly Italian courtier that sets up for Protector of our [English] nation only to buble us the more effectually, during which the cardinal further enflamed the artist by reasoning that:

a king of England too may take w[ha]t he pleases from any person w[ha]tsoever, at what price he thinks fit; but I told him roundly that it was a Catholic Mistake, yt[i.e. that] our Princes can do nothing but by law, that their subjects are not to be servd in yt manner, that they treat as Robbers any yt shoud touch the value of a penny without an act of Parliament which always implies our own consent.

104 Ibid.
105 Conversions to English currency in this section are based on contemporary currency values (which were relatively stable year on year) given in Brinsley Ford, ‘The Blathwayt Brothers’, and Colin Chapman, How heavy, how much and how long? : weights, money and other measures used by our ancestors, Dursley, 1995.
108 Ibid. In his criticism of the Vatican’s modus operandi, Jervas is echoing the sentiments of numerous other English travellers who expressed shock at the gross abuses of power exercised by the Roman Catholic Church (in stark contrast to the perceived democracy of the Classical world), as well as the autocratic governments they met with on the continent, most notably in France. See for example Ellis papers. 28,901, f425r;
In recounting the story to Vertue some years later, Jervas added, revealing again a disproportionate sense of the situation, that he had ‘threatned to send some English ships to demolish Cevita Vecchia’. Without diplomatic assistance, however, he was helpless to affect the situation, and finally accepted the pope’s compensation payment on his second visit to Italy in 1738-39. In a curious post script to this fiasco, the cartoon was subsequently purchased by Henry Somerset (1707-1745), 3rd Duke of Beaufort, when he visited Italy in 1726-27 and has been called by a recent art historian a ‘putative ‘cartoon’…which seems to be a late-Baroque imitation’.

National pride again prompted Jervas to belligerence in the summer of 1704, when the Duke of Shrewsbury recorded how he had brawled with one Mr. Gordon, who had apparently ‘called our Queen a whore’. The fracas happened in what was called the English Coffeehouse, adjacent to the German Ambassador’s palazzo. The Duke learnt from a young English traveller, John Howe, that ‘Jervaise in his late combat was so frightened, that he fell into a swound, & [Howe’s] Gov[erno]r found him so that at the coffee[house] all say none but Gordon was upon him, though he [Jervas] says three or four; the rest came to part them’. Other informal details of Jervas’s life during this decade are scarce, as his surviving correspondence (a total of seven letters over a ten

---


109 Walpole Society, *Vertue Notebooks*, (vol. 3), pg. 93. Eighty kilometres from Rome, Civitavecchia was the main trading port for the city.


111 Ingamells, *A Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers*, 1997, pg. 68. Vertue confirms that the cartoon purchased by the Duke of Beaufort ‘is the same drawing Mr. Jarvis the painter had agreed for many years ago’ (Walpole Society, *Vertue Notebooks*, (vol. 4), pg. 163-4).

112 John Shearman, *Raphael’s Cartoons in the collection of Her Majesty the Queen*, London, 1972, pg. 105, n55. The cartoon was then in the collection of the Duke’s descendants at Badminton, Gloucestershire.

113 Montagu Boughton vol. 65. A Journal by his Grace Charles Duke of Shrewsbury, Northampton Record Office, pg. 346 (diary entry for 14 August 1704). The Duke doubted that this was the reason for the argument however. Mr. Gordon is unidentified; as his name could be Scottish, he may have been an a member of the exiled Jacobite community in Rome.

114 Montagu Boughton vol. 65. A Journal by his Grace Charles Duke of Shrewsbury, Northampton Record Office, pg. 338 (diary entry for 28 July 1704). The coffeehouse was pulled down by papal order the following month.
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year period) is generally formal, and art-orientated in nature. Vertue notes that he called himself ‘Carlo Jervasi’\textsuperscript{115} in Italy which appears to have been habitual among his artistic contemporaries since John Talman (‘Gio. Talmar’) and Henry Trench (‘Enrico Trench’) also italicised their names when abroad.\textsuperscript{116} Jervas was certainly developing his own private art collection, Pope later enthusing over ‘so many Raphaels, Titian’s and Guido’s, as are lodg’d in your Cabinet’.\textsuperscript{117} The immense quantities of drawings and paintings attributed to Italian masters which were offered in his posthumous sale must have been largely accumulated during this period, and also his second, brief visit to Italy towards the end of his life. Vertue was characteristically disparaging of this collection, but provides an insight into the means of acquisition, remarking how ‘he us[e]d at Rome to b[u]y whole cargoes at once[;] by this means he got some good – among an infinite number of trash’.\textsuperscript{118}

Jervas’s place(s) of residence in Rome are unknown. His landlord in 1705 was one ‘Ant.[onio?] Axer’,\textsuperscript{119} who died in February of that year.\textsuperscript{120} He may be the same ‘signor Antonio Axer Tedesco, molto intelligente…ma io per me stimo il parere di Axer’ (‘Mr. Antonio Axer, German, very intelligent… as for me, I respect the opinion of Axer’) mentioned by the Roman collector Padre Sebastiano Resta in a letter of February 1704.\textsuperscript{121}

\textsuperscript{115} Walpole Society, \textit{Vertue Notebooks}, (vol. 3), pg. 16.
\textsuperscript{116} Ingamells, \textit{A Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers}, pg. 924, 950.
\textsuperscript{117} Letter from Pope to Jervas dated 29 November 1716. Sherburn, \textit{The Correspondence of Alexander Pope}, pg. 377.
\textsuperscript{118} Walpole Society, \textit{Vertue Notebooks}, (vol. 3), pg. 103.
\textsuperscript{119} Montagu Boughton vol. 65. A Journal by his Grace Charles Duke of Shrewsbury, Northampton Record Office, pg. 390 (diary entry for 5 February 1705).
\textsuperscript{120} Shrewsbury heard on 5 February 1705 that ‘Ant. Axer, Gervases Landlord was dead, & his wife desired I would convey a letter from her to Jervase’ (Montagu Boughton vol. 65. A Journal by his Grace Charles Duke of Shrewsbury, Northampton Record Office, pg. 390. Confusingly, five years later in 1710, the artist John Talman took rooms in the house of the German dealer Antonio Axer on the Corso (Sicca, ‘On William Kent’s Roman sources’, pg. 136). As the Duke of Shrewsbury is unambiguous in stating that Ant.[onio?] Axer died in February 1705, both Axers are plausibly of the same family, accustomed to providing lodgings to visiting artists.
Jervas described his lodgings in 1703 as ‘very high & very good, except in an Earthquake, we were rockt as in a ship for at least 40 seconds’. These tremors occurred between October 1702 and the following February, gathering in ferocity, and Jervas recounted to Hough the devastation and loss of life suffered in the epicentres of Norcia and L’Aquila, both of which are over 100 kilometres from Rome. ‘Only the greater shocks affect us here,’ he could write, ‘...if there comes another rousing shock, I shall decamp’. He was horrified by the consequent religious fervour, ‘the dismal processions disturb more than the earthquakes, such continual howling and whipping ymselves with chains & cords; crowns of thorns & habits lined through with fir bushes next their naked hides, arms strecht out & fastened to great crosses, with skeletons, houre glasses, sythes, and other horrid symbols yt bring grist to ye Priests and frighten the rest of the world out of their wits’. Yet he was not immune to reflection prompted such forces majeures, his focus turning to the possibility of Rome being damaged by further and greater shocks:

tis certain no place upon our globe ought to be so much regretted, should it be destroyed. No time could repair the loss: so many & so stupendous monuments of art & magnificence yt must necessarily perish, that no pen nor pencil can express, nor the most elevated imagination conceive a just idea of their beauty. If my prayers woud signify anything, I coud forget myself & my acquaintance, & beg for the preservation of this glorious place.

Jervas did not spend the remainder of his time exclusively in Rome, however. In September 1704 he made out his will, signed in the presence of the Duke of Shrewsbury,

---

123 Ibid.
124 Ibid, f19v. The Duke of Shrewsbury was more scornful, writing in his diary that ‘The confessors in this towne bragg that the earthquake had done more good than 3 holy yeares, that they have penitents who have not thought of God in these 30 years’ (Montagu Boughton vol. 65. A Journal by his Grace Charles Duke of Shrewsbury, Northampton Record Office, pg. 209 (diary entry for 20 January 1703).
Chapter 1 Jervas’s continental travels 1698-1708/09

witnessed by the latter’s servants, and ‘gave it into my [the Duke’s] custody, in case of my death to be delivered to Mr. Baldwyn, his uncle at Shrewsbury’. Jervas also left money for his landlord Mr. Axer, and repaid a loan of £100 to the Duke.\textsuperscript{126} This alignment of his affairs is explained by the diary entry made by the Duke less than a week later; he ‘saw Jervas who sayd he sh[oul]d go tomorrow’, but does not mention the his destination. The artist does not feature again in the Duke’s diary, the latter departing in April 1705, which may be interpreted with some certainty as evidence that Jervas was absent from Rome during this seven month period. Given that Jervas was departing Rome in the autumn, but would later return, his probable destination was Naples, for both climatic and more particularly artistic reasons.

Naples was then the furthest south that a traveller to Italy could conveniently visit, though it was not without its disincentives; the road from Rome was ‘shamefully bad’\textsuperscript{127} and prone to \textit{banditti},\textsuperscript{128} the region impoverished and an official passport was essential in order to enter the Kingdom of Naples, then under Spanish rule.\textsuperscript{129} For Jervas it would have been an indispensable visit for the purposes of his artistic education. The city was renowned for its religious, rather than private, artistic patronage, hence the most celebrated art works were easily accessible in the churches and monasteries.\textsuperscript{130} Caravaggio (c.1571-1610), Ribera (1591-1652), Artemisia Gentileschi (1593-c.1653) and Salvator Rosa (1615-1673) had all worked in the city, as did Luca Giordano (1634-1705) and Francesco Solimena (1657-1747) at the time when Jervas is believed to have visited.

\textsuperscript{126} Quotation and references from Montagu Boughton vol. 65. A Journal by his Grace Charles Duke of Shrewsbury, Northampton Record Office, pg. 358 (diary entries for 20 and 21 September 1704).

\textsuperscript{127} Wright, Edward, \textit{Some observations made in travelling through France, Italy, &c. in the years 1720, 1721, 1722}, London, 1730, vol. 1, pg. 149.

\textsuperscript{128} Lassels, \textit{The Voyage of Italy}, part 2, pg. 192-3.

\textsuperscript{129} Black, \textit{The British and the Grand Tour}, pg. 32, 41, 89; and Black, \textit{Italy and the Grand Tour}, pg. 51-54.

Jervas had returned to Rome by August 1706 at the latest, from where he wrote to the Duke of Marlborough with regard to the Odescalchi collection. His whereabouts between that date and his return to London in the winter of 1708-1709 are subject to conjecture. The title page of his posthumous sale catalogue proclaims that the contents were, 'chiefly collected by him [Jervas] in a series of forty years in Rome, Lombardy, Venice, France and Flanders' (the ordering of these venues may be significant, and reflect a hierarchy of artistic value). Lombardy (presumably Milan and Piacenza), Venice and Flanders (no doubt including Antwerp) were almost certainly visited at this period, rather than his second, brief, voyage to Italy in 1738-39 when he was ill. No further evidence survives for his itinerary, though several of his sale lots by Jervas himself are copies after paintings in Siena (9th day, lot 581: ‘The Circumcision at St. Catherina in Siena from Guido’), and Florence (23rd day, lot 1951: ‘5 [drawings] of the Wrestlers at Florence...’; 24th day, lot 2042: ‘3 Views of Meleager’s Boar at Florence’), suggesting, quite credibly, that he also visited Tuscany.

William Kent, who spent the decade 1709-1719 on the continent declared that, ‘I find Rome ye best place to make a painter’. He might have intended this in several senses, primarily that Rome was considered the prime repository of ancient and modern painting, sculpture, and architecture. Judging from Jervas’s correspondence, and the innumerable originals and copies offered in his posthumous sale (which represents only those items which he had not sold by his death), he was indeed a diligent student. The thorough artistic education and private collection with which he returned to London in

131 The exact date of Jervas’s return to London is unclear. He was hailed by Addison in The Tatler of April 1709 as ‘the last great painter Italy has sent us’ (The Tatler, no. 4 [16-19 April 1709], single sheet, unpaginated), and the following month, May 1709, Swift departed from London leaving an unfinished portrait in Jervas’s studio (see chapter 5 footnote 9).
132 ‘A Catalogue of the most Valuable collection of Pictures, Prints, and Drawings late of Charles Jarvis, Esq, deceased’, which sale commenced on 11 March 1739/40. The phrasing erroneously suggests that the artist was abroad for forty years, rather than the two sojourns of 1698-1708/09 and 1738-39 made over a period of forty years.
133 Lot details from Jervas’s second posthumous sale, which commenced on 2 April 1741.
1708-1709 were but part of the advantage he had accrued by his travels. The social ‘polish’ acquired by experiencing different societies, languages, governments and cultural mores, was a significant part of the attraction of European travel for the British nobility, and a degree of gentrification could be attained by travellers of more humble origin. Jervas was clearly an astute traveller, his itinerary mirroring that of the elite Grand Tourists on whom he was dependent for his livelihood while abroad, while also taking full advantage of the inherent opportunities for social promotion among small expatriate communities. On returning home, travellers of all kinds found themselves, through the sheer rarity of their experience, part of ‘a charmed, exotic world’. Consequently, Jervas’s lengthy training in the artistic *caput mundi* lent him an unassailable credibility, and he found ready patronage among those whom he had met and served abroad, as well as numerous others of that elite social stratum.

---

136 Black, ‘Notes and Documents’, pg. 337.
CHAPTER 2 JERVAS’S PATRONS: ROBERT WALPOLE AND HIS WHIG ALLIES

As the chronicler George Vertue was considering the phenomenon of contemporary patronage in his notebook of 1737, he enumerated some of the fortunate artists who enjoyed the exclusive promotion of a nobleman, and coupled the names of Sir Robert Walpole (1676-1745) and Charles Jervas.¹ An initial survey of the latter’s output would appear to undermine this theory of exclusivity, demonstrating as it does the wide and varied sources of commissions received by the portraitist. So would exploration of the array of contemporary artists who were also recipients of Walpole’s patronage. However, with the exception of those works prompted by family loyalty and close personal friendship, the vast majority of the Jervas’s oeuvre and professional milestones bear a lineage that culminates in his position of favour with the King’s First Minister. In Jervas’s case, Walpole’s patronage manifested itself in several forms, from direct commissions for paintings to significant promotion among his extended family, political allies and courtiers (including the royal family), and the purchase of Old Master paintings for the celebrated ‘capital collection’. The success with which Walpole endorsed the artist, most notably in his nomination for the post of Painter to the King, is both a measure of his rise to political omnipotence, and the extent to which allies, aspirants and sycophants alike, by also patronising Jervas, openly flattered their Prime Minister’s taste.

This auspicious relationship originated in the most predictable manner - Walpole, the newly appointed Secretary at War to Queen Anne, commissioned a portrait from Jervas to commemorate his promotion (CR W20) (fig 2a). The modest painting was executed very shortly after Jervas returned from Italy in the winter of 1708-9, in the period before Walpole was dismissed from office in September 1710. His choice of artist may have been directed by his fellow Kit Cat member, the Irish-born writer Richard Steele (1672-

¹ Walpole Society, *Vertue Notebooks*, (vol. 3), pg. 79.
1729), who as mentioned hailed Jervas’s return from Italy in glowing terms.\(^2\) The commission not only heralded a fruitful association between the men, but was also the first in a series of increasingly bravura portraits of Walpole, by various artists, over the next thirty-five years.\(^3\) As it was, the portrait of 1709/10 was a celebration of achievement for the immensely hard-working King’s Lynn MP who had used the past decade to impress his fellow Whigs with his political acuity and brilliant delivery in the Commons. Clearly in the ascendant, Walpole was nonetheless considered by his party of secondary import to his Norfolk neighbour (and soon to be brother-in-law) Charles Townshend (1674-1738). Six months of imprisonment in the Tower of London (in 1712) on grounds of misappropriation of public funds were, contrary to expectation, Walpole’s proving ground, and he triumphantly cast himself as a quasi-martyr to the Whig cause. His gradual and opportunistic rise to power began, not uneventfully, by means of political skill, flawless timing and systematic abuse of government monies and sinecures on an audacious scale.\(^4\)

For Walpole, the embellishment of his homes, creation of an unrivalled collection of art works, and avid patronage of contemporary artists and craftsmen were just some of his stratagems for the acquisition and consolidation of political power. He maintained and adorned a range of private and government residences; Orford House in Chelsea, with the assistance of John Vanbrugh; 16 Grosvenor Street (for his son and heir Robert, Lord Walpole); Ranger’s Lodge in Richmond Park (for Maria Skerrett, later his second wife, and their daughter); 10 Downing Street from 1735, and 17 Arlington Street off Piccadilly from 1742. At Houghton in Norfolk, he replaced the squirely family house with the truly palatial Hall, transplanting old Houghton village to comply with Charles Bridgeman’s

---

\(^2\) See chapter 1 pg 72n.
\(^3\) Kneller painted Walpole for Jacob Tonson’s Kit Cat Club series at some point between 1710-1715 (National Portrait Gallery no. 3220) but Jervas’s portrait is positively the first commissioned by Walpole himself for his own purposes. J. Douglas Stewart, *Sir Godfrey Kneller*, London, 1971, pg. xvi.
new plans for the demesne. The Yorkshiremen Thomas Ripley (c.1683-1758) and William Kent (1685-1748), as architect and interior decorator respectively, oversaw an edifice in compliance with Walpole’s ambitions for princely splendour, a setting for his growing collection of art works, the whole designed to amaze and awe. A combination of unstinting and lavish entertainments along with its majestic setting did not fail to impress, and at Downing Street, ‘as the visitor made their way to an audience with the ‘sole’ minister they embarked on a psychological journey similar to that an ambassador had to take when visiting the Doge of Venice…or even [a] monarch of one of the courts of Europe’.6

Walpole’s collection, to which Jervas contributed as both artist and procurer, comprised a combination of inherited family paintings, commissioned works, and (by far the largest category) recent purchases. The quality of the collection, which had grown to 421 paintings by 1736,7 received universal acclaim from the outset, the more surprising in view of Walpole’s apparent lack of connoisseurial qualifications. He had forsaken his scholarship at King’s College, Cambridge, when he unexpectedly became his father’s heir and succeeded at the age of twenty-four to both the Houghton estate and indirectly the latter’s parliamentary seat for Castle Rising. Having never travelled abroad or previously displayed artistic inclinations, Walpole made his earliest known art purchase in 1718, which raises the question of why he acquired at such a rate, and, more importantly, how he made what were considered exemplary decisions in the formation of his collection.

Some way towards an explanation may be divined in the apparently contradictory nature of Walpole’s personality; an amalgam of bluff, hard-drinking country squire and eloquent, intuitive politician and courtier. His initial intention was surely to furnish his

residences in a sumptuous manner and unsubtly demonstrate to visitors their host’s enormous spending power. The collection worked on another level too, allowing Walpole to compete with the old nobility to which he aspired, and (superficially at least) prove their equal in taste and erudition. That Walpole bought works from notable and aristocratic collections, such as those of the Dukes of Wharton and Portland, Earls of Cadogan and Halifax, Grinling Gibbons and Jonathan Richardson, served not only to imbue the purchases with additional credibility, but enrich the growing collection with a range of celebrated provenances. Indeed, the arrivistic proliferation of Garter stars throughout the decorative scheme at Houghton confirms Walpole’s tendency to flaunt symbols of social prowess. His attitude appears to have tempered over time, and by the late 1730s appears motivated by a more artistic appreciation, leading in 1743 to a proposed tour of Italy with his youngest son Horace.8

The obvious question of how Walpole developed his refined tastes with such remarkable speed has not been satisfactorily answered to date. His sons were important advisors and agents during and after their respective Grand Tours in 1722-23 (Robert), 1730-31 (Edward) and 1739-41 (Horace), though it must be noted that only the last was a natural connoisseur. William Kent’s free hand in the interior schemes at Houghton serve to demonstrate the confidence his employer had in his artistic expertise, and he was doubtless another advisor with regard to purchases and commissions. However, Kent was in Italy for a decade from 1709 and is not known to have been associated with Walpole prior to his work at Houghton from c.1725. Significantly, no advisor has been identified or suggested for the initial period of Walpole’s activity, and it is proposed here that Jervas, who first met Walpole for the portrait commission of 1709/10, could have provided some element of direction and encouragement in the 1710s, when Walpole first began to acquire. As already seen, Jervas had employed a good deal of his

8 Horace Walpole to Horace Mann, April 1743. ‘We were talking over Italy last night; my Lord [Sir Robert Walpole] that if he thought he had strength, he would see Florence, Bologna and Rome, by way of Marseilles to Leghorn. You may imagine how I gave in to such a jaunt. I don’t set my heart on it, because I think he cannot do it.’ W S Lewis (ed.) The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole’s Correspondence, New Haven, 1955, vol. 18, pg. 202.
time in Italy in sketching private collections, and undoubtedly shared his impressions with his English patrons, if only to draw attention to his prolonged period of study there. It is possible that his experience of the Italian culture of noble patronage, in which the successful accumulation of political influence and generous artistic sponsorship were closely allied, was an influence on Walpole in the early years of their acquaintance. It was in the 1710s and early 1720s that he was acquiring a range of Netherlandish, Flemish, French and Italian paintings via the frame maker John Howard, dealers like Andrew Hay, and Robert Bragge and at the sales of Jan Griffier (?1645-1718), Grinling Gibbons, William van Huls, and the Duke of Portland. It is certain that Jervas was offering his artistic expertise as late as 1735. Earl Waldegrave, then Ambassador to Paris, was instrumental in the acquisition of Poussin’s *Holy Family with Ss Elizabeth and John the Baptist* (1650s) for £320, on the receipt of which Walpole wrote, ‘It is impossible not to be pleased with it, I thank your Lordship for persuading me to buy it’ (fig 2b). The Earl replied, ‘I hear that M. Jervais has discovered that the picture sent you is not a Poussin. It gives a very good idea of his judgement and the connoisseurs here have been very merry about it’. Jervas’s *faux pas* does not appear to have affected his patron’s estimation of him, as he was subsequently acting as his agent abroad, and Walpole purchased five old master paintings from Jervas’s posthumous sale. Had Jervas any influence on the formation of the celebrated collection, the fact has gone unrecorded in Horace Walpole’s *Ædes Walpolianae* (1748, 1752), and has been obscured by Sir Robert’s deliberate destruction of swathes of personal correspondence and documentation. It remains a likelihood however, in view of their long and close association.

---

11 Jeremy Black, *Walpole in Power*, Stroud, 2001, pg. 72. The painting is still considered to be by Nicholas Poussin (1594-1665), and is now in The State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, no. 1213.
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Jervas’s portraits executed for Walpole constitute a definite contribution to the collection. Two further portraits of Sir Robert himself have been identified, the first datable to 1725, the year in which he was created a Knight of the Order of the Bath, that order having been revived by the King at Walpole’s own prompting. (CR W21). The portrait was updated the following year, presumably by Jervas, when the sitter was granted the more prestigious honour of the Garter, and the surviving portrait shows him wearing the black velvet robes of the Chancellor of the Exchequer prominently emblazoned with his Garter star and riband. The third and last portrait type by Jervas dates to approximately 1730, coinciding with the zenith of Walpole’s power, when he had forced the resignation of Townshend, and could henceforth truly be called, and weald power as, the ‘prime’ minister (CR W22-W23). A host of family portraits were likewise executed by Jervas, including Walpole’s parents14 (probably copies of earlier examples); his siblings Dorothy (CR T14-T22) and Galfridus (CR W11), brother-in-law Charles Townshend (CR T8-T13), his two wives Catherine Shorter (CR W3-W9) (and her sister Charlotte CR C90) and Maria Skerrett (CR W25-W16). Walpole also commissioned portraits of his eldest son Robert (CR Coll6-Coll8),15 and two portraits of his daughter-in-law Margaret Rolle (CR W14). One of only two lifetime portraits of his daughter Mary Cholmondeley is a delicate crayon drawing by Jervas (possibly a preparatory sketch for an oil painting), which was hung at Houghton as a set with the three pastel portraits of his sons Robert, Edward and Horace, executed in Venice by Rosalba Carriera (1675-1758) during their respective Grand Tours (CR C71). Mary’s sudden death in France in early 1731 presumably elevated the status of this life-sketch in her father’s estimation, causing it to be displayed in this context with her siblings’ finished portraits.

---

14 These were sold with other Walpole portraits at 47 Leicester Square, London, in 1825, as lots 27 (father) and 92 (mother). Lot 55 was called ‘The Daughter of Sir Robert Walpole, in a brown dress’. The vendor, auction house, and exact date of the sale are unrecorded, and the paintings are now untraced. See fig 2c and 2d.

15 It is here proposed on stylistic grounds that these portraits of Robert, Lord Walpole, were collaborations between Jervas and John Wootton.
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In accordance with usual practice, these portraits tended to commemorate key events in the sitters’ lives such as betrothal or professional advancement. Copies after the prime version were expected as presentation gifts for family members or political allies, and provided Jervas (and his studio) with lucrative work. The single surviving document in Walpole’s papers which records his association with Jervas is a bill from the artist for such copies. Dated 20 October 1725, he was providing Susan Hammond, Walpole’s sister, with framed portraits of Sir Robert and Lady Walpole, presumably commemorating the former’s recent knighthood. The same bill also charges for a portrait of Lady Walpole for the minor Whig politician and wit Charles Dartiquenave (1664-1737), the total for the three portraits, frames and packing being £52.3s.16

The artist’s only surviving non-portrait paintings were commissioned by Walpole as over-door pieces for Houghton’s Drawing Room, representing cats and dogs with dead game birds and a deer (CR Nonp1, Nonp2) (fig 2e). They derive specific motifs from a work by the Flemish artist Paul de Vos (c.1591-1678), though the overall compositions may be to an original design by Jervas. None of his other animal or still life works have survived (or if they do, they are not identified), but the Duke of Shrewsbury’s diary does record Jervas working in this genre while in Italy (CR Nonp5, Nonp6).

Jervas also figures among the large network of dealers, diplomats and artists who made purchases on Walpole’s behalf at home and abroad. Only one painting in the Walpole collection has been acknowledged as bearing this provenance, that being Carlo Maratti’s portrait of Pope Clement IX (1669) (fig 2f). This portrait shows the sixty-nine year old pope in a fur-lined scarlet cape and hat, seated in a velvet-upholstered chair with rich gilded carvings. It is a superior copy after the Vatican original, commissioned by Marchese Niccolò Maria Pallavicini, and purchased by Jervas from Pallavicini’s heirs.

16 Vouchers 1725 (bundle). Cholmondeley (Houghton) Papers, Cambridge University Library. These copies are now untraced.
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the Arnaldi family. This was during the artist’s second visit to Italy between October 1738 and May 1739; on his return he immediately sold the painting to Walpole for 200 guineas, this course of action recorded by Vertue in his notebooks, and confirmed by Horace in the Aedes. Walpole, quite possibly with the encouragement of Jervas, had designated a ‘Carlo Maratt Room’ on the piano nobile at Houghton, containing thirteen paintings by the master, and a further fifteen works by his pupils Giuseppe Chiari (1654-1727) and Niccolò Berrettoni (1637-1682), and others working in the classical vein espoused by Raphael and the Carracci. Maratti (1625-1713) was the most illustrious living artist at the time of Jervas’s first visit to Italy, and the latter’s admiration is evident in the multitude of studies and copies of his work which he produced, as evinced in his sale catalogue. Jervas knew Maratti (and almost certainly Chiari) personally during the course of his decade in Rome, though the elderly artist’s later works were believed to be of declining quality. Pope Clement IX however dates to his artistic prime, and was universally admired. Vertue saw (and drew) it at Houghton in July 1739, just two months after Jervas’s return from Italy, calling it ‘the Famous picture’, and Horace records it in pride of place over the fireplace in the Carlo Maratti Room in 1743, stating in the Aedes, ‘Nothing can be finer than this, the Boldness of the Penciling is as remarkable as his Delicacy in his general Pictures, and it was so much admired, that he did several of them; one is at Lord Burlington’s at Chiswick.’

17 Walpole Society, Vertue Notebooks, (vol. 3), pg. 96; 1935-36 (vol. 4), pg. 11; 1951-2 (vol. 6), pg. 122.
19 See Introduction pg. 22-25, 29.
20 The Duke of Shrewsbury visited Maratti’s studio with John Dryden jnr. (1667/8-1703) in 1702, recording in his diary, ‘he [Maratti] was abroad but his wife & daughter shewd us all the pictures, his painting dos not much please me and he is now much decayd’. Montagu Boughton vol. 65. A Journal by his Grace Charles Duke of Shrewsbury, Northampton Record Office, pg. 145 (diary entry for 7 January 1702).
21 Walpole Society, Vertue Notebooks, (vol. 4), pg. 13; 1951-2 (vol. 6), pg. 122.
22 Walpole, Aedes Walpolianæ, 1752, pg. 57. The Aedes was first published in 1748 with many printing errors, and a corrected edition in 1752. However, it is believed to have been compiled by 1743, and so within his father’s lifetime, as 24 August 1743 is the date of the Dedication addressed to Sir Robert. Therefore the arrangement of art works can be assumed to be that approved by the latter.
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Given Jervas’s role of dealing in art works since at least 1698, and the phenomenal quantity of works in his collection at the time of his death (a percentage of which must surely have been transient stock), it is likely that he made other purchases on behalf of Walpole for which the evidence has not survived. Certainly two of the five works bought in Jervas’s sale by Walpole can be readily identified, Rembrandt’s *Portrait of an Old Woman*\(^\text{23}\) and Andrea Sacchi’s (attrib) *Venus Resting in a Landscape*,\(^\text{24}\) but this provenance is omitted in Horace’s *Aedes* (fig 2g).\(^\text{25}\) Other lots in Jervas’s sale show that he produced copies from the Walpole collection, further demonstrating the esteem in which he was held by Sir Robert.\(^\text{26}\)

The benefits of Sir Robert’s patronage stretched far beyond his own requirements however, and Jervas’s body of work forms something of an illustrated history of the ‘Robinocracy’. Charles, 2\(^\text{nd}\) Viscount Townshend (1674-1738) was Walpole’s earliest and closest ally, the significance of their equal partnership up to 1730 obscured by Townshend’s forced retirement in that year and subsequent devotion to Norfolk agriculture (famously earning him the moniker ‘Turnip Townshend’). Their affiliation was strengthened in 1713 when Townshend took for his second wife Dorothy Walpole, Sir Robert’s sister. Jervas was commissioned to produce a master version, and several copies after it, of Lord Townshend in Garter Robes commemorating his elevation to that elite brotherhood in 1724 (CR T8-13). Dorothy herself is represented in three principal types after each of which there are multiple copies and variations (CR T14-T22). The

---

\(^{23}\) Fourth day of sale, 14 March 1740, lot 279, £58.6s. The painting was sold to Empress Catherine of Russia in 1779 along with most of the Walpole collection, and is now in the Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts in Moscow, no. 2622.

\(^{24}\) Sixth day of sale, 17 March 1740, lot 401, £52.10s. Now in The State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, no. 127.

\(^{25}\) In fact, the *Aedes* mistakenly states that the Sacchi is from the collection of Lord Halifax (Walpole, *Ædes Walpomana*, 1752, pg. 45). The buyers names and prices are recorded in the Houlditch MSS (‘Sale Catalogues of the Principal Collections of Pictures sold by auction in England within the years 1711 – 1759’) bound volumes, National Art Library, London, pressmark 86.00.18.

earliest is perhaps CR T17 which remains at Houghton, and appears by its style, dimensions and hanging arrangement in Houghton’s Supping Parlour to be a pendant to a portrait of her sister-in-law Catherine Shorter (CR W4) (fig 2h). Charles and Dorothy’s children appear together in an unusually informal group portrait of c.1725 which includes seven children and a dog in a landscape, the eldest boys mischievously hunting for birds eggs (CR T30). Charles’s first wife Elizabeth Pelham was depicted by Jervas (CR T23), presumably before her death in 1711, as well as three of Charles and Elizabeth’s adult children; Thomas (CR T26), William (CR T27-T29) (and his wife Henrietta Poulett CR T24-T25), and Elizabeth (CR C95-C97) (and her husband Charles Cornwallis CR C94) (fig 2d).

Jervas performed related services for Lord Townshend, providing the remodeled Raynham Hall (this work carried out by Ripley and Kent) with full length portraits of the King and Queen, transforming a Lely portrait of Lord Townshend’s mother from a half- into a whole-length, and completing a portrait of Lord Townshend himself, left unfinished by his former teacher Godfrey Kneller. Jervas also provided portraits of this patron and his wife, intended as gifts for Walpole’s brother Horatio at nearby Wolterton Hall, and a whole-length portrait in Garter regalia for John Hobart of Blickling Hall. Horatio himself commissioned an important iconographic series for the state rooms at Wolterton (the house rebuilt 1726-41 by Ripley) comprising whole lengths of Queen Caroline, Kings Charles I, George I and II, Oliver Cromwell and King Louis XIV, as well as further portraits of Horatio and his wife Mary Lombard (fig 2i).


28 Some of these were paid for together on 8 September 1738, the following entry from Horatio Walpole’s personal account book (1730-1746); ‘To Mr. Jervis ye painter for a picture of King Charles ye 1st, & Oliver Cromwell 45 guineas. To him for ye French Kings picture 20 guineas. To him for what remained due on account of Mrs. Walpoles & my pictures 24 guineas. To his servant 1 guinea’. The total being £94.10s. 17/1/3 Box 41 L. Wolterton Hall private archive,
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Other members of the Whig inner circle appear among the artist’s patron list, such as Sir Spencer Compton (c.1674-1743), William Pulteney, Earl of Bath (1684-1764) and William Cavendish, 2nd Duke of Devonshire (1672-1729). Charles Spencer, 3rd Earl of Sunderland (1674-1722) is particularly significant in this context; he was a leading member of the Whig junto until 1716, at which date he formed the disaffected ‘Sunderland faction’ in opposition to Walpole and Townshend. In the period up to his alienation from the main Whig party, he was a generous patron of Jervas. Four different whole-length types of his wife Anne Spencer (d.1716) survive, one of them a grouping of the recently deceased Anne depicted as a Murilloesque Virgin, surrounded by her five cloud-born children (CR S17). Anne was one of the famously beautiful daughters of the 1st Duke and Duchess of Marlborough, and Jervas produced multiple large, whole-length portraits of her sisters Henrietta Godolphin, Elizabeth Egerton and Mary Montagu, their husbands and children.

The pattern of Walpole’s patronage of Jervas he repeated with a variety of other artists and craftsmen. Many others were adopted early in their careers, and thereafter enjoyed considerable commissions from Walpole and his network. John Wootton (1682-1764), Michael Rysbrack (1694-1770), James Richards (1671-1759), John Ellys (c.1701-1757), Ripley and Kent each owed much of their success both to his patronage and his promotion, the last four receiving official sinecures as a direct result. Another beneficiary, the copyist Ranelagh Barrett (active 1737-d.1768), was given studio space by Walpole at the Treasury, ‘who had much business and employment there, for persons of Quality &c and others’, and Michiel van Huysum (1704-c.1760) lived at Houghton while he painted all the over-chimneys and over-doors in the attic storey. This stable of artists bears a parallel with Walpole’s loyal network of political allies, on whom many were heavily dependent for their livelihoods. By patronising Walpole’s favoured artists or making generous gifts of art works to their protector they were dealing in an accepted currency to express gratitude, deference and approbation.

29 Walpole Society, Virtue Notebooks, (vol. 3), pg. 112.
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The obviously Whig accent of Jervas’s oeuvre prompts the question of his personal political affiliations. Contemporary artists were rarely in such a secure professional position as to enable them to deliberately alienate either the Tory or Whig factions, which divisions permeated the patron classes. Nonetheless, they did tend to gravitate towards one or other party, more likely for pragmatic, commercial, rather than personal, reasons. Jervas’s scant surviving correspondence does tend to suggest that he was a committed Whig by nature, when he staunchly defends the Anglican Church and supremacy of law over monarchy, and Pope recognized his ‘Whig-principles’ in a letter of 1714, as did Vertue in his notebooks. Such tenets are bound to have endeared him to Walpole at the beginning of their acquaintance, and the latter’s endorsement thereafter is likely to have both enhanced Jervas’s loyalty to the party, and determined the extensive following which he swiftly gained.

Walpole’s favour proved to be Jervas’s professional lifeblood, without which it is impossible to consider his career trajectory. But just as this patronage entailed innumerable benefits, inherent in it was the means of his demise. The ‘great Collection of noble original pictures’, which ironically grew to become an exemplar of the Grand Tour collection in spite of its owner never having travelled abroad, was Horace Walpole’s own academy which fostered his virtuoso propensities. In his Anecdotes of Painting in England (1762-71), Horace ostensibly relied on the diaries and notebooks of Vertue, but in the fourth volume he dispatched with Jervas’s reputation with a vehemence that is all his own:

33 Walpole Society, Vertue Notebooks, (vol. 3), pg. 79.
34 Walpole Society, Vertue Notebooks, (vol. 5), pg. 121.
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One would think Vertue foresaw how little curiosity posterity would feel to know more of a man who has bequeathed them such wretched daubings. Yet, between the badness of the age’s taste, the dearth of good masters, and a fashionable reputation, Jervas sat at the top of his profession; and his own vanity thought no encomium disproportionate to his merits. Yet he was defective in drawing, colouring, composition, and even in that most necessary and perhaps most easy talent of a portrait-painter, likeness.\textsuperscript{35}

This indictment of Jervas’s talent and character was to hold firm for generations of art historians. However, such strength of opinion must be borne in mind when reading the Aedes, Horace’s official published account of Sir Robert’s collection which doubles as an unfettered homage to his father. In it, Horace is arguable revising the extent of Sir Robert’s admiration for and patronage of Jervas, to the latter’s detriment. For this reason it is quite possible that the artist in fact played a greater role in the character and formation of the Houghton collection, to an extent which has been deliberately ignored by his son in his official published account. It remains a fundamental irony that Jervas’s relationship with the Walpoles was both the source of his fortune and infamy.

\textsuperscript{35} Walpole, Anecdotes of Painting, vol. 4, pg. 12.
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In succeeding to the post of Principal Painter to the King on the death of his much-revered teacher Sir Godfrey Kneller, Jervas joined of an illustrious lineage of court-sponsored artists, most notably Hans Holbein (1497/8-1543), Sir Anthony Van Dyck (1599-1641) and Peter Lely (1618-1680). Such an appointment was undoubtedly trumpeted by the artist and his admirers as an artistic accolade, and with some justification given the cachet of this premier position. An examination of the circumstances however reveals that the promotion was for entirely political gain, and that Jervas was a bit-player in a larger drama authored by his protector Robert Walpole. His sixteen-year tenure was marked by – at best – apathetic patronage from the monarch, with rare commissions outside those routinely assigned to the incumbent, and none that could be considered artistically challenging. Nevertheless, the considerable social, financial and professional impacts on the artist were overwhelmingly positive, and indeed the indifference of his patron proved to be an advantage in itself.

Prior to his appointment, Jervas had a variety of formal and informal relations with the royal collection, and was no stranger to the court. Vertue relates how he; ‘learnt or rather dwel’d’¹ with Kneller, then Principal Painter, for one year in the 1690s, in which period he met ‘Mr Norrice….a great promoter & encourager of Mr. Jervaise’.² John Norris (fl.1667-1714) was joiner and frame-maker in the royal household and, presumably with the approval of Parry Walton the Surveyor of Pictures (in office 1679-1701), allowed Jervas access to the royal collection for study purposes.³ On one occasion this access was recorded in the papers of the Lord Chamberlain’s department, and establishes Jervas at work in London at a far earlier date than has hitherto been assumed. The Earl of Dorset (Lord Chamberlain 1689-1697) issued a warrant dated 24 July 1694 to James Marriott,

¹ Walpole Society, *Vertue Notebooks*, (vol. 3), pg. 15.
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‘Keeper of Their Ma[jes]t[ie]s. Standing Wardrobe’ at Hampton Court requiring him, ‘to permit Mr. Charles Jervas to make Sketches in Little of ye Kertoones of Raphael which are in yr. Custody’. The entry suggests that Jervas was not working by royal commission, and quite possibly intended his small-scale drawings to be engraved and published (as he attempted to do when he reached Paris four years later). Bertus notes that he in fact sold them to the Tory politician Dr. George Clarke (1661-1736) to help fund his continental tour.

The cartoons referred to were the series of seven massive squared drawings prepared by Raphael in 1515-16 as the blueprint for a set of new tapestries for the Sistine Chapel. They were purchased for £300 by Charles I, intending them to be used to produce tapestries at the newly-established Mortlake factory in Surrey. To this end, they were cut into vertical strips and remained in this state until William III ordered the former King’s Gallery at Hampton Court to be remodelled specifically to house the art works (fig 3a). Parry Walton undertook the task of reassembling the drawings, and Jervas was the first (of many) recorded artists to have had access to study and copy them. Jervas’s interest in the cartoons was inevitable given the reverence in which they were held by contemporaries, and later artists, as ‘the most valuable Set of portable Pictures in the World’. Jonathan Richardson pater et fils declared, after a long discussion of the same artist’s works in the Vatican and elsewhere that: ‘There [in the Hampton Court Cartoon Gallery] is the Utmost Perfection of the Art of Painting Now in the World, and probably the Utmost that ever Has been’. Jervas’s place in the studio of the Principal Painter, and

---

4 LC5/151, pg. 375. National Archives, Kew.
5 See chapter 1 pg. 52-53.
6 Walpole Society, Vertue Notebooks, (vol. 3), pg. 42.
7 Subsequent artists include Henry Cooke (71642-1700) in 1697 (LC5/152, pg. 25. National Archives, Kew); Simon Gribelin’s engraved set was published in 1707; John Simon’s engraved set was published c.1710; Nicolas Dorigny’s superior set of engravings was published in 1719 (for these prints, see Timothy Clayton, The English Print 1688-1802, New Haven & London, 1997, pg. 49-52.); Jacob Christoph Le Blon (1667-1741) in 1728 (Lord Chamberlain’s warrant books general 1727-38, LC5/160, pg. 94. National Archives, Kew); and Sir James Thornhill (1675-1734) the following year (Ibid, pg. 105).
8 The Spectator, 25 October 1711.
9 Richardson, snr., and jr., An Account, pg. 256.
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subsequent rapport with John Norris, presumably explain how he was granted the
privilege of early access, but it is also testimony to his skill at this early stage of his
career.

Immediately upon Jervas’s return from Italy, understood to have been in the winter of
1708-1709, he received his only known commission from the Crown prior to his
appointment in 1723. This commission, documented in the artist’s invoice, consisted of a
framed whole-length portrait of Prince George of Denmark (1653-1708), consort of
Queen Anne, who had died the previous October. The sum of £62.5s.6d (£50 for the
painting, the remainder for ‘a carved & gilded frame’) was paid on behalf of the late
Prince’s administrators by Spencer Compton (c.1674-1743), who had held the post of
treasurer to the late consort. The painting was not however for the royal collection; it
was a gift from the crown to Scroop Egerton, 4th Earl of Bridgewater (1681-1745), and
presumably a copy after an earlier portrait. In exploring the possible routes by which
Jervas, newly arrived from Italy after a decade’s absence, might have secured this not
inconsiderable commission, a healthy network of patrons emerges, and places in context
the flourishing career on which he was embarking. His most obvious advocate for the
job would be Kneller himself, who may indeed have sub-contracted the task to his
former pupil. It is equally possible that Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough ensured the
commission went to him; she held sway over Queen Anne’s patronage, and her
husband was in negotiation with Jervas over possible purchases for Blenheim in 1706
when the artist was in Italy. Sarah’s son-in-law Scroop Egerton, for whom the painting
was intended, may also have influenced the choice of artist; he was in Rome at Easter
1701 and would inevitably have known Jervas among the small community of
expatriates there. Egerton was a diligent patron of Jervas in the 1710s, as were all four of
the Duchess of Marlborough’s sons-in-law. And finally, it was quite possibly via his

10 Special Collections 86.WW.1. National Art Library. Mr Jervas’s Bill, 1709.
12 See chapter 1, pg. 63-65.
13 See Introduction, pg. 33.
early patron Dr George Clarke that Jervas secured this commission; as previously mentioned Jervas sold his copies after Raphael’s cartoons to Clarke, who also lent him £50 to help finance his visit to Italy. When in Paris, Jervas was sourcing quality prints for Clarke, who was a connoisseur in this field. Most importantly, however, Clarke was a successful political administrator close to the Prince of Denmark – he was his private secretary at the Admiralty – and could have taken the opportunity once more to assist his protégé’s career. Any one of these possible patrons would have been sufficient, but their collective presence indicates that Jervas had already established a firm reputation for himself amongst a party of influential courtiers.

By the time of Kneller’s death on 26 October 1723, he had been ill and virtually unable to work for over a year. It was therefore no surprise to the artistic community or those artists irked by his thirty-year dominance in the face-painting industry. The sequence of events over the subsequent five weeks demonstrates a combination of careful solicitation and a large amount of good fortune which resulted in Jervas’s appointment to Sir Godfrey’s former court position. In the summer of that year, George I departed for one of his regular protracted visits to his electorate at Hanover. Amongst his retinue were Charles Townshend and John Carteret (1690–1763), Secretary of State of the North and South respectively. Carteret was then, on the death of the Earl of Sunderland in 1722, the head of an opposition faction within the Whig party, attempting to challenge the dominance of the Walpole-Townshend alliance. While in Hanover, both men sought to exercise their influence, ‘the most striking demonstration’ of which was ‘the ability to

---

14 In his will, Clarke left to Mrs. Ellen Godolphin, ‘daughter of my late dear friend Colonel Sydney Godolphin’, many luxury items, including ‘eight Heads after the Cartons of Raphael at Hampton-Court’, but does not identify the artist. *A true copy of the last will and testament of George Clarke Esq., LLD, late member of Parliament for the University of Oxford*, London, 1737.
15 Clarke bequeathed his print collection to Worcester College, Oxford, where it remains.
16 Kneller painted a double portrait of Prince George and Clarke in 1705, which is in the collection of All Souls College, Oxford.
18 Walpole Society, *Vertue Notebooks*, (vol. 3), pg. 9.
Chapter 3 Jervas’s court patronage, and appointment as Principal Painter to the King influence the king’s appointments to the court and administration’.\textsuperscript{19} Carteret readily found ground-support among the Hanoverian court, by which the king was apt to be influenced, and therefore the vacancy which arose on the death of Kneller presented itself to these protagonists as an opportunity in which political points could be scored, rather than one which instigated a debate on artistic merit.

Walpole wrote to Townshend on 19 November that the Lord Chamberlain, the Duke of Newcastle (1693-1768) (fig 3b): ‘beggs you will not forget Jervas the painter. He [Jervas] has it much at heart to be dispatch’d’.\textsuperscript{20} The right of appointment for the post of Principal Painter, along with hundreds of other court positions, lay in the gift of the Lord Chamberlain, head of the largest department in the royal household.\textsuperscript{21} That Newcastle clearly consulted with Walpole, who solicited Townshend in Hanover, reflects the politicised nature of the appointment. That Newcastle should defer completely to the advice of his colleagues further emphasises strong cohesion among the Whig élite. The French ambassador to the court, Count de Broglie, wrote to Louis XV the following year that: ‘the more I consider state affairs, the more I am convinced, that the government is entirely in the hands of Mr. Walpole, lord Townshend, and the duke of Newcastle, who are on the best terms with the duchess of Kendal’, while also noting, importantly in this case, that Newcastle, ‘is indebted to [Walpole] for his situation, [and] submits to his judgement in every thing’.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{19} John M Beattie, \textit{The English Court in the reign of George I}, Cambridge, 1967, pg. 150.
\textsuperscript{21} Beattie, \textit{The English Court’}, pg. 133; Bucholz, \textit{The Augustan Court}, pg. 68. Ninety of the premier positions at court were in the direct gift of the monarch, the remainder divided between the departments of the Lord Chamberlain, Lord Steward, Lord Almoner, Groom of the Stole, Master of the Horse, Master of the Robes and the Keeper of the Privy Purse. The Lord Chamberlain had the power to appoint over 400 middling and menial positions in his department.
\textsuperscript{22} Coxe, \textit{Memoirs of the life and administration of Sir Robert Walpole}, pg. 301-2. Letter dated July 1724. In considering the Newcastle-Townshend-Walpole alliance, it is interesting to note that Lord Townshend’s first wife was Elizabeth Pelham (1681-1711), half-sister of the Duke of Newcastle. On her death, he married Robert Walpole’s sister Dorothy (d.1726).
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Walpole’s reminder of the 19th was unnecessary; on the same day Townshend wrote to the Duke of Newcastle from Hanover that, ‘His Majesty approves of Mr. Gervase to be the King’s Painter’. Townshend almost certainly received approval for his recommended candidate via the king’s mistress, the Duchess of Kendal (1667-1743) since Lord Hervey noted that in the reign of George I, ‘the canal of application to the royal ear had always been from Lord Townshend to the Duchess and from the Duchess to the King’. Townshend’s letter of confirmation arrived with the Lord Chamberlain on the 30 November and he acted upon it immediately. Just three days later he confirmed Jervas ‘into the place and Quality of Principal Painter in Ordinary to His Majesty in the room of Sr. Godfrey Kneller Bt. Deceas’d. To have hold Exercise and Enjoy the Said Place together with all Rights, Profitts, privileges and Advantages thereunto belonging.’

It is evident from the pace with which the appointment proceeded that Jervas was indisputably the favoured candidate. A London newspaper, a mere week after Sir Godfrey’s death, stated that, ‘Thomas [sic] Jervais, Esq; succeeds Sir Godfrey Kneller as Principal Painter to his Majesty’. This in itself was a considerable achievement, but owed as much to external circumstances as to any efforts he might himself have exerted. As previously seen, he was diligently patronised by Walpole and a radiating web of Whig hopefuls from the time of his arrival back in London in c.1709. His royal commission in that year has highlighted the fertile patron base he had already managed to nurture, and the strongly Whig character of his professional output over the following years must have compounded his credit with the upper echelons of the party, and ensured that he was, with little competition, their obvious choice for preferment when

25 The date on which the letter was received from Hanover is noted on the document by the recipient, Newcastle.
27 Evening Post (1709), Saturday 2 November, 1723, Issue 2227. The comment was repeated the following Saturday in Weekly Journal, or Saturday’s Post, 9 November 1723, issue no. 263, pg. 1562, repeating the erroneous Christian name.
28 See chapter 2.
Chapter 3 Jervas’s court patronage, and appointment as Principal Painter to the King

the opportunity arose. By sheer coincidence, Jervas had little competition from fellow artists. The Swede Michael Dahl (1659-1743) was arguably the most talented painter at work in London at the time of Kneller’s decease, but this Catholic artist had thrived in the reign of Queen Anne and her Scandinavian husband, and had ever since been associated with the Tory faction. He appears to have provoked a personal grudge against himself on the part of the king at exactly this time, as he refused to paint the portrait of the king’s grandson, the infant Duke of Cumberland (1721-1765). This was on the grounds that he had not yet had the honour of painting the Duke’s parents (the Prince and Princess of Wales, the future King George II and Queen Caroline), and was, ‘unwilling to begin with a child. The King took it so ill that he immediately gave the vacant place to Mr. Jervis, a far inferior artist.’

Ironically, Jervas almost certainly benefited from the king’s profound lack of interest in the visual arts, and by extension in the practitioners of those arts, even when they were in his own household.

In addition to these favourable conditions was Jervas’s own ambition. Walpole’s letter to Townshend, already quoted, remarks that the artist had the appointment ‘much at heart’, and in order to succeed he must have petitioned assiduously, as was then necessary with court positions. A comparable example may be given of his contemporary John Clavering who had petitioned Baron von Bernstorff (1649-1726), one of George I’s Hanoverian advisors at the court of St. James; ‘I spoke to the Old Baron of Sir Wilfred Lawson’s being made groom of the Bedchamber who seem’d much surpriz’d at it. I reminded him at the same time of the promise he got me...he seemed to think I did not much desire it [the post] because I had not tormented him as other people do for all those things, for I really am the worst sollicitor for my self in the World.’

---

30 Beattie, The English Court, pg. 162. In a letter to his sister Lady Cowper (1685-1724), Lady of the Bedchamber to Caroline Princess of Wales from 1714 to 1724.
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flaw was not one shared by Jervas, whose ‘boasting manner’ had been noted by Vertue years earlier.\textsuperscript{31}

At the time when Jervas became a courtier, the English court was in a period of transition. During the previous quarter century, its ancient role as arbiter of fashion and unique source of political power and career opportunity had been successfully challenged by a myriad of alternatives ranging from parliamentary government and emerging professions to political clubs, coffee-houses, the burgeoning news trade, and public entertainments.\textsuperscript{32} It nonetheless continued to attract the social élite, many of whom with Whig affiliations would have been known to Jervas through private commissions. While certain court appointments were purely sinecures, almost all obliged the office holder to give attendance for set periods and occasions, and observe strict, often lavish, standards of dress and lifestyle. To the aristocracy and upper nobility who populated the court (at least that section closest to the persons of the royal family), such requirements can hardly have been onerous. Jervas, by contrast, whose role brought him into direct contact with the monarch, was of considerably lower pedigree by birth and of indeterminate education. To have been considered at all suitable for a position at court, it must be assumed that Jervas had, through observation and study, achieved the necessary standard, namely a gentlemanly household, the ability to converse in French (as was the norm at court), and a suitable wardrobe and manner of deportment. In recompense, Jervas’s post ‘in Ordinary’ indicated that it was established and permanent. In theory, post-holders could be dismissed at any time, but this happened extremely rarely. Along with this security, Jervas was granted an annual income of £200, though court salaries tended to be ‘the tip of an indeterminately sized emoluments iceberg’\textsuperscript{33} comprising a mixture of perquisites, land, favour and other benefits. The Lord Chamberlain himself, for example, had an established salary of £100 vastly augmented by ‘Board Wages’ (in compensation for the antiquated right to dine at

\textsuperscript{31} Walpole Society, \textit{Vertue Notebooks}, (vol. 3), pg. 17.
\textsuperscript{32} Bucholz, \textit{The Augustan Court}, pg. 241-248.
\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Ibid}, pg. 115.
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court) bringing the total to a more realistic £1,200. Jervas’s salary was actually a
retainer since it was expected that he would charge the crown for each individual
commission and service provided.

The practical duties expected of the Principal Painter, as with numerous court positions,
had been established by tradition and though not clarified on paper they can be deduced
from the range of work performed by Jervas and his predecessors. The output of each
was however heavily dependent on the predilections of the monarch whom they served.
George I and II have consistently suffered in the history of royal artistic patronage;
Horace Walpole intemperately labelled the period as one in which, ‘the arts were sunk
to the lowest ebb in Britain’ and a more recent art historian wrote that the advent of the
Hanoverian kings ‘signalled the start of almost half a century of inactivity’. Such an
evaluation is not entirely deserved, and is partly owing to an inevitably bruising
comparison with the munificence of their Stuart predecessors Charles I and II, and their
own immediate descendants Frederick Prince of Wales, George III and IV. While the
earliest Georges were largely uninterested in contemporary art, as with all political
leaders they could not afford to deny the potency of even the most limited patronage.
George I, and to a slightly lesser extent George II, loyally drew from a small circle of
German artists for this purpose; Joachim Kayser (fl.1712-1727), Johan Anton Klyher,
Martin Maingaud and Georg Wilhelm Fountaine (c1680-1745) had previously worked at
the Hanoverian court before following George I to England and further benefiting from
his patronage. The German artistic community already in London was
disproportionately favoured by George I and II also; Kneller painted the official images
of George I; Enoch Seeman’s (c.1708-1745) coronation portraits of George II and Queen

35 Walpole, Anecdotes of Painting, 1871 (reprint of 1786 edition), pg. 316.
37 Oliver Millar, The Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen. The Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian
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Caroline (described by Horace Walpole as ‘execrable’) and a number of versions by the same artist, remain in the royal collection (while those by the Principal Painter, Jervas, do not). The miniaturist Christian Friedrich Zincke (1683-5 – 1767) was popular with George II; he flattered his sitters by making them appear younger, but Vertue notes that it was to this artist that the king, ‘took more pleasure in setting...than...to any painter for that his works were beautiful & like.’ Non-German artists to receive some extent of patronage under the first Hanoverians were the Swede Charles Boit (1663-1727), John Wooton (c.1682-1764), Philip Mercier (1689-1760), William Kent (1685-1748) and Bernard Lens III (1682-1740); Lens held the positions of Painter in Enamel to the king, and drawing master to the children of George II. Kent, due to Walpole’s influence, executed the decoration in a suite of rooms at Kensington Palace in the period 1722 to 1727, ‘to the Designs his Maty.[Majesty] has seen and approved of’. The royal collection which the Hanoverian monarchs inherited held little interest for them too; Lord Hervey relates an anecdote to highlight George II’s ‘extreme ignorance in painting’ in which the king calls Van Dyck’s portrait of royal offspring, ‘the three nasty little children’.

The records however also reveal a consistent programme of conservation: Jan van der Vaardt (c.1653-1727), Joseph Goupy (1686-1770), William Walters, John Kent, and Peter Walton as Surveyor of Pictures were each engaged at different times to repair

---

38 Ibid, pg. 172.
41 LC5/158, pg. 366. National Archives, Kew. This warrant confirms that Kent has been commissioned to paint: ‘the ceilings of the Gallery and Great and Little Closet at Kensington’, and is dated 26 June 1725.
43 Payments dated February 1725 (LC5/158 pg. 332) and June 1727 (paid to his executor) (LC5/159). National Archives, Kew.
44 Warrant issued July 1725 (LC5/158 pg. 403) and payment dated April 1726 (LC5/158 pg. 439). National Archives, Kew.
45 Payments dated December 1734 (LC5/19 pg. 290) and February 1737 (LC5/20 pg. 186). National Archives, Kew.
46 Payment dated April 1733 (LC5/19 pg. 110). National Archives, Kew.
47 Geoffrey Beard, ‘William Kent and the Royal Barge’, The Burlington Magazine, vol. 112, no. 809 [August 1970], pg. 488-495. The barge was designed for Frederick Prince of Wales, and on the maiden voyage on the Thames the royal party travelled from Chelsea to Somerset House to view ‘Mr. Walton’s Progress in cleaning and mending the Royal Pictures’.
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specified paintings and frames in the royal collection. Artists requesting access to the
collection for making studies and copies appear to have been welcome, with seventeen
painters including George Knapton (1698-1778),\textsuperscript{48} John Ellys (c.1701-1757),\textsuperscript{49} Sir James
Thornhill (1675-1734)\textsuperscript{50} and the engraver John Faber the younger (c.1695-1756)\textsuperscript{51} granted
permission in the 1720s and 1730s alone. And while neither George I nor II made
significant purchases of Old Master paintings or drawings for the royal collection, it is
frequently overlooked that six paintings from the collection of Mr. Laws were acquired
for the collection by George I in 1723, including two works now attributed to the studio
of Guido Reni (but then believed to be autograph) which were gifted to the National
Gallery by William IV.\textsuperscript{52}

These efforts can hardly be evaluated as anything but a lacklustre attitude to artistic
patronage, and sketch out the environment into which Jervas’s royal production must be
situated. The full extent of his work for the crown has hitherto been unexamined, but the
records of the Lord Chamberlain’s office record both commissions and payments, and
reveal a complete picture of Jervas’s royal oeuvre. By far the largest proportion of
commissions were copies of the monarchs’ state portraits to be sent to embassies abroad,
or colonial offices in the New World. Thus, Jervas and his studio provided copies of the
official royal image of George I (almost certainly copies after Kneller, rather than
involving new sittings with the reluctant monarch) for Horatio Walpole at the Paris
Embassy,\textsuperscript{53} and Stephen Poyntz in Sweden.\textsuperscript{54} The accession of George II and Queen
Caroline precipitated a fresh series of commissions, whereby portraits of the new
monarch and his consort were supplied to official representatives abroad, it being

\textsuperscript{48} Warrants dated July 1722 (LC5/158 pg. 81) and June 1723 (LC5/158 pg. 166). National Archives, Kew.
\textsuperscript{49} Warrant dated July 1724 (LC5/158 pg. 287). National Archives, Kew.
\textsuperscript{50} Warrant dated February 1729 (LC5/160 pg. 105). National Archives, Kew.
\textsuperscript{51} Warrant dated June 1735 (LC5/160 pg. 258). National Archives, Kew.
\textsuperscript{52} Lucy Whitaker and Martin Clayton, \textit{The Art of Italy in the Royal Collection. Renaissance and Baroque},
pg. 34.
\textsuperscript{53} LC5/158 pg. 254, 376. National Archives, Kew.
\textsuperscript{54} LC5/158 pg. 376. National Archives, Kew.
Chapter 3 Jervas’s court patronage, and appointment as Principal Painter to the King usually specified in the warrant that the portraits were, ‘to be sett up under the State as hath been usual on such like Occasions’ (fig 3c). As a result, throughout late 1720s and 1730s, Jervas’s copies after the coronation portraits were shipped to the respective Governors of Minorca (CR G43, C37), Jamaica (CR G12, G13, G44, G47, C38, C42), Barbados (CRG22, G36, G39, G49, G50, C29, C33, C43), the Leeward Islands (CR G40, C16, C34), the Bahamas (CR G25, G41, C35), New York (CR G15, G33, C26), New Jersey (CR G48), New England (CR G26, C20), Virginia (CR G46, C41), the Carolinas (CR G27, G42, G51, C21, C36) and Nova Scotia (CR G29, C23). Each warrant requiring the provision of a portrait was accompanied by a twin warrant issued to John Howard (Joyner of the Privy Chamber to his Majesty 1714-1727; succeeded by his son Gerrard 1727-1752) to prepare the necessary frame(s) and packing cases. Likewise, the new state image was disseminated to the various embassies in Europe, and on rare occasions was gifted to foreign royalty, as when Jervas’s portraits of George I, George II and Queen Caroline were presented to the Queen of Sweden via the ambassador Baron Sparr in 1731-2 (CR G9, G34, C27). Unfortunately very few of these numerous paintings sent abroad have been identified. Those commissioned by the crown and presented to British institutions have fared

68 The coronation portraits survive in the Swedish National Collection of Portraits, Gripsholm Castle, Sweden (CR G34, C27), and the Legislative Council Chamber, Halifax, Nova Scotia (CR C23).
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slightly better; portraits of the royal couple presented to the Lord Mayor of London, ‘to be sett up in Guildhall’, and the Corporation of Bristol, have survived in situ (CR G37, C30),\(^{69}\) as has that of the king for John Hobart of Blickling Hall (CR Coll2).\(^{70}\) For each whole length portrait, all of which were copies after the official approved image, Jervas charged £50, on top of which were ‘office fees’ in the region of 10% of the previous sum.

Remarkably few paintings were commissioned from the artist other than those categorised above. Jervas did execute profile drawings of the king and queen, ‘for the Coronation Medal and Coin’ (CR Medal1),\(^{71}\) Vertue noting that they were to be engraved by Mr. Croker, the ‘Mint Graver’.\(^{72}\) A whole length portrait of the Duke of Cumberland at the age of seven is now in the National Portrait Gallery (CR W39), and was engraved by Vertue in 1728 – it may have been the image commissioned by Queen Caroline which, ‘proving sucesfull’, secured sittings with the king and queen.\(^{73}\) Jervas amalgamated the figure of the Duke with that of Queen Caroline from the standard coronation image to form the double portrait of mother and son still in the royal collection (CR C52) (fig 3d).\(^{74}\) The prime version of the coronation portraits, after which the many copies were made, ought logically to be in the royal collection, and almost certainly were originally, but have never been recorded.\(^{75}\) Their fate is unknown, but

\(^{69}\) LC5/159, pg. 133, LC5/18 pg. 46. National Archives, Kew. Vertue recorded that the king sat for this painting for London’s Guildhall in August 1728 (Walpole Society, Vertue Notebooks, (vol. 3), pg. 35).

\(^{70}\) LC5/19 pg. 62. National Archives, Kew. John Hobart’s sister, Henrietta Howard, was mistress to King George II. The painting is still in situ at Blickling Hall, Norfolk, now a National Trust property.


\(^{72}\) Walpole Society, Vertue Notebooks, (vol. 3), pg. 17. Vertue records that the portrait of the Duke of Cumberland was commissioned in 1728.

\(^{73}\) Millar, The Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures, no. 500 (not illustrated). See John Van der Kiste, King George II and Queen Caroline, Stroud, 1997, plate no. 7 for an engraving after the oil painting.

\(^{74}\) In an inventory of painting in the royal collection dated 1804-5, there is recorded ‘King George 2nd, attributed to Jarvis, presented by Lord St. Helens in The King’s (late) Dining Room, Queen’s Palace’, and ‘King George 1st, attributed to Jarvis, in Queen Mary’s Closet [Hampton Court]’. These picture cannot now be traced in the royal collection; if they survive they have been re-attributed. Oliver Millar has pointed out that neither King Charles II nor Queen Anne appear to have contributed their official regal images to the royal collection during their lifetimes (Millar, The Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures, nos. 236-237 [King Charles II], 339, 340, 368, 369, 488, 489 [Queen Anne]). With thanks to Lucy Whitaker, Assistant Surveyor of...
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sadly the royal collection has not always enjoyed an exemplary standard of care. A
London guidebook of 1842 bemoaned the condition of paintings at Hampton Court,
noting that:

among a heap of rubbish there exist some curious but maltreated and defaced
Mantuan pictures, and some portraits of interest…the present condition of some
of these fine works is, however, pitiful to see; ruined by neglect, damp, dirt – and
yet more by the picture-cleaners and restorers of the last century.\textsuperscript{76}

The following decade, Richard Redgrave (1804-1888), Surveyor of the Crown Pictures,
conceded that, ‘Little has been done to the pictures in the palace [Hampton Court] since
a large number of them had been dumped there, chiefly from Kensington [Palace], in the
reign of William IV’, and that many were in a ‘failing condition’.\textsuperscript{77} Redgrave, a
conscientious and methodical Surveyor, found yet more pictures decaying in storage at
Windsor Castle and Buckingham Palace.\textsuperscript{78} It is therefore possible that the coronation
portraits, and possibly other works by Jervas held in low esteem were destroyed in this
manner.

Nonetheless, four further paintings by the artist have survived in the royal collection; all
three-quarter length portrait copies. They represent Isaac Newton (1642-1727), William
Wollaston (1660-1724), John Locke (1632-1704) and Dr. Samuel Clarke (1675-1729), and
were commissioned by Queen Caroline;\textsuperscript{79} payment was made to Jervas in February of

\textsuperscript{77} Susan P Casteras and Ronald Parkinson (eds), \textit{Richard Redgrave 1804-1888}, exhibition catalogue, London,
V&A Museum and New Haven, Yale Centre for British Art, New Haven and London, 1988, pg. 88. An
earlier Surveyor, Thomas Unwins, had said of William IV that he ‘did not know a picture fr
window-shutter’. Oliver Millar, ‘Caring for The Queen’s Pictures: Surveyors Past and Present’, Christopher Lloyd
(ed.), \textit{The Queen’s Pictures. Royal Collectors through the centuries}, exhibition catalogue, London, National
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid, pg. 90.
\textsuperscript{79} Oliver Millar, \textit{The Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures}, nos. 363 (Newton, incorrectly as by studio of
Kneller), 377 (Locke, as ‘after Kneller’, no artist given), 501 (Clarke, as ‘after Jervas’, no artist given), and 642
(Wollaston, no artist given). See CR Copy33 (Newton), CR Copy49 (Wollaston), CR Copy27 (Locke) and CR
C76 (Clarke). The source of the queen’s admiration for these men is implicit given her own intellectual
enquiries. Newton was the leading scientific theorist of the age, and President of the Royal Society between
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1738, a few months after her death (fig 3e).\textsuperscript{80} Caroline, unlike her father-in-law and husband, benefited from a cultured upbringing in the progressive princely courts of Elector Frederick III of Brandenburg and Electress Sophia of Hanover which attracted leading \textit{philosophes} and artists such as Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716), Voltaire (1694-1778) and George Frideric Handel (1685-1759). Many expressions of her intellectual pursuits were once evident, including the library building designed for her by William Kent and erected at St. James’s Palace (now destroyed), her Picture Closet and \textit{Wunderkammer} at Kensington Palace, and ‘Hermitage’ and ‘Merlin’s Cave’ structures in the grounds of Richmond Palace which housed her busts and wax tableaux of prominent British ‘worthies’ and monarchs (also now lost).\textsuperscript{81} Significantly, in the central octagonal hall of the Hermitage were niches containing busts of the philosophers Newton, Wollaston, Locke and Clarke by Giovanni Guelfi (fl. 1714-1734).\textsuperscript{82} The portraits of these four by Jervas were almost certainly part of the group described as ‘Portraits of several Poets, Painters, and Philosophers’ recorded in the Queen’s Dressing Room at Windsor Castle five years after her death.\textsuperscript{83} The portrait of Clarke was a copy after a Jervas original which was then owned by Lady Lechmere;\textsuperscript{84} the remaining three were copies after originals by Kneller and Dahl.

Jervas’s alternative contribution to the royal collection could have been in the area of acquisitions, but here it has been seen that very few works of any kind entered the

\textsuperscript{80} LC5/20 pg. 306. National Archives, Kew.
\textsuperscript{81} Joanna Marschner, ‘Queen Caroline of Anspach and the European princely museum tradition’, Clarissa Campbell Orr (ed.), Queenship in Britain 1660-1837. Royal patronage, court culture and dynastic politics, Manchester, 2002, pg. 130-142.
\textsuperscript{82} Ibid, pg. 133.
\textsuperscript{83} George Bickham jr., \textit{Deliciae Britannicae; or, The Curiosities of Hampton-Court, and Windsor-Castle}, London, 1742, pg. 187.
\textsuperscript{84} Walpole Society, \textit{Vertue Notebooks}, (vol. 2), pg. 74.
Chapter 3 Jervas’s court patronage, and appointment as Principal Painter to the King collection during his period of office. Vertue records that in 1738 Jervas, ‘advertised in the news papers. He was set out to Italy to purchase pictaintings [sic] for the royal family.’  

He may have purchased speculatively during this second and last visit to Italy in 1738-9, but no items are known to have entered the royal collection as a result. The most active member of the royal family in this regard was Frederick Prince of Wales, eldest son of George and Caroline. Jervas is extremely unlikely to have any contact with or influence on Frederick in view of the persistent Hanoverian trait of violent antipathy between parents and eldest son which was duly perpetuated in this generation.

Frederick nurtured a lively circle of young contemporary artists, amongst them Philippe Mercier (1689-1760), Charles Philips (1708-1747), John Ellys (1701-1757) and Joseph Highmore (1692-1780) which wilfully emphasised his father’s Germanic boorishness. Queen Caroline’s artistic activities were directed by her fascination with ancestry, particularly the Tudor monarchs, and her wide-ranging intellectual interests. Her Picture Closet at Kensington Palace housed an abundance of miniatures, sketches, paintings and wax profiles, described by Vertue after a visit in 1739 as, ‘the greatest store of portraits of [the] English.’  

As part of this programme, she commissioned William Kent to paint three scenes from the life of Henry V, purchased an anonymous portrait of Elizabeth I and ‘begged’ from Lord Cornwallis a series of fifteen portraits of medieval and Tudor royalty, probably painted as a series in the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century. The Crown paid for a whole-length of the late Queen Anne from Jervas in March 1736, destined for ‘the Gallery at Kensington’, a commission almost certainly instigated by Caroline, and which probably served to complete a series (CR Copy1). These interests originated in her youth in the Brandenburg court, and also a

---

87 Millar, The Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures, nos. 505-507.
88 Ibid, no. 48.
89 Ibid, nos. 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 38, 41, 42, 51 and 54.
90 LC5/20, pg. 112. National Archives, Kew. Jervas’s copy may well be the painting about which Oliver Millar wrote, ‘possibly executed in Kneller’s studio…the head is probably by Kneller himself’, which was in the Queen’s Gallery at Kensington in the reign of George II. Millar, The Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures, no. 340.
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fascination with delineating the ancient ancestry of British monarchy and the due place of the Hanoverians in that succession. The likelihood of Jervas’s input as dealer or advisor is therefore remote, though it is possible that he encouraged Caroline’s purchase of Giorgio Vasari’s *Venus and Cupid* in 1734.\(^{91}\) However, what was widely acknowledged to be her greatest contribution to the royal collection occurred entirely by accident; the rediscovery of long-forgotten volumes of drawings by Holbein in ‘a Buroe in His Majesty’s Great Closet’ at Kensington palace.\(^{92}\)

While Queen Caroline appears to have prompted all those works by Jervas commissioned for the royal collection, albeit modest in nature and quantity, she is also responsible for irrevocably damaging his artistic reputation. Vertue pinpoints a single fateful day in 1732 when, ‘The Queen attended with Several Noblemen came from Kingsinton one morning to View some pictures at Mr. Jarvis’s house in Cleveland Court his Majesties painter.’ The royal entourage then proceeded to St. James’s Square to see Lord Tankerfield’s staircase newly painted by Jacopo Amigoni (b.c.1685-1752), and then to the studio of John Wooton where they examined, among other works;

a great picture of his Majesty painted on horseback a grey horse for Lord Hubbard [John Hobart of Blickling Hall, brother of the king’s mistress]. The face of the King by Mr. Jarvis & all the other parts by Mr. Wooton – the Horse &c was much approv’d off, but the King’s not thought to be like, was much spoke against from thence (fig 3f).\(^{93}\)

---

\(^{91}\) The painting was exhibited at ‘Essex House, Essex-Street, Strand’ and was to be disposed by public raffle before Caroline purchased it outright on behalf of the king for £1,000. Jameson, *A Handbook*, pg. 362. Whitaker and Clayton, *The Art of Italy*, no. 9.

\(^{92}\) Marschner, ‘Queen Caroline of Anspach’, pg. 137. Queen Caroline subsequently purchased the Holbein oil of Sir Henry Guildford (?1489-1532), Comptroller of the Household to King Henry VIII, the preparatory sketch for which was among the artist’s drawings in the royal collection. Millar, *The Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures*, no. 28.

\(^{93}\) Walpole Society, *Vertue Notebooks*, (vol. 3), pg. 61-2. The equestrian portrait of King George II by Jervas and Wooton is distinct from the whole length standing portrait of the same subject by Jervas, also at Blickling Hall, and mentioned in footnote 65. The equestrian portrait was commissioned and paid for by Lord Hobart, whereas the other was a gift from the king.
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Vertue emphasises that this single visit (not, ironically, that to Jervas’s own studio which passed without comment, but to that of his occasional collaborator Wooton) precipitated a decline in Jervas’s career, ‘especially at Court’, and ‘lessened his character and buisiness’. 94

If indeed, as Vertue believed, Queen Caroline occasioned a downturn in Jervas’s career as a result of her disappointment, it cannot be said that she or the king transferred their patronage to another; only Enoch Seeman could be said to have benefited indirectly, producing an alternative set of coronation portraits which met with satisfaction. 95 The flow of warrants from the Lord Chamberlain for various state portraits between 1732 and the artist’s death seven years later remained unaltered however, and it is after the above episode that the queen’s commissions for copies date. It is telling indeed that Jervas’s alleged loss of popularity at court is difficult to determine, and serves to underline the meagre artistic patronage, at the best of times, offered by the monarchs and consort he served. This indifference, as well as the constant loyalty of Sir Robert Walpole, also account for the fact that Jervas was not replaced at court.

The positive impact of Jervas’s appointment on his life and career was immense; already the Whig favourite, he was the object of yet more aristocratic patronage on account of his royal approbation. This is particularly evident on the occasion of the revival of the Order of the Bath in 1725 when Jervas was commissioned to execute whole length portraits of numerous newly-honoured nobles (fig 3g). Similarly, he produced many portraits, of remarkable uniformity, of titled sitters who attended the coronation in 1727, appearing in their full regalia before Westminster Abbey (e.g. CR B27, B30) (fig 3h). Jervas’s new role at court and the prestige it offered erased his previous social obscurity, and undoubtedly enabled him to make a fortuitous marriage with, ‘a Gentlewoman with

---

94 Walpole Society, Vertue Notebooks, (vol. 3), pg. 99.
95 Millar, The Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures, nos. 508-513. The date of Seeman’s coronation portraits is unclear, and may date to before the episode related.
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15 or 20 thousand pounds’ in 1727. The resulting improvement in both his status (artistic and social) and income allowed him to develop his connoisseurial tendencies, and amass the impressive collection of Old Master paintings and drawings which was to feature in his posthumous sale.

---

96 Walpole Society, *Vertue Notebooks*, (vol. 3), pg. 59.
CHAPTER 4 JERVAS’S PATRONS: THE DIGBY FAMILY OF COLESHILL, WARWICKSHIRE AND SHERBORNE CASTLE, DORSET

William Digby (1661/2-1752) 5th Baronet appears an unlikely source of patronage for Jervas, whose patron-base was characteristically comprised of aspiring members of the Whig party. Lord Digby retired from public office in 1698, having struggled to reconcile his Tory sympathies with his public roles at parliamentary and county level. In that year he inherited Sherborne Castle in Dorset from his cousin John Digby, 3rd Earl of Bristol, and spent the remainder of his long life in retirement as a pious and philanthropic country gentleman. However, not only was Jervas patronised by Lord Digby and his children, but the presence of his only known self portrait among the family collection and a copy of his will in the Digby family archive point to a deeper bond than that of mutually ambitious sitters and painter.

Lord Digby’s great-grandfather, Sir Robert Digby (d.1618) of Coleshill, Warwickshire was a follower of Queen Elizabeth’s favourite Robert Devereux (1566-1601), 2nd Earl of Essex, by whom he was knighted in Dublin in August 1599,¹ the summer Devereux unsuccessfully sought to wrest control from the disparate Irish septs. Indeed, Digby was a relation as well as a follower; by a marriage settlement dated April 1598 Digby had made an advantageous match with Lettice Fitzgerald (1580-1658), Devereux’s first cousin.² Lettice was heiress to the immense estates of the Earls of Kildare, and following years of legal wrangling her claim to 30,000 acres of her late grandfather’s midlands estates, centred on Geashill in King’s county (now co. Offaly) was satisfied by James I in 1619. The following year her son Robert Digby (1599-1642) was created 1st Baron Digby of Geashill, and he enhanced the family’s prestige as a force amongst the leading planter dynasties by wedding Lady Sarah Boyle (1609-1633), daughter of the ruthlessly ambitious 1st Earl of Cork. Throughout the seventeenth century, members of the Digby
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family, while maintaining their connection with the older family estate at Coleshill, actively exploited the potential to be found in Ireland of accumulating land and office.

William Digby was born and raised at Coleshill, and inherited the family’s extensive properties from his late brother the 4th Baronet in 1685. An active MP for Warwickshire in the late 1680s and 1690s, his sympathies for the Nonjurors and his own irresolute support for the Williamite monarchy weakened his political significance. Through his practical support for clergymen such as John Kettlewell (1653-1695), Coleshill became known as a haven for other Nonjurors. On his retirement from public life in 1698, he and his large family moved to the newly inherited estate at Sherborne in Dorset, where his benevolent management of his properties, and staunch Christian tenets earned him the soubriquet ‘the good Lord Digby’ (fig 4a). An absentee landlord of his Irish demesnes in King’s county, his neighbours and tenants there were the so-called New English colonists of the Cromwellian era, among them the Baldwins and Jervas, with whom he inevitably shared many common concerns and aspirations, focused on the consolidation of property interests.

The close relations between these three particular families can be traced in the person of Martyn Baldwin (1651-1725), younger brother of Elizabeth Jervas, and uncle of Charles Jervas. His will states that he was born in Geashill, which places his parents Captain John Baldwin and Mary Holbeche in King’s county by 1651. He is listed as ‘Martyn Baldwin of Geashill’ in James II’s Act of Attainder (1689), indicating that he held land in his own name by that time. He also leased property from the largest landowner in the

---

3 Those who refused to swear allegiance to King William and Queen Mary.
4 The Sherborne estate was the property of Sir Walter Raleigh from 1594 until his arrest and execution. Sir John Digby, the brother of Sir Robert Digby, purchased it from the crown in 1617. Sir John was created 1st Earl of Bristol in 1622. The title became extinct on the death of the 3rd Earl in 1698, and Sherborne was inherited by his cousin William, 5th Baron Digby of Geashill.
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region, Lord Digby; a document of 1686 acknowledges receipt of over £100 ‘being the sume agreed upon for & in consideration of inserting the life of Mrs. Alice Jones [Martyn’s future wife] into his Lease of Geashill’. Further receipts chart the payment of rent for these lands in the following decades. Shortly after the death of his first cousin Matthew Holbeche in 1713, Martyn purchased from his widow, and then completely rebuilt, the Holbeche estate of Meriden Hall in Warwickshire, about ten miles from Coleshill. Two of the three trustees of his will (dated 1719) were members of the Digby family; one was Robert Digby (c.1692-1726), son of Lord Digby, and the second was Charles Cotes, brother-in-law of Lord Digby, who, like Martyn, had a legal practice in London. Martyn bequeathed his properties in Warwickshire and King’s county to his ‘beloved nephew’ William Baldwin (d.1739), to be succeeded in the absence of male heirs by William’s own nephew Thomas Baldwin (1713-1751). Lord Digby’s youngest son Wriothesley (1697-1767) acquired a lease of Meriden Hall from Thomas in 1747, and, on the latter’s death without male heirs, and in accordance with Martyn Baldwin’s will, Wriothesley inherited the freehold of the estate in 1764. It remained in the Digby family for the next two hundred years.

Martyn maintained close relations with his Jervas nephew. When the latter was living in Rome, the Duke of Shrewsbury recorded that he drew up his will and ‘he gave it into my custody, in case of my death to be delivered to Mr. Baldwyn his unckle at

---

7 MS3887/18/5, Birmingham City Archives. Martyn and Alice appear to have married at some date after June 1692, as she is referred to as ‘Alice Jones’ in her father’s will (1689), its codicil (1690), and when probate was granted in June 1692. Martin was one of the witnesses to the original will. PROB 11/410. Will of Sir Thomas Jones of Shrewsbury, Shropshire, dated 4 July 1689, proved 22 June 1692. National Archives, Kew.
8 See for example MS 3887/14, MS 3887/B/20, MS 3887/18/3 Birmingham City Archives.
10 The third and final trustee of Martyn’s will was ‘Barnard Whalley of Bilseley in the County of Warwick Esq’, Barnard Whalley snr had married Martyn’s sister Luce (her dates 1648-1700), but was deceased by 1719. Their eldest son, also Barnard, is therefore the person referred to in his uncle Martyn’s will.
11 Thomas was based in Jamaica at this time, where he had business interests. MS 3887/B/149, Birmingham City Archives.
Chapter 4 Jervas’s patrons: The Digby family of Coleshill, Warwickshire and Sherborne Castle, Dorset

Jervas too owned land at Meriden, and executed several portraits of his uncle (CR B3-B5). His celebrated pupil, Alexander Pope, even produced a portrait sketch of Martyn, which was in the Digby collection until at least the mid-nineteenth century. And it is almost certainly through Jervas that Pope was introduced to the Digby family, and came to form such a close bond of friendship with Lord Digby’s son Robert. The introduction is likely to have been made in early 1717, and for the following nine years until Robert’s death from TB the two corresponded, with evident affection and admiration, on their shared passion for garden design at their respective properties at Sherborne and Twickenham, the ‘primitive simplicity’ of rural life on the Digby estates, Pope’s literary progress, and the burden of persistent ill-health. Pope repeatedly expressed his admiration for the family, as here in a private letter to Martha Blount, written during his only visit to Sherborne, in June 1724:

When I have been describing his [Lord Digby’s] agreeable Seat, I cannot make the reflection I’ve often done upon contemplating the beautiful Villa’s of Other Noblemen, raisd upon the Spoils of plunderd nations, or aggrandiz’d by the wealth of the Publick. I cannot ask myself the question, ‘What Else has this man to be lik’d? what else has he cultivated or improv’d? What good, or what desireable thing appears of him, without these walls? I dare say his Goodness and Benevolence extend as far as his territories; that his Tenants live almost as

---

12 Montagu Boughton vol. 65. A Journal by his Grace Charles Duke of Shrewsbury, Northampton Record Office, pg. 358 (diary entry for 21 September 1704). This will is now untraced.
14 The sketch was probably executed in Jervas’s London studio in the period when Pope lived and studied there 1713-1714. It is likely to have been originally in Martyn’s collection and inherited, along with the Meriden estate, by Wriothesley Digby in 1764, as already described. The sketch cannot now be traced, and may have been sold from Meriden Hall in a large sale of contents held in 1947. ‘Inventory of the Household Furniture and Effects at Meriden Hall in the county of Warwick the property of Charles Wriothesly Digby Esq. Taken 29 September 1854’. Collection of Moore & Tibbits [solicitors], ‘Inventories of furniture, etc. at Meriden Hall’. Date 1842-1863. MS 3444/91, Notebook 6, pg. 86, Birmingham City Archives. Also mentioned in an inventory of Meriden Hall dated 9 July 1863 (same document reference, loose sheet in notebook).
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happy & contented as himself; & that not one of his Children wishes to see this Seat his owne.  

Returning home to Twickenham some days later, Pope wrote to Robert that, ‘however I may like One of your places, it may be in that as in liking One of your family; when one sees the rest one likes them all’. This proved to be the case, as his correspondence bears evidence of friendships with Robert’s siblings Mary (c.1690-1729) and Edward (c.1693-1746), and cousin Frances Scudamore (1684-1729), the last of whom was Pope’s neighbour in Twickenham. Several members of the family subscribed to Pope’s publications, and he credited Edward with being instrumental in the publication of *The Dunciad* in 1728. Edward also assisted in the book’s distribution. That same year, Lord Digby erected a memorial stone in Sherborne Abbey to his late children Robert and Mary, for which Pope provided the epitaph (fig 4b).

The above serves to outline the longstanding personal and business relations between the relevant families which place in context Lord Digby’s patronage of Jervas. Neither he nor his ancestors were significant artistic patrons, the family’s art collection consisting in the main of family portraits by unidentified members of the British and Irish schools. Lord Digby’s eldest brother Robert (1654-1677) was painted by Carlo Maratti (1625-1713) during his grand tour, and also by the miniaturist Samuel Cooper (1609-1672), but these works are exceptional among the collection, still largely intact at Sherborne Castle. Consequently, it is more likely that Lord Digby’s connection with Jervas came via their long-standing and various familial ties, rather than an interest in the younger man’s
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artistic abilities or ambitions. Indeed, it is just possible that Lord Digby provided practical support to Jervas when the latter first came to England, and would have been well placed to provide an entrée to Kneller’s studio in the early 1690s. The first documented connection between the two men appears in Lord Digby’s account at Hoare’s bank, when in October 1705 he received two payments from Jervas amounting to £240. The latter was in Italy at this time, and the entry sadly gives no description of the transaction; the likely explanation is that it represents the cancellation of a loan to cover travel expenses, or capital for Jervas’s sideline as an agent in art works.\(^{20}\) Payments to Jervas occur on only two occasions; the sum of £54.7s in 1712, and £30 in 1729, and probably represent remuneration for his artistic services:\(^{21}\) Jervas’s portraits of Lord Digby’s children Robert (CR D3) (fig 4c) and Mary (CR D2) (fig 4d), two unidentified female sitters likely to be other daughters (CR D6, D7) (fig 4e, 4f), and of his niece Frances Scudamore (fig 4g) have survived (CR S3, S4) (fig 4h).

Two further portraits sold from the Digby family collection in 2002 are likely to have been originally the property of Martyn Baldwin, and inherited along with his estate by the Digby family in 1764. These include Jervas’s only surviving self-portrait, in which he is depicted next to a folded letter addressed to ‘Martyn Baldwin, Meriden Hall, Warwicks’, the sign off of the manuscript reading ‘yr. most obedt. Neph. Charles Jarvis’ (CRJ3) (fig 4i). The final portrait, depicting an elderly man in a neutral setting and very modest apparel, is probably of Baldwin himself, the high degree of sensitive characterisation marking it out as exemplary within the artist’s œuvre (CR B5) (fig 4j).\(^{22}\)

---

\(^{20}\) The entries are dated 2 October 1705 ‘By bill on Mr. Jarvis; £200’ and 15 October 1705 ‘By bill on Charles Jervas; £40’. There is a final, also unexplained, payment from Jervas on 16 March 1710/11 for £60. Hoare’s Archive, Ledgers of William, 5th Baron Digby.

\(^{21}\) The first payment is dated 3 July 1712, the second 30 June 1729. Hoare’s Archive, Ledgers of William, 5th Baron Digby.

\(^{22}\) On Lady Scudamore’s death in 1729, she owed Jervas £59.10s ‘for Pictures’, which debt was settled by her executors in July of that year. The bill may relate to CR S4, as Jervas normally charged £50 for a whole length portrait, the £9.10 credibly being the cost of the frame. MS 3887/103/14 and MS 3887/103/16, pg. 5. Birmingham City Archives.

\(^{23}\) Martyn Baldwin’s portrait, by an unrecorded artist, hung at Meriden Hall as of 1854 and 1863. ‘Inventory of the Household Furniture and Effects at Meriden Hall in the county of Warwick the property of Charles
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Jervas’s will, a duplicate of that dated 2 Sept 1738 for which probate was granted on his death, is now among the Digby family papers, but is likely to have been entrusted to Jervas’s first cousin William Baldwin (d.1739), one of his named executors, to whom Meriden Hall was bequeathed by his uncle Martyn.24 It too would have been acquired by the Digbys along with the Meriden estate in 1764.

To his contemporaries, Jervas’s attractions lay in his proximity to the influential Walpole/Townshend faction, and his fashionable reputation. Neither quality would have drawn Lord Digby and his offspring to his studio, given their retired, country lifestyle, Tory sympathies and evident lack of interest in the fashions du jour. The patronage offered no political or social advantage to either party. The family was equally unconnected to Jervas’s literary career and ambitions, although he almost certainly instigated the subsequent friendship between Pope and various family members, particular Robert Digby. Uniquely among Jervas’s patrons, the relationship is explicable only as a result of familial interdependence established in earlier generations, inevitable among the relatively isolated English planter families in Ireland. While the extent of Lord Digby’s support for Jervas at the start of the latter’s career is unclear, his position as deputy lieutenant for Warwickshire and an active and prominent MP for Warwick (1689-1698),25 coupled with the strong familial connections, may explain Jervas’s acceptance in Kneller’s studio and his early access to the royal collection, both of which were to be crucial to the development of his artistic career and success.

Wriothesly Digby Esq. Taken 29 September 1854’, and another dated 9 July 1863. Birmingham City Archives, collection of Moore & Tibbits [solicitors], ‘Inventories of furniture, etc. at Meriden Hall’. Date 1842-1863. MS 3444/91, Notebook 6, pg. 86, and loose sheet in same notebook.
24 MS 3887/B/173, Birmingham City Archives.
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Writing to Dean Swift in May 1739, Alexander Pope related that Jervas had just returned to London from his second and final visit to Italy, ‘declaring Life itself not worth a Day’s journey at the expense of parting from one’s Friends’.¹ The remark demonstrates the ebullient character of their mutual friend, as well as the fêted contemporaries with whom Jervas was on companionable terms some thirty years after they first met. Indeed, the artist enjoyed friendships with a coterie of literary figures such as the dramatist John Gay (1685-1732), writers and politicians Sir Richard Steele (1672-1729) and Joseph Addison (1672-1719), and poet Thomas Parnell (1679-1718); and their surviving papers provide important insights into Jervas’s character and career. Harsh biographers of the artist have in the past believed that he is only remembered for the calibre of his friendships,² but Jervas was not merely a passive member of this circle, attracted simply by its intellectual celebrity. In fact, he gained little professionally from his association, particularly after 1714 when the Jacobite and Tory sympathies of many in this literary group invited opprobrium from his Whig patron base. Jervas published three titles translated into English, one of them co-edited by Pope, and planned a fourth work which was to be an original composition. Undoubtedly it was Pope who had the greatest impact on Jervas’s literary career but the extent of their genuine and frank relationship has hitherto been insufficiently examined, and the accounts of it have consistently regarded Jervas as the sole beneficiary. Their mutual regard and various professional collaborations affected both significantly, and the poet was Jervas’s most eloquent admirer: ‘Beauty, frail Flow’r, that ev’ry Season fears,/Blooms in thy Colours for a thousand Years’.³ It is ironic in light of Pope’s sentiments that Jervas’s most enduring legacy falls outside the field of art history; his translation of Cervantes’ magnum opus

² For example, Gosse, British Portrait Painters, pg. 43; Whitley, Artists and their Friends, vol. 1, pg. 40; Talley, ‘Extracts from Charles Jervas’s ‘Sale Catalogues’, pg. 7.
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Don Quixote, which has remained in print, credited with Jervas’s name, ever since its publication in 1742, most recently reissued in 2008.4

From the time of his return from Italy in 1708-1709, Jervas maintained a lively social life as relayed through his letters and those of his acquaintances. The circle of friends he gathered were of a notably literary character, and significantly excluded his fellow painters and other visual artists. The surviving evidence may of course give a biased impression, his eminent literary friends producing predictably voluminous correspondence which has, equally predictably, been preserved and published for its historical and entertainment value. However, it is remarkable how little social or professional interaction Jervas appears to have had with his fellow visual artists. He had established his independent portrait practice in London by 16955 but was not involved then or later with the contemporary artistic clubs or societies the Virtuosi of St. Luke (the ‘Tip top Clubbs of all’ – Vertue) or the Rose and Crown Club (whose members were the ‘Eminent Artificiers of this Nation’ – Vertue), which thrived from 1689 until after his death.6 Neither was he among the sixty-two subscribers to his former teacher Kneller’s academy founded in 1711, unlike many contemporaries such as Michael Dahl, John Wootton, George Vertue and James Thornhill. This academy was succeeded by the St. Martin’s Lane Academy (1720-24) established by Louis Chéron (1660-1725) and John Vanderbank (1694-1739), again without Jervas’s recorded participation.7

Fellow Irishman Jonathan Swift (1667-1745) was an early acquaintance, first as a modest patron but soon a friend, and quite credibly drew Jervas into this literary circle. Jervas

5 ‘Mr. Jarvis, Long-Acre’ appears in an advertisement listing London’s ‘Life’ [portrait] painters, the advertisement appearing in the newspaper Collection for Improvement of Husbandry and Trade on 29 March, 26 April and 16 August 1695. See fig q.
7 Ibid. Bignamini has analysed the membership of all the known London artistic clubs 1689-1768. Jervas is absent from all the records.
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returned from his continental tour in the winter of 1708-1709, Steele hailing him in The Tatler of April 1709 as ‘the last great painter Italy has sent us’. The following month, Swift departed from London after an eighteen month stay, leaving an unfinished portrait by Jervas; when he returned to London the following year he sat to Jervas again to allow the canvas to be completed (fig 5a). The same month as this sitting, September 1710, Swift and Jervas were dining with Joseph Addison in the latter’s Chelsea home. The two Irishmen were again socialising early the following year, Swift recounting that:

Darteneuf and I and little Harrison, the new Tatler, and Jervas the painter, dined to-day with James, I know not his other name, but it is one of Darteneuf’s dining places, who is a true epicure. James is clerk of the kitchen to the queen, and has a little snug house at St. James’s, and we had the queen’s wine, and such very fine victuals, that I could not eat it.

Jervas’s acquaintances also included Gay and Parnell, who along with Swift, Pope and John Arbuthnot (1667-1735), Queen Anne’s personal physician, formed the kernel of the short-lived but fertile Scriblerius Club (fl.1713-mid 1714). Although Jervas was never involved in the group’s informal gatherings in Arbuthnot’s apartment in St. James’s Palace, his close companionship with all its members in the 1710s is notable on several counts. The club’s raison d’être was to promote subversive satire with a markedly Tory

---

8 The Tatler, no. 4 [16-19 April 1709], single sheet (unpaginated).
9 ‘…on Monday Jervas is to retouch my picture’ (9 September 1710). ‘I am rising to go to Jervas to finish my picture….Ten at night. I sat four hours this morning to Jervas, who has given my picture quite another turn, and now approves it entirely; but we must have the approbation of the town. If I were rich enough, I would get a copy of it and bring it over [to Dublin]’ (11 September 1710). Williams, Jonathan Swift. Journal to Stella, vol. 1, pg. 9, 13-14.
10 Ibid. pg. 32.
11 Ibid. pg. 202. The dinner was on 27 February 1711. ‘James’ was James Eckersall (c.1679-1753), a member of the royal household from the time of his appointment as Doorkeeper of the Privy Kitchen c.1692, his final appointment was that of First Clerk of the Kitchen in 1743 (R O Bucholz (project director), The Database of Court Officers 1660-1837, Index of Officers – E, http://www.luc.edu/history/fac_resources/bucholz/DCO/Database-Files/Index-E.pdf). Eckersall became a close friend of Pope and Jervas; the latter bequeathed both men £1,000 in his will. Charles Dartignanave (1664-1737) was a frequent companion of Swift while the latter was on visits to London, and was a renowned gourmet. See CR W8. ‘Little Harrison’ was probably William Harrison, who was appointed secretary to Lord Raby, Ambassador Extraordinary to The Hague in May 1711; on his death in 1713 Swift wrote to Stella, ‘No loss ever grieved me so much’ (Williams, The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, vol. 1, pg. 323n).
accent, mourning the imminent extinction of the Stuart line and the shift of political and economic might from land owners to city-based ‘monied interests’. The vigorously witty exchanges between members were the germ for such satirical exemplars as Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* (1726), Pope’s *The Dunciad*, and Gay’s *The Beggar’s Opera* (both 1728). It is significant that Jervas managed to foster his fruitful relationship with Walpole and the Whigs, while socialising with the party’s most perceptive gadflies. Equally important is the fact that his social circle clearly transcended these political affiliations, as it provided no material advantage on any side, and must therefore have been based on the literary and artistic qualities of the individuals. Jervas’s long-standing and disinterested friendship with such creative virtuosi also indicates some share in that intellectual brilliance for which the group is famous. This is evident in his own literary productions which show him to be a talented linguist; his three published translations being from Latin, Italian and Spanish, while he also understood French and Greek. Moreover, two of the translations, Machiavelli’s novella *The Marriage of Belfagor* (1719) and Cervantes’ *Don Quixote* (1742), are famously satirical works, demonstrating Jervas’s active contribution to the promotion of the genre. Finally, in a rare surviving reflection on Jervas’s private interests, Pope’s early biographer William Ayre expressly called Jervas: ‘a thinking Man, and one who spent many Hours in Reading, chiefly Books of Moral Philosophy, to which Study he inclin’d, and few were better able to express in Words as well as in Colours, the Difference of the Passions’.

---

13 The publications are discussed in this chapter. Jervas used French phrases in his correspondence and would doubtless have learnt French while living in Paris in 1698-9, and used it frequently at Court. As regards his knowledge of Greek, he again quotes classical phrases in his correspondence, and when a rival translation of Homer’s *Iliad* was published in 1715 in deliberate competition with Pope’s, Jervas loyally wrote to Pope that ‘I cou’d not forbear comparing, And I do not know what the Devil is got into my head, but I fancy I could make a more Poetical Translation in [a] fortnight (excepting a very few Lines)’. George Sherburn (ed.), *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*, Oxford, 1956, vol. 1, pg. 296 (12 June 1715).  
14 Ayre, *Memoirs*, pg. 25. Sadly no record of Jervas’s library survives, which could corroborate Ayre’s comments. Pat Rogers in *The Alexander Pope Encyclopedia* (pg. 16) has suggested that Ayre was a pseudonym for the publisher Edmund Curll.
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The genuine camaraderie enjoyed by this small group is evident in their surviving correspondence. A cheerful letter to Parnell of February 1716 is a collaboration between Gay, Jervas, Dr. Arbuthnot and Pope, written ‘in the chop house in exchange Alley’. Jervas’s contribution to the letter starts with faux humility: ‘Tho’ my Proportion of this Epistle shou’d be but a Sketch in Miniature yet I take up half this Page having paid my Club with the good Company both for our Dinner of Chops & for this Paper’. The previous summer Jervas, Pope, Arbuthnot and Henry ‘Duke’ Disney (d.1731), the last ‘a fellow of abundance of humour, an old battered Rake, but very honest’ according to Swift, planned a trip to Oxford and Bath via the home of Sir William Wyndham (1687-1740). The jaunt was forestalled, possibly due to Wyndham’s involvement in the imminent Jacobite rebellion for which he spent some months in the Tower, but Jervas appears to have co-ordinated the logistics of the journey. In Gay’s poem ‘Mr. Pope’s Welcome from Greece’, subtitled ‘…upon Mr. Pope’s having finished his Translation of Homer’s Iliad’, Jervas is included in the Thames-side throng gathered to welcome the weary author: ‘Thee Jervas hails, robust and debonair,/Now have we conquer’d Homer, friends, he cries’. And in the unusual survival of domestic minutiae, Gay reveals that when Swift stayed with him in London in 1726, Gay had borrowed bed linen from Jervas for his guest, which was later returned to their owner ‘mended, finely washed, & neatly folded up’. Two years later, in anticipation of another visit, Gay assured Swift that he had bought ‘two pair of Sheets against your coming to town, so that we need not send any more to Jervas upon that ac[ount]’. The friendship with Swift was renewed during Jervas’s various visits to Ireland; he dined with the Dean of

---

15 Arbuthnot in his paragraph mentions the location from which they write. Sherburn comments (pg. 331n) of this letter, ‘The writing is strongly redolent of wine’. Sherburn, The Correspondence of Alexander Pope, vol. 1, pg. 332.

16 Ibid.
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St. Patrick’s in May 1718, Swift’s account book recording that he served his guests ‘Bief ale &c.’. The only surviving letter from Jervas to Swift is dated 1734, and affectionately discusses mutual friends such as Pope, Mary Pendarves (future wife of Swift’s gardening friend Dr. Patrick Delaney of Delville) and Bishop Hough, offers medicinal advice for the Dean’s infamous ‘giddy’ spells, and promises to send Swift a print of William Conolly (1662-1729) of Castletown House, Kildare.

Undoubtedly Jervas’s single most intimate and influential friendship was with Alexander Pope, whom he probably met through Swift in the period 1709/10 when the artist settled in London and Pope was enjoying the modest acclaim resulting from his first published work, his Pastoral. With the encouragement of John Caryll snr (1667-1736), one of Pope’s long-standing confidants, the poet engaged in painting lessons, commencing in the spring of 1713. He wrote to Caryll in April: ‘I’ve been almost every day employed in following your advice in learning to paint, in which I am most particularly obliged to Mr. Gervase, who gives me daily instructions and examples’. In the succeeding twelve months, Pope lived and studied with Jervas at his house (and studio) in Cleveland Court, a period which was pivotal for both men, personally and professionally, and which formed the basis for their enduring friendship. Pope was by that time already an occasional and self-deprecating painter who had probably been encouraged to draw since childhood; his aunt was the widow of the miniaturist Samuel Cooper (1609-1672), whose personal collection the poet inherited in 1710. Although his early works do not survive, documentary evidence records that he copied a female

---

22 The other guests at this dinner hosted by Swift were his constant companions Rebecca Dingley and Stella, along with one or more of the talented Grattan brothers, and Dr. Thomas Sheridan (1687-1738). Thompson and Thompson, The Account Books, pg. 178.
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portrait by Kneller in 1705,\textsuperscript{27} and presented a \textit{Madonna} to Caryll’s wife late in 1710.\textsuperscript{28} 
During his year of study with Jervas, his earnest application, and plain enjoyment of the medium is evident in an entertaining account given to their friend Gay:

\begin{quote}
I become by Mr. Jervas’s help, \textit{Elegans Formarum Spectator}.\textsuperscript{29} I begin to discover Beauties that were till now imperceptible to me. Every Corner of an Eye, or Turn of a Nose or Ear, the smallest degree of Light or Shade on a Cheek, or in a dimple, have charms to distract me. I no longer look upon Lord \textit{Plausible}\textsuperscript{30} as ridiculous, for admiring a Lady’s fine Tip of an Ear and pretty Elbow (as the \textit{Plain-dealer} has it) but am in some danger even from the Ugly and Disagreeable, since they may have their retired beauties, in one Trait or other about ‘em. You may guess in how uneasy a state I am, when every day the performances of others appear more beautiful and excellent, and my own more despicable. I have thrown away three Dr. Swifts, each of which was once my Vanity, two Lady Bridgwaters, a Dutchess of Montague, besides half a dozen Earls, and one Knight of the Garter. I have crucify’d Christ over-again in effigie, and made a Madona as old as her mother St. Anne. Nay, what is yet more miraculous, I have rival’d St. Luke himself in Painting, and as ‘tis said an Angel came and finish’d his Piece, so you would swear a Devil put the last hand to mine, ‘tis so begrim’d and smutted. However I comfort my self with a christian Reflection, that, I have not broken the Commandment, for my Pictures are not the likeness of any thing in heaven above, or in earth below, or in the waters under the earth.\textsuperscript{31}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{27} In a letter addressed to the sitter, whose identity is unknown, he wrote disingenuously, ‘I must complain to you of my hand, which is an arrant traitor to my heart; for having been copying your picture from thence [i.e. his heart] and from Kneller these three days, it has done all possible injury to the finest Face that ever was made, and to the liveliest Image that ever was drawn’. \textit{Ibid.} vol. 1, pg. 4. Letter dated 1 March 1705.
\textsuperscript{28} Letter Pope to Caryll dated 27 January 1711. \textit{Ibid.} vol. 1, pg. 115.
\textsuperscript{29} Approximately, ‘a nice judge of beauty’, from the Latin play \textit{Eunuchus} by Terence (195/185-159BC), Act iii, Scene 5. The quote was the title of an article by Addison in \textit{The Spectator} no. 144 on 15 August 1711.
\textsuperscript{30} A character in William Wycherley’s (1641-1715) play \textit{The Plain Dealer} (1677). Wycherley and Pope corresponded frequently in the dramatist’s final years.
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His best productions, he believed, were portraits of his friends, and the only surviving painting firmly attributed to his hand is indeed very accomplished, and contradicts the impression of flippancy conveyed in the above letter. It is an exact copy after Kneller’s Kit Kat-style portrait of Thomas Betterton (1635-1710), the actor and dramatist who solicited the young Pope to write a stage tragedy (fig 5b). Spence lists various other works by Pope he had seen, including ‘a grave old Chaucer, from Occele,...a Lucius Verus [Roman co-emperor 161-169 BC],...two Turkish heads, a Janizary from the life,...St. John praying’. Two lesser-known works by Pope, also now lost, are worthy of particular mention in this context: ‘a head of Vandyck, drawn by Pope, in black and red chalk, finely executed’, was at Holm Lacy in 1794, which was in Pope’s time the home of Frances Scudamore, née Digby (1685-1729), a member of the Digby family whom Pope met almost certainly via Jervas, and with whom he maintained close ties throughout his life. The final and most intriguing work may have been from life, and is recorded in the 1854 inventory of goods at Meriden Hall, the Warwickshire home of Jervas’s maternal uncle Martyn Baldwin; in the Dining Room was ‘Martin Baldwin by Alexander Pope’.

What Pope gained from these lessons was a great deal more significant than the production of drawings and paintings. The visual subtleties to which he became attuned, and the technical process of painting were to seep into the imagery and

32 Letter Pope to Caryll dated 31 August 1713, ‘I find my hand most successful in drawing of friends and those I most esteem; insomuch that my masterpieces have been one Dr. Swift and one Mr. Betterton’. Ibid. vol. 1, pg. 189.
33 James M Osborn (ed.), Joseph Spence, Anecdotes, Observations, and Character, of Books and Men, Oxford, 1966, no. 34. Pope presented the painting to the brilliant Scottish lawyer William Murray (1705-1793) who gave the poet professional advice and representation towards the end of his life. The painting is still in the recipient’s family at Scone Palace, Perthshire.
34 Joseph Spence, Observations, and Characters of Books and Men, London, 1820, pg. 336. A Janizary was a member of an elite military unit of the Turkish army.
36 ‘Inventory of the Household Furniture and Effects at Meriden Hall in the county of Warwick the property of Charles Wriothesly Digby Esq. Taken 29 September 1854’, MS 3444/91, collection of Moore & Tibbits [solicitors], ‘Inventories of furniture, etc. at Meriden Hall. Date 1842-1863’. Notebook 6, pg. 86, Birmingham City Archives.
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language of his poetry. His use of ‘colour-words’ and of studio imagery is a marked characteristic of his oeuvre, evident in, for example, the 1715 preface to the Iliad volume one: ‘[Homer’s] Expression is like the colouring of some great Masters, which discovers itself to be laid on boldly, and executed with Rapidity. It is indeed the strongest and most glowing imaginable, and touch’d with the greatest Spirit’.37 Later in ‘Of the Characters of Women’ (1733) the poet gently mocks the guises (Arcadian shepherdesses, classical goddesses, saints, etc.) sometimes assumed by female sitters for their portraits.38 In one of the many anonymous pamphlets by Pope’s ‘dunces’ in response to his Dunciad (1728), his free use of colour associations is ridiculed: ‘Leave the blue Languish, and the Crimson Sigh;/Leave the gay Epithets that Beauty crown,/White Whitylinda, and Brownissa Brown;/…Omit awhile the Silver Peal to ring’.39 Pope’s later delight (and expertise) in architecture and gardening, in which his opinions were earnestly sought by his friends, may also have had their origin in this period, in which he developed a new visual vocabulary, and gained confidence in his own artistic instinct and abilities.40

Pope was evidently an eager and grateful pupil, but this year of study, perhaps unexpectedly for both him and Jervas, was a remarkable pleasant interlude in their lives, on which Pope reflected nostalgically in the summer of 1714 when he had returned to the family home at Binfield, near Windsor:

I fancy no friendship is so likely to prove lasting as ours, because I am pretty sure there never was a friendship of so easie a nature. We neither of us demand any mighty things from each other; what Vanity we have expects its gratification from other people. It is not I, that am to tell you what an Artist you are, nor is it

---

39 Anon [Leonard Welsted and James Moore Smythe], One Epistle to Mr. A Pope, occasion’d by Two Epistles Lately Published, London, 1730.
you that are to tell me what a Poet I am; but ‘tis from the world abroad we hope, (piously hope) to hear these things...‘Tis not unlike the happy friendship of a stay’d man and his wife, who are seldom so fond as to hinder the business of the house from going on all day, or so indolent as not to find consolation in each other every evening....[I] am perfectly convinc’d of the truth of a Maxim we once agreed in, That nothing hinders the constant agreement of people who live together, but meer Vanity.\(^{41}\)

The delight in one another’s company as well as their intellectual rapport was reiterated in a letter written by Pope to Jervas when the latter was on a prolonged visit to Ireland in 1719; ‘I can’t express how I long to renew our old intercourse and conversation, our morning Conferences in bed in the same Room, our evening Walks in the Park, our amusing Voyages on the Water, our philosophical Suppers, our Lectures, our Dissertations, our Gravities, our Reveries, our Fooleries, our what not?\(^{42}\)

Many instances of practical assistance offered to one another attest to the durability of their friendship. Until the mid-1720s, Pope during his London visits would stay with Jervas at Cleveland Court, receiving his post there, and acting as caretaker when the latter was absent. During one such visit to Ireland in 1716, Pope amiably pleads with Jervas to return to London (‘Many faces have died for ever for want of your Pencil, and blooming Ladies have wither’d in expecting your return’)\(^{43}\) and relates the state of the household under his care:

As to your enquiry about your House, when I come within the walls, they put me in mind of those of Carthage where your Friend, like the wandring Trojan, ‘Animum Pictura pascit inani’.\(^{44}\) For the spacious Mansion, like a Turkish Caravanserah, entertains the Vagabond with only bare Lodgings. I rule the Family very ill, keep bad Hours, and lend your Pictures about the Town. See

---


\(^{43}\) Letter Pope to Jervas 9 July 1716. *Ibid*, vol. 1 pg. 347.

\(^{44}\) Approximately ‘He feeds his soul on what is nothing but a picture’. *Aeneid*, i. 464.
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what it is to have a Poet in your House! Frank [Waters, Jervas’s servant] indeed does all he can in such a Circumstance, for considering he has a wild Beast in it, he constantly keeps the Door chain’d. Every time it is open’d, the Links rattle, the rusty Hinges roar, the House seems so sensible that you are its support, that it is ready to drop in your absence; but I still trust my self under its Roof, as depending that Providence will preserve so many Raphaels, Titian’s and Guido’s, as are lodg’d in your Cabinet. Surely the Sins of one Poet can hardly be so heavy, as to bring an old House over the Heads of so many Painters. In a word, your House is falling, but what of that? I am only a Lodger.\footnote{Letter Pope to Jervas 29 November 1716. Sherburn, \textit{The Correspondence of Alexander Pope}, vol. 1, pg. 377.}

In turn, Jervas diligently canvassed for subscriptions to Pope’s literary endeavours. When a proposal for Pope’s translation of Homer’s \textit{Iliad} in six volumes was issued in October 1713, Jervas utilised his professional contacts on behalf of his friend, to whom he relayed his progress; ‘Yesterday I gave a Printed Proposal to Lord Halifax & spoke to the Duke of Devonshire to join my Lord Wharton’s Interest & move your affair, that we may set ‘em agoing About the Counties’.\footnote{Letter Jervas to Pope 27 May 1714. \textit{Ibid}, vol. 1, pg. 226.} He even persuaded his portrait sitters to endorse the translations; ‘Mrs. Raines a Young Lady in the City & one of my Shepherdesses, takes one of the Volumes, has paid her 2 Guineas & is to be a Subscriber in your next list.’\footnote{Letter Jervas to Pope 12 June 1715. \textit{Ibid}, vol. 1, pg. 296.} On visiting Ireland in the summer of 1717, Jervas arrived with a large quantity of the third volume of the \textit{Iliad}, which had just been published, for distribution to Irish subscribers.\footnote{Letter Pope to Jervas June-July 1717. \textit{Ibid}, vol. 1, pg. 410.} Pope profited extremely handsomely from his translation of the \textit{Iliad}, due to the generous terms of his contract with his publisher Lintot, and his having 575 subscribers (some with multiple orders) endorse the project at the outset.\footnote{Pope is estimated to have cleared £5,000 - £6,000 from the \textit{Iliad} (Owen Ruffhead, \textit{The Life of Alexander Pope, Esq.}, London, 1769, pg. 182). 575 subscribers, including Jervas, are listed in volume 1 (1715). The \textit{Odyssey} was also funded by subscription, 571 subscribers listed in volume 1 and another 37 at the end of volume 5. Jervas subscribed for two sets of the \textit{Odyssey}.}
own words, ‘I have found more Patrons than ever Homer wanted’. The practical services offered by Jervas in this enterprise contributed in no small extent to its success. And when Pope’s translation of Homer’s Odyssey was published in five volumes between 1725 and 1726, subscribers were directed to collect their copies from the Cleveland Court address (fig 5c). Jervas provided the frontispiece for volume one of the Iliad, which shows a classical bust of Homer (possibly a drawing of an item in Jervas’s collection) (CR Nonp3), and oversaw the engraving by Vertue of his 1714 portrait of Pope (CR P13), which was used as the frontispiece for The Works of Mr. Alexander Pope published in 1717.

The two friends were a reliable source of moral support and encouragement to one another in the early 1710s, when both were on the cusp of promising careers. Pope’s consistent flattery in private and public was a prestigious endorsement for Jervas, his epistle ‘To Mr. Jervas’ being published in 1716 and again in his collected Works the following year. A selection of Pope’s private correspondence was published in both their lifetimes in 1735, at the height of the poet’s career, in which the distinguished author’s admiration for Jervas’s character and skill is unequivocal. Pope had no qualms in coupling the moral weight of their separate endeavours, or even comparing Jervas favourably with Homer: ‘It is my employment to revive the old of past ages to the present, as it is yours to transmit the young of the present, to the future. I am copying the great Master in one art [translating Homer’s Iliad], with the same love and diligence with which the Painters hereafter will copy you in another’. Jervas’s literary projects must also owe a great deal to Pope’s encouragement. His first endeavour was a joint project of translation, and it must be no coincidence that Pope’s mammoth translations of Homer’s Iliad and Odyssey are paralleled in Jervas’s modest second career with two works of translation. Pope’s belief in his friend’s literary abilities is also evidenced in his

50 Alexander Pope (transl.), The Iliad of Homer, London, 1715. vol. 1, Preface [unpaginated].
51 ‘London Gazette’, Saturday 10 April 1725 [issue 6363] and ‘Daily Courant’ Friday 10 June 1726 [issue 7691].
explicit encouragement of another unfulfilled project: ‘The Ancients...expect you should do them right; those Statues from which you learned your beautiful and noble Ideas, demand it as a piece of Gratitude from you, to make them truly known to all nations, in the account you intend to write of their Characters. I hope you think more warmly than ever of that noble design.’

The admiration each held for the other’s forte did not impede criticism however, and Pope entreated his friend to explore history painting: ‘I recommend to your hand the story which every pious Irishman ought to begin with, that of St. Patrick....I long to see you a History Painter. You have already done enough for the Private, do something for the Publick; and be not confined, like the rest, to draw only such silly stories as our own faces tell of us’. It is significant also that it was during the period in which he lived with Jervas, when they enjoyed their ‘Conferences’ and ‘philosophical Suppers’, that Pope made the momentous decision to undertake the translation of the Iliad, issuing the proposal in October 1713, and signing the contract with the publisher Bernard Lintot in March 1714. Something of the perceived equilibrium of their relationship (and talent) was touched upon by their friend Parnell is his epigram:

Once Pope under Je[r]vais resolvd to adventure  
& from a Good Poet Pope turnd an ill painter  
So from a Good Painter Charles Jervais we hope  
May turn an ill Poet by living with Pope  
Then Each may perform the true parts of a friend  
While each will have something to blame or commend.

---

55 Mack, *Alexander Pope*, pg. 267. Jervas was witness to two of Lintot’s payments to Pope, recorded on the reverse of the contract in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Ms Don.a.6).  
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The task of translating the *Iliad* occupied Pope for five years from 1714 and proved to be a stressful and isolating responsibility. ‘And Homer (damn him!) calls’, he wrote in ‘A Farewell to London’ (1715).\(^{57}\) Its arduous nature intensified his memories of Jervas’s busy studio, rich artistic collection, and their pleasant lessons. He drew these sentiments together in his poem ‘To Mr. Jervas’, which was first published in 1716.\(^{58}\) The adulatory verses celebrate the compatible nature of both their friendship and their fields of expertise:

Smit with the Love of Sister-Arts we came,
And met congenial, mingling Flame with Flame;
Like friendly Colours found our Arts unite,
And each from each contract new Strength and Light.
How oft in pleasing Tasks we wear the Day,
While Summer Suns roll unperceiv’d away?
How oft our slowly-growing Works impart,
While Images reflect from Art to Art?\(^{59}\)

The narrative of the poem goes on to envisage a joint visit to ‘fair Italy’,\(^{60}\) where they pay homage at the tombs of their respective heroes, Raphael and Virgil, while ‘thy well-study’d Marbles fix our Eye/A fading Fresco here demands a Sigh:/Each heavenly Piece unwearied we compare’.\(^{61}\) The poet finally muses on the immortality offered by Jervas to his sitters, their memory as evoked through his ‘breathing Paint’\(^{62}\) giving comfort and pleasure to the living.

---


\(^{58}\) See Appendix A and B for full text.

\(^{59}\) Alexander Pope, ‘To Mr. Jervas, with Fresnoy’s Art of Painting, Translated by Mr. Dryden’, John Dryden [and Charles Jervas] (transl.), *The Art of Painting*, 1716, lines 13-20.

\(^{60}\) *Ibid*, line 26

\(^{61}\) *Ibid*, lines 33-35.

\(^{62}\) *Ibid*, line 55.
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The occasion for this encomium was the reissue of John Dryden’s (1631-1700) translation into English of the painter Charles-Alphonse du Fresnoy’s (1611-1668) De arte graphica [The art of painting] (1668). The original work was a Latin didactic poem composed over a period of 25 years in which du Fresnoy sought to distil the tenets of painting into ‘infallible Rules’.63 These ranged from the principles of perspective, composition, and the use of colours to vaguer exhortation such as, ‘Let a Nobleness and Grace be remarkable through all your work. But to confess the Truth, this is a most difficult Undertaking; and a very rare Present, which the Artist receives rather from the hand of Heaven, than from his own Industry and Studies’.64 It concludes with lifestyle advice for the aspirant artist, advising him to carry a ‘Table-book’ at all times to sketch from the life, to study geometry and the art of ‘the Ancients’ as found in their medals, statues and basso relievos, to ‘let no Day pass over you without a Line’, ideally practised in the morning, to maintain a bachelor state and moderation in ‘wine and good Cheer’.65 In his opening line, ‘Ut pictura poesis erit; similisque Poesi / Sit Pictura’ (‘As a painting so a poem will be, and likewise let a painting be as poetry’)66 he draws on Horace’s Ars Poetica (18BC) in which a sisterhood of painting and poetry is first proposed. Du Fresnoy borrows the analogy at the start of his work largely to explain the genre (poetry) he has chosen in which to deliver his treatise, and to espouse the classical author to his own cause. His use of Latin, rather than his native French, was another means by which to add import and gravitas to his work. The poem was published in 1668 in a single volume with a French translation by Roger de Piles (1635-1709), written in co-operation with du Fresnoy. De Piles, who launched his career as an art theorist and critic with this work, translated the 549 lines of concise verse into prose, and added a series of lengthy explanatory remarks and addenda. The resulting publication was a pan-European success, encapsulating ancient and contemporary classical artistic axioms, and appealing to practitioners and connoisseurs alike.

64 Ibid, pg. 31-33.
65 Ibid, pg. 27, 67-9, 73.
66 John Dryden [and Charles Jervas] (transl.), The Art of Painting, 1716, pg. 2.
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The first translation into English, published in London in 1695, was at the instigation of ‘some Gentlemen Vertuosoes and Painters’ who persuaded Dryden to undertake the commission.\(^67\) They included the painters Kneller, John Closterman (1660-1711), Henry Cooke (c.1642-1700) who provided the frontispiece, and the author Richard Graham (fl. 1695-1727).\(^68\) The last three were members of the Virtuosi of St. Luke, and their interest can be seen as part of the nascent movement to elevate the technical standard (‘much declin’d in the present Age’)\(^69\) and intellectual status of painting in Britain. In his preface Dryden admitted that he considered himself unequal to the task of translating *De arte graphica*, not owing to any imperfect understanding of the original Latin or French, but that he was ‘not sufficiently vers’d in the Terms of the Art’. However those ‘most Skillfull Painters, and other Artists’ who desired to ‘give the world this usefull Work’ promised to guide his interpretation. The result he offered to the reader as ‘a tolerable Translation. Not Elegant, for I propos’d not that to my self: but familiar, clear and instructive’.\(^70\) His preface sets out to re-emphasise the notion of kinship between painting and poetry, but idiosyncratically tends to align painting with Dryden’s preferred *métier*; stage drama. He takes the opportunity in this discursive essay to critique his fellow-playwrights and their productions, offering various examples of plays (including some of his own) which share the formal characteristics advocated by du Fresnoy.\(^71\) To this eccentricity is added the translator’s frank confession that the whole production was done in great haste, the preface ‘begun and ended in twelve Mornings’, and the whole publication completed in two months in the midst of his translation of

---

\(^67\) Dryden signed a contract with the publisher Jacob Tonson in June 1694 to translate the entire works of Virgil; in the document he mentions that he has already committed to translating ‘a little French Booke of Painting’. Charles E. Ward, *The Life of John Dryden*, North Carolina, 1961, pg. 272.


\(^71\) Among those mentioned are Robert Stapylton’s ‘The Slighted Maid’ (1663) [pg. xlv], Thomas Otway’s ‘Venice preserv’d’ (1682) [pg. xlv], and Dryden’s ‘Tyrannick Love, or The Royal Martyr’ (1669) [pg. xlvii] and ‘The Spanish Fryer’ (1680) [pg. liv].
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Virgil.\textsuperscript{72} The body of the text consists of the original Latin verse printed alongside an English translation of de Piles’ prose, and, as with the 1668 publication, includes du Fresnoy’s extensive essays ‘Observations on the Art of Painting’ and ‘Judgement...On the Works of the Principal and Best Painters of the two last Ages’. As a supplement, Graham added ‘A Short Account of the most Eminent Painters both Ancient and Modern, continu’d down to the Present Times according to the Order of their Succession’, which concluded with the artist John Riley (d.1691).\textsuperscript{73}

Graham appears to have managed the revision and reissue of this edition in 1716 (fig 5d).\textsuperscript{74} He contributed a preface dedicating the publication to the Earl of Burlington in which he explains the need to take ‘Liberties’\textsuperscript{75} with Dryden’s translation, namely that the latter produced a competent translation of de Piles, but that de Piles himself occasionally misunderstood the original Latin. In this way Graham makes de Piles responsible for any inaccuracies in Dryden’s English version, rather than the revered English dramatist who was, according to Graham, ‘one of Your Lordship’s favourite Authors’.\textsuperscript{76} Jervas, he continues, had been prevailed upon to correct the translation where deemed necessary, he being ‘a very good Critick in the Language [Latin], as well as in the Subject of the Poem’.\textsuperscript{77} Such value was placed on Dryden’s text that any

\textsuperscript{72} Ibid, pg. lv and iv.
\textsuperscript{73} The ‘Short Account’, which appears, on the basis of its title page, to have also been made available as an independent pamphlet, was printed anonymously in 1695, but attributed to Richard Graham in the 1716 edition.
\textsuperscript{74} The title page states that it is ‘The Second Edition, Corrected, and Enlarg’d’. Pat Rogers in The Alexander Pope Encyclopedia, pg. 114 believes that the ‘first edition’ was published in 1715, but there is no evidence to support this. WorldCat [www.worldcat] does list an edition of 1715, part of the Eighteenth Century Short Title Catalogue, which is available on microfilm. However, WorldCat is incorrect, as this is in fact the edition of 1716. The ‘first edition’ implied by the title page is most likely that of 1695. The engraver Simon Gribelin (1661-1733) is also associated with both the 1695 and 1716 editions; in the first he engraved the frontispiece after Henry Cooke, and in the second he both designed and engraved the new frontispiece, showing the ‘Corinthian maid’ outline her lover’s shadow on a wall.
\textsuperscript{75} Richard Graham, ‘Epistle Dedicatory’, John Dryden [and Charles Jervas], (transl.), The Art of Painting, 1716, unpaginated.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{77} Ibid.
alterations made by Jervas were distinguished with ‘proper Marks’, being here quotation marks. This enables comparison between the two editions, and demonstrates the clarity and insight which Jervas brought to the re-wording of many passages. For example, where Dryden wrote ambiguously: ‘Let the whole Picture be made of one piece, and avoid as much as possibly you can, to paint drily’, Jervas reworded it as: ‘Let the whole Picture be of one Piece, as if it were painted from one Palette’. Again he rewords an inscrutable passage given by Dryden as:

The raising and roundness of a Body, ought to be given it in the same manner as we behold it in a Convex Mirrour, in which we view the Figures and all other things, which bear out with more Life and strength than Nature it self. And let those which turn, be of broken Colours, as being less distinguish’d, and nearer to the borders.

The 1716 edition gives the passage as:

As in a Convex Mirrour the collected Rays strike stronger and brighter in the middle than upon the natural Object, and the Vivacity of the Colours is increas’d in the Parts full in your Sight; while the goings off are more and more broken and faint as they approach to the Extremitiies, in the same Manner Bodies are to be rais’d and rounded.

Elsewhere Jervas makes clear that he is utilising to all three versions of the text, Latin, French and English, in his work, adding in a footnote on page forty-three; ‘The French Translator here, as well as Mr. Dryden, is unintelligible; which happen’d by their mistaking the Meaning of the Word Opaca, which is not put for dark; but Opaque, in Opposition to transparent: for a white Garment may be Opaque…’ In all, the 1716

---

78 Ibid. Dryden’s ‘Preface of the Translator, with a Parallel, or Poetry and Painting’ is also included in this edition.

79 John Dryden, (transl.), De Arte Graphica, 1695, pg. 52.

80 John Dryden [and Charles Jervas] (transl.), The Art of Painting, 1716, pg. 55. The original Latin line reads ‘Tota siet Tabula ex unà depicta Patellâ’, in which Jervas has translated the last word more accurately, it being ‘plate’ or ‘platter’.

81 John Dryden, (transl.), De Arte Graphica, 1695, pg. 40.

82 John Dryden [and Charles Jervas] (transl.), The Art of Painting, 1716, pg. 41.

83 Ibid, pg. 43.
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edition translates the French prose into 1068 lines of English, of which 154 (i.e. 14%) are marked as the work of Jervas.

Pope’s involvement in the publication can be deducted most notably from the inclusion of his poem, ‘To Mr. Jervas’, ostensibly an epistle to the artist accompanied by a volume of *De arte graphica*:

> Read these instructive Leaves, in which conspire
> Fresnoy’s close Art, and Dryden’s native Fire:
> And reading wish, like theirs, our Fate and Fame,
> So mix’d our Studies, and so join’d our Name;

An early draft of the poem survives in Pope’s manuscripts which differs somewhat from the published text, but makes clear that from the outset it was composed for *De arte graphica*, ‘This small well-polish’d Gem (ye work of years)’. Pope’s involvement is likely to have been wider than this single contribution, and a newspaper advertisement of 1722 states that the book was ‘published by Mr. Pope and Mr. Jervas’, implying a collaborative work; the actual publisher was Lintot. The lure of this joint-project for both Jervas and Pope is obvious, as it represents an extension of their friendship and mutual interests as well as a public forum for their lesser-known talents. Jervas brought his linguistic skills and technical expertise to an iconic art thesis already associated with Dryden. Pope meanwhile had the opportunity to display his artistic sensibility, while assisting the public profile of the new edition by the inclusion of his poem. ‘To Mr. Jervas’ also bears a neat parallel with Dryden’s paean ‘To Sir Godfrey Kneller’ published in 1694 (though not included in the Dryden/Kneller collaboration *De arte graphica* of 1695). The decision to re-work Dryden’s volume may date to the period 1713-14 in which the two painted and lived together; as a student of art Pope is likely to have known, if not learnt from, du Fresnoy’s precepts, while Jervas too would inevitably have been

---

84 *Ibid*, unpaginated.
85 See Appendix A. A newspaper advertisement of March 1716, announced the publication of the new edition of ‘*De arte graphica*’, said that the book includes verses by Mr. Pope to Mr. Jervas ‘Occasion’d by this Edition’. *Post Man and the Historical Account*, London, 8 March 1716, issue 11,250.
86 *London Journal* (1720), Saturday 3 February 1722, issue cxxxii.
familiar with the 1695 edition with which his own teacher Kneller was so involved. The obvious inaccuracies in Dryden’s text may therefore have been a glaring irritation to both, as well as London’s painting community.

The value placed on du Fresnoy’s *De art graphica* was such that it was twice more translated and published in English in the eighteenth century. James Wills (fl. 1740-1777) issued such a literal translation, matching the original Latin verse line for line, that it was considered unreadable.\(^87\) The final, and much-lauded, appearance of the title was under the auspices of Sir Joshua Reynolds in 1783. The painter William Mason (1724/5-1797) translated du Fresnoy into English verse, and replaced de Piles’ remarks with new footnotes and annotations by himself and Reynolds. In a parallel with the 1716 version, Mason wrote ‘Epistle to Sir Joshua Reynolds’ for the volume, in which he traces the history of *De arte graphica* through its various guises, highlighting the weaknesses of each previous apparition. In that of 1716, the inclusion of Pope’s ‘To Mr. Jervas’ received particularly ruthless attention:

> Let Friendship, as she caus’d, excuse the deed;
> ...
> But what, if Fashion tempted Pope astray?
> The Witch has spells, and Jervas knew the day
> When mode-struck Belles and Beaux were proud to come
> And buy of him a thousand years of bloom.
> ...
> Perish alone that selfish sordid rhyme,
> Which flatters lawless Sway, or tinsel Pride;
> Let black Oblivion plunge it in her tide.\(^88\)

---

\(^87\) Lawrence Lipking, ‘The Shifting Nature of Authority in Versions of De arte graphica’, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, vol. 23, no. 4 [Summer 1965], pg. 496.
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These bitter sentiments reflect Reynold’s well-known contempt for Jervas. It may have been fuelled by the uncanny similarities in their careers; like Jervas, Reynolds was the premier society portraitist of his time; he too recognised De arte graphica as ‘giving the leading Principles of Art with more precision, conciseness, and accuracy, than any work of the kind that has either preceded or followed it,’ and he too was appointed, in 1784, Principal Painter to the King.

Jervas’s second published work was carried out so independently of his literary friends that it had an air of secrecy (fig 5e). As it does not bear his name, his authorship is based on a single piece of documentary evidence, albeit one which is unequivocal. In a letter from Dublin to Charles Ford in London, Swift set out the train of events with characteristic cynicism;

Jervas happened to read the Story of Belphigor in an Italian Machiavel, and not knowing it was already in English, very gravely translated and published it here, so that I assure you he is an Author. I was not let into the Secret till lately, so this is entre nous, but it may serve for Pope to laugh at, if he can pretend to come by it any where else.

Machiavelli’s Belfagor arcidiavolo was composed between 1518 and 1520. Based on a medieval yarn, it tells the story of a ‘principal devil’ Belfagor who was sent to earth by a hellish Council to discover if the state of marriage was as corrupting and wretched as lamented by those souls arriving in hell. Belfagor arrives in Florence in the guise of one ‘Roderigo of Castilia’, a handsome and wealthy bachelor. He is soon married to an

---

90 William Mason (transl.) and Joshua Reynolds, The Art of Painting, pg. ix.
92 Charles Ford (1682-1741) was an intimate friend of Swift. He owned Woodpark demesne in Co. Meath, but lived mainly in London.
95 Machiavelli, Niccolò [and Charles Jervas (transl.)], The Marriage of Belfagor, Dublin, 1719, pg. 5.
impoverished noblewoman Honesta Donati, and is rapidly undone by his wife’s pride, scorn and the financial demands of her extended family. Justifiably fearful of his creditors, Roderigo flees the city and only escapes their wrath with the help of a peasant farmer John Matteo, by hiding in a dunghill. Roderigo, or rather Belfagor, thanks John Matteo by arranging to cooperate in several staged exorcisms, for which the latter was handsomely rewarded by the ‘saved’. When their collaboration turns sour, and John Matteo’s life is in danger, the peasant farmer is forced to concoct an elaborate ruse to rid himself of his satanic accomplice. In an elaborate public ceremony, he terrifies Belfagor with the mere mention of Honesta’s name, the devil ‘choosing rather to go back to hell…than subject himself again to all the vexations, disturbances and dangers of the matrimonial yoke’.  

The particular attraction of this story for Jervas must be the subject of conjecture, as the publication escapes all comment, other than that quoted, in contemporary correspondence. It is surely significant that Swift tells Ford, mockingly, ‘I assure you he is an Author’, suggesting an earnest wish on the translator’s part to be valued for his literary abilities. In this regard, publishing in English, as he thought for the first time, Machiavelli’s only surviving novella must in itself have had innate cachet. Had the moral of the story been of particular significance, it bears comparison with an element of du Fresnoy’s advice: ‘…a true Painter…delights in the Liberty which belongs to the Batchelor’s Estate’.  

Only one recorded copy of the booklet survives, suggesting a small print run.

---

96 Ibid, pg. 15.
98 In the Bryn Mawr College Library, Pennsylvania, Special Collection Department. A full text scan is available at [http://www.brynmawr.edu/Library/speccoll/digilib/Belfagor.pdf](http://www.brynmawr.edu/Library/speccoll/digilib/Belfagor.pdf). The publisher was George Grierson (c.1680-1753), who was latter appointed King’s printer (see M Pollard, A Dictionary of Members of the Dublin Book Trade 1550-1800, London, 2000, pg. 254-256). In 1720 Samuel Croxall of London published A Select Collection of Novels in six volumes, written by the most Celebrated Authors in several Languages…and all New Translated from the Originals, by several Eminent Hands, none of which translators are named. Machiavelli’s ‘The Marriage of Belphegor’ appears in volume 1 but the translation is entirely different to that by Jervas of the previous year.
Jervas’s final publication, as mentioned, was that of a new translation into English of Cervantes’ (1547-1616) *Don Quixote* (fig 5f). From the time of its original appearance in Spanish (in two parts, published in 1605 and 1615), the novel had enjoyed international success in many languages and successive editions. The first in English appeared in 1612 and 1620 (parts 1 and 2 respectively), the work of Thomas Shelton (fl. 1598-1629), an Irish Catholic rebel in exile in the Low Countries. Three other major versions, each claiming to be fresh translations, were published in subsequent years; those of John Phillips (1687), Captain John Stevens and Peter Motteux (both 1700). A Spanish language edition published by the Tonson family in London in 1738, very closely related to the translation by Jervas four years later, was a defining moment in the history of the novel in England. It was notable for a variety of reasons; its superior production quality, lavish illustration with sixty-nine engravings (including the earliest ‘portrait’ of Cervantes, by William Kent), and the addition of the first ever biography of the author written by Don Gregorio Mayáns y Siscár, Librarian to King Philip V of Spain. The inclusion of these elements, both by their sheer presence and in their nature, sought to aggrandise the novel’s stature, providing a dignified framework to a text previously considered bawdy and burlesque. The edition was sponsored, and probably initiated, by John Carteret, 2nd Earl of Granville (1690-1763). Carteret, a life-long politician, had a famous command of modern and classical languages and was an eager literary patron. Significantly, this edition deliberately reinterprets the text as a satirical masterpiece.
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suitable for the edification of the learned and affluent reader.\footnote{An event known as the ‘canonisation’ of the text among Don Quixote’s modern critics. See Rachel Schmidt, Critical Images. The Canonization of Don Quixote through Illustrated Editions of the Eighteenth Century, Montreal and Kingston, 1999, pg. 48.}

Cervantes is recast as an author with an earnest moral crusade which endeared him to Carteret and his erudite contemporaries; to ridicule skilfully the genre of chivalric romantic literature, and encourage a critical and informed approach to fictional literature.\footnote{For further discussion, ibid, pg. 47-52; Pablo Alvarez, University of Rochester [New York] Department of Rare Books, Book of the Month October 2005, ‘Vida y Hechos del Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha. Compuesta por Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. En Quarto tomos. London: J and R Tonson, 1738, http://www.lib.rochester.edu/index.cfm?PAGE=3305, accessed 3 November 2008; Barry Taylor (ed.), Foreign Language Printing in London 1500-1900, Boston Spa and London, 2002, pg. 193.} This message is graphically depicted in the frontispiece by John Vanderbank, which is explained in detail in an essay on the engravings.\footnote{‘Advertencias de D. Juan Oldfield, dotor en Medicina, Sobre las Estampas desta Historia’ ['Advertisement concerning the prints by John Oldfield MD'], Cervantes, Don Quixote, London, 1738, pg. i-viii.}

It denotes Mount Parnassus, home of the Muses, overrun by grotesque multi-headed and unnatural beasts. In the foreground, an athletic Herculean figure representing Cervantes arms himself to engage them in battle; a satyr presents him with a club and a mask, denoting the author’s use of ‘raillery and satire’\footnote{‘Advertisement concerning the prints by John Oldfield, MD’, Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de and Charles Jervas [Jarvis], (transl.), The Life and Exploits of the ingenious gentleman Don Quixote de la Mancha, London, 1742, vol. 1, pg. xxxii.} to beguile and vanquish the fantastical creatures. The classical Muses follow Hercules/Cervantes, awaiting restoration to Mount Parnassus.

The publication of 1742 is essentially an English language translation of this edition, retaining all the paratextual elements such as the engravings, dedication to Lord Carteret, Cervantine biography, Dr. Oldfield’s explanation of the illustrations and the deluxe production standards. A valuable addition is the translator’s preface, which Jervas commences with an explanation as to his motivations; ‘As much as I dislike the usual practice of translators, who think to recommend their own by censuring the former translations of their author, I am obliged to assure the reader, that, had I not thought those of Don Quixote very defective, I had never given myself or him the trouble
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of this undertaking.’

Having enunciated the failings of earlier translations, he argues that, in spite of these unworthy representations, ‘yet the wit and genius of the author has been able to shine through all disadvantages, so as to make every one of them as entertaining as any we have among us’. He sets out what he regards as Cervantes’ principal design, one disrespected by previous English translations, ‘to preserve the face of gravity, generally consistent through his whole work, suited to the solemnity of a Spaniard, and wherein without doubt is placed the true spirit of its ridicule’. This emphasis on the author’s deft use of irony and satire, rather than the novel’s ‘low comic and burlesque vein’, is central to the 1738/1742 reappraisal of Don Quixote.

Cervantes’ use of word-play, witty alliteration, colloquial proverbs and deliberately archaic diction present challenges to his translators, and these are frequently addressed by Jervas in his footnotes, in which he seeks to explain how he resolves each instance. One such issue is raised in the very first paragraph, where Don Quixana (soon to adopt his more famous moniker) is said to habitually eat ‘duèlos y quebrantos’ on Saturdays. In the body of the text, Jervas replaces this with ‘amlet’ (i.e. omelette), but in a footnote gives the literal translation of the Spanish (‘griefs and groans’) and some theories as to what dish this might actually be. He concludes the note: ‘As it is not easy to settle its true meaning, the translator has substituted an equivalent dish better known to the English reader.’ Elsewhere, he chooses to leave a Spanish culinary term intact, and describe it in the footnote. Where translation unavoidably provided a puzzling phrase, Jervas noted the original by way of excuse to the author. For example: ‘The original is Antifaces. Antifaz is a piece of thick black silk, which the Spaniards wear before their faces when travelling, not for disguise, but to keep off the dust and the sun. We have nothing

108 ‘The Translator’s Preface’, ibid, vol. 1, pg. iii. This preface is twenty pages long, fifteen of which are occupied by ‘some account of the rise, progress and continuance’ (pg. viii) of the chivalric codes, such as medieval duelling and combat.
equivalent to it in our language, and therefore are obliged to substitute the term *masks*, though it does not convey the strict and proper idea.’"113 Jervas was working from Cervantes’ original text, but, using his knowledge of other languages such as Italian and French, clearly consulted other translations in order to compare how they interpreted passages of the Spanish original. Where other translators are mentioned in his notes, it is normally with scorn, as in: ‘This passage has been utterly mistaken by all translators in all languages’,114 and ‘No translation had made sense of this artful passage…’ 115

Jervas includes many lucid and helpful footnotes, and since the edition of 1738 had none, they must all be his original additions. One form of note aims to assist the non-Hispanic reader. These range from the social (‘It is the custom in Spain and Italy to strew flowers on dead bodies, when laid upon their biers’),116 and domestic (‘In Spain they keep their wines in the skin of a hog, goat, sheep, or other beast’)117 to the architectural (‘The casements [i.e. windows] are made of canvas in winter, and of lattice in summer…’),118 culinary (‘The Spaniards and Italians begin dinner with melon or other fruit, as we end it’)119 and the opinionated (‘The Spanish and Italian husbands are more inclined to jealousy than those of any other nation’).120 In frequently mentioning etiquette common to both Spain and Italy, Jervas is presumably drawing on his own experience of the latter country, though its inclusion is not particularly relevant to the reader or the novel. Other footnotes give the sources for biblical or classical references,121 or serve to draw the reader’s attention to particularly skilful passages, such as ‘All the

113 *Ibid*, vol. 1, pg. 242, note 3. Another example is in vol. 2, pg. 141.
120 *Ibid*, vol. 1, pg. 208.
121 For instance, *ibid*, vol. 2, pg. 395; vol. 1, pg. 337, and vol. 2, pg. 373, note 3.
time they are going to the burial, how artfully does the author entertain the reader, by way of digression, with this dialogue between Don Quixote and Vivaldo’.

Circumstantial evidence suggests that Jervas had at least begun his translation in the mid-1720s, when in a joint letter from Pope and Lord Bolingbroke (1678-1751) to Swift, they inform him cryptically: ‘Jervas and his Don Quixot are both finish’d’, possibly meaning that the translation is complete, or that somehow both are ‘defeated’. An even earlier letter also alludes to an interest in the novel; writing to Jervas in Ireland in 1719, Pope jests that he has stayed there so long that he must have been made, like Don Quixote’s hapless servant Sancho Panza, governor of an island, ‘and you are administering Laws to the wild Irish’. There is no evidence in the form of public subscription to suspect that Jervas was commissioned to write the translation, nor correspondence showing that he attempted to publish it privately or otherwise. One piece of internal evidence points to the fact that it was a lengthy project and continued into the 1730s; in several footnotes he alludes to his having consulted ‘the Royal Dictionary’, probably that published under the auspices of the Real Academia Española [Royal Academy of Spain] in six volumes between 1726 and 1739. The sequence of events is however unclear. The Carteret edition was published in April 1738, five months before Jervas left for Italy. On his return to London in May the next year, he

---

123 Letter dated 14 December 1725. Williams, The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, vol. 3, pg. 120.
125 Real Academia Española, Diccionario de la Lengua Castellana, en que se explica el verdadero sentido de las voces su naturaleza y calidad con las phrases ó modos de hablarlos proverbios ó refranes’, [‘Dictionary of the Spanish Language, which explains the true meaning of the voices, their nature and quality, with phrases or ways of talking, proverbs and sayings’], Madrid, 6 vols, 1726-1739. Jervas refers to it in vol. 2, pg. 18, note 1; pg. 186, note 1; pg. 311, note 2. A popular French-English dictionary titled ‘The Royal Dictionary’ was first published by Abel Boyer in London in 1699, and often reissued, but it is clear from Jervas’s notation that he is working from the original Spanish text of the novel, and referring to a Spanish dictionary for assistance, rather than translating the novel from French to English.
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lived only a further six months, in some degree of ill-health. It cannot be determined whether he was at this stage commissioned to prepare his manuscript for an English translation of the Carteret edition, or whether his papers were edited after his death either by his widow, the publishers, or another; the Translator’s Preface unfortunately does not make clear when, or under what circumstances, it was composed. A contract between Penelope Jervas and the two publishers (the Tonsons and Dodsley) assigning copy of her late husband’s translation to the latter (for the price of £21 and 15 free copies) is dated 7 May 1742, and suggests that such an agreement was not in place with Jervas prior to his death.

The two quarto volumes of Jervas’s translation were in the printing presses by December 1741, when subscriptions for the price of two guineas were invited. The title was published by early May 1742, and within a year it was being offered ‘With the Addition of a Supplement to the Translator’s Preface, communicated by a learned Writer, well known to the Literary World’, which was gratis to whose to had already

127 Letter Pope to Fortescue, 17 August 1739; ‘I dined yesterday with Jervas upon a venison pasty, where we drank your health warmly, but as temperately, as to liquor, as you could yourself: for neither he nor I are well enough to drink wine; he for his asthmatic, and I for another complaint, that persecutes me much of late.’ Ibid, vol. 4, pg. 193.
128 J. and R. Tonson were the sole publishers for the 1738 Spanish edition; the 1742 edition was published jointly by the Tonsons ‘in the Strand’ and Robert Dodsley ‘in Pall-Mall’. Dodsley (1703-1764) began life, coincidentally, as a footman to Charles Dartiquenave (see footnote 11) but became an author and publisher, and the ‘main initiator’ of Johnson’s Dictionary (1755). See Rogers, Encyclopedia, pg. 88-89.
129 James E. Tierney (ed), The Correspondence of Robert Dodsley 1733-1764), Cambridge, 1988, pg. 518. Significantly, an agreement between the Tonsons and Dodsley survived (until 1910 at least) in which Pope is ‘named as a referee in case of dispute’, indicating that Pope is unofficial guardian of his late friend’s literary bequest. The location of this agreement is not given; it is mentioned in Ralph Straus, Robert Dodsley. Poet, Publisher & Playwright, London and New York, 1910, pg. 323.
130 London Daily Post and General Advertiser, 11 December 1741, issue 2227.
131 The two newspaper notices inviting subscriptions (London Daily Post and General Advertiser, 11 December 1741, issue 2227 and Country Journal or The Craftsman, 23 January 1741/42, issue 812) both state that the book will be published ‘by Lady-Day next’, i.e. by 25 March 1742. This may have been the case, but the earliest notice announcing the publication is found in the Daily Post, 5 May 1742, issue 7098, which states that it is published ‘This Day’. It is possible that publication did indeed occur before 5 May, as the phraseology of ‘This day is published...’ was customarily used for new titles for some weeks after the actual first day of publication. Sherburn in The Correspondence of Alexander Pope, vol. 4 pg. 455 (footnote) states that Jervas’s translation was published in April 1742, but does not give his source; it may be Straus’s Robert Dodsley, pg. 323 which gives the publication date as 6 April 1742.
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purchased the book. The supplement consisted of a treatise on medieval romantic literature, the target of Cervantes’ satire, which complimented Jervas’s exploration of chivalric combat and honour codes which makes up three-quarters of his Translator’s Preface. Pope immediately identified the author of the Supplement as the Rev. William Warburton (1698-1779), who was to be his own literary executor after his death.133 A second, revised, edition of Jervas’s translation appeared in 1748, ‘with a new Translation of the Poetical Parts, by another Hand’.134

As in his primary career, Jervas’s Don Quixote attracted early critics. Warburton himself included a curious remark in his 1751 edition of the Works of Pope, which record the poet quipping that Jervas made the translation without understanding ‘a word of Spanish’.135 The statement has been discounted by later literary critics,136 and the disparaging tone is at odds with the unfailing Pope/Jervas friendship. A more detailed, and credible, criticism appears in John Hawkins’ (1719-1789) Life of Samuel Johnson (1787). In a tangential discussion on translations of Don Quixote, Hawkins concedes that although Jervas’s:

...gives the sense of the author, [it] was performed by persons whose skill in the language was not great. The fact is, that Jervis laboured at it many years, but could make but little progress, for being a painter by profession, he had not been accustomed to write, and had not style. Mr. Tonson the bookseller seeing this, suggested the thought of employing Mr. Broughton, the reader at the Temple

133 Letter Pope to Warburton 21 May 1743; ‘I never read a thing with more pleasure than an Additional Sheet to Jervas’s preface to Don Quixot...I knew you as certainly as the Ancients did the Gods, by the first Pace, & the very Gait.’ Sherburn, The Correspondence of Alexander Pope, vol. 4, pg. 455.
134 Whitelall Evening Post or London Intelligencer, 22 November 1748, issue 435. The identity of the ‘Hand’ is unknown.
135 ‘Mr. Pope used to say he had had an acquaintance with three eminent Painters, none of which had common sense. Instead of valuing themselves on their performance in that art, where they all had merit; the one was deep in military Architecture, without a line of Mathematics [Kneller]; the other in the doctrine of Fate, without a principle of Philosophy [?Kent]; and the third in the translation of Don Quixote without a word of Spanish [Jervas]’. William Warburton (ed), The Works of Alexander Pope Esq., London, 1751, vol. 7, pg. 322 footnote.
Jervas’s literary achievements have been consistently undervalued, or ignored, by his few biographers, perhaps reflecting the scorn which can be idly apportioned to translators who are not considered ‘authors’. Anecdotes of Jervas’s legendary vanity have also enabled his publications to be dismissed as feeble attempts to emulate his talented literary friends, and earn him intellectual plaudits. Each, however, has its merit, most particularly *Don Quixote*, which disseminated the classic novel to a broad English-speaking readership in a version which successfully preserved much of the original’s nuances and humour. Similarly, his intimate friendship with Pope has been consistently and incorrectly regarded as insignificant to both men, personally and professionally. This theme was fostered by Pope’s early editors and biographers,

---


138 Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, and John Ormsby (transl.), *The Ingenious gentleman Don Quixote of la Mancha*, London, 1885, pg. 5-6. In his preface, Ormsby stoutly defends Jervas’s 1742 translation.


confronted with an uncomfortably ample supply of documentary evidence attesting to their subject’s long relationship with and admiration for an artist universally derided from the time of his decease. Dr. Johnson’s life of Pope states that the latter was ‘near-sighted’, and that his ‘encomiastic verses to Jervas…shew his power as a poet; but I have been told that they betray his ignorance of painting’.141 As already seen, in William Mason’s criticism of the 1716 edition of De Arte Graphica, Pope’s lines addressed to Jervas are excused by the bewitching effects of both friendship and fashion.142 More recently, this relationship has received fairer treatment,143 but an examination of Jervas’s friendships with Pope, and other members of his literary coterie, is crucial to an understanding of Jervas’s own aspirations and achievements in this field, and offers rare insights into his intellectual qualities and private character.

141 Samuel Johnson, The Lives of the most eminent English poets, with critical observations on their works, London, 1781, vol. 4, pg. 33-34. Earlier biographies by William Ayre (1745, pg. 21) and Owen Ruffhead (1769, pg. 190 footnote) choose to mention Jervas incidentally.
The membership of Jervas’s studio has gone unrecorded, Vertue simply acknowledging that he and his ‘underlings’ produced many copies, ‘large & small from other pictures of famous painters’. It is no doubt significant that, given the derision which his oeuvre attracted from the time of his death, there is no record of any other painter claiming to have been his pupil or assistant. From among the mass of surviving contemporary portraits it is evident that other artists, now largely anonymous, were working in imitation of Jervas. Maria Verelst (1680-1744), though taught by her father Simon Verelst (1644-c.1721), frequently referenced Jervas in her female portraits in details of pose, setting and costume.

The absence of discernible stylistic progression within his oeuvre suggests a certain stagnation for which the artist was responsible. Certainly by the final decade of his life other practising artists had emerged who attracted a stronger following from both pupils and patrons; Philippe Mercier (1689-1760), William Hogarth (1697-1764) and Jean Baptiste van Loo (1684-1745) had confidently drawn away from the Knellerian tradition, and reinvigorated portraiture and the conversation piece. Jervas’s art historical legacy is therefore negligible, in the sense that his pupils are now unrecognised, and his pre-eminence in the portrait-genre in British art history was to be short-lived and of no artistic consequence. This outcome is, arguably, deserved, given his lack of stylistic and technical innovation which set his last works (e.g. CR S13) markedly at odds with contemporary production.

---

2 Adrienne Corri has suggested that Thomas Gainsborough may have been a pupil of Jervas, based on banking records. Jervas died in 1739, the year in which the thirteen year-old Gainsborough first moved to London; if the latter did enter Jervas’s studio the tenure must have been brief. Adrienne Corri, ‘Gainsborough’s Early Career: New Documents and Two Portraits’, *Burlington Magazine*, vol. 125, no. 961 [April 1983], pg. 213.
Conclusion

As explored in the Introduction, Jervas’s reputation was dealt a mortal blow by Horace Walpole, the son of his most powerful advocate. In his *Anecdotes of Painting in England* (1771), Walpole somewhat smugly describes the fate of the artist’s paintings, in the mere thirty years since his death;

‘Portraits that cost twenty, thirty, sixty guineas, and that proudly take possession of the drawing-room, give way in the next generation to those of the newly-married couple, descending into the parlour, where they are slightly mentioned as *my father’s and mother’s pictures*. When they become *my grandfather and grandmother*, they mount to the two pairs of stairs; and then, unless dispatched to the mansion-house in the country, or crowded into the house-keeper’s room, they perish among the lumber of garrets, or flutter in rags before a broker’s shop at the Seven Dials. Such already has been the fate of some of those deathless beauties, who Pope promised his friend should, *Bloom in his colours for a thousand years*.\(^3\)

The impact was to be crucial for past and present Jervas scholars; his personal papers have been lost, his once-famous art collection dispersed without trace, and many details of his life, career and studio practice have gone unrecorded. The result has been cumulative; growing derision in art historical literature discouraged fresh investigation or even the retention of relevant documents, while a plummeting commercial interest in his portraits has inevitably led to decay and neglect. The paucity of scholarship was evident as early as 1862 when George Scharf (1820-1895) published a catalogue raisonné of paintings at Blenheim Palace. Scharf was then secretary of the newly-formed National Portrait Gallery, later its first director, and the undisputed expert on historical British portraiture. Nonetheless, he attributed the authorship of numerous Jervas portraits at Blenheim to Kneller, describing one as follows: ‘Although not bearing the signature of the painter, this picture may certainly be regarded as one of the best and most beautiful

---

\(^3\) Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting*, vol. 4, pg. 15. The story is repeated in Richard Redgrave and Samuel Redgrave, *A Century of Painters*, vol. 1, pg. 22, and attributed to Joshua Reynolds, who is recorded as having told his sister, when she asked why she had seen so few works by the celebrated Jervas, ‘My dear, you will find they are all removed to the attic’.
production of Sir Godfrey Kneller. The folds of the blue dress are painted with extraordinary mastery. The expression of the countenance is life-like and pleasing’ (CR M31).4

Jervas’s contribution to literary history is unquestionably significant, but he appears to have entirely eschewed the contemporary aesthetic debates fostered by Kneller’s academy, and Jonathan Richardson in An Essay on the Theory of Painting (1715) and Two Discourses (1719). Instead, Jervas employed his literary and linguistic abilities in translating internationally renowned authors; du Fresnoy, Machiavelli and Cervantes, and his acclaimed edition of Don Quixote is surely his greatest legacy.

Jervas undoubtedly made little impression on the course of portrait painting in Britain and Ireland. Yet his greatest interest to scholars lies not in his oeuvre, but in the manner in which he fashioned his career, and a range of inherent paradoxes. He was, for example, taught by the leading master of his time, Kneller, undertook diligent and extended training in France and Italy, and attained the most eminent court position open to his profession, yet had little known contact with his artistic colleagues, and no known protégés. He attracted the friendship and loyalty of aristocratic patrons and friends, yet was himself of obscure social origins and indeterminate education. Indeed his remarkable social advancement, and long-standing relationship with Walpole and the Whig leadership indicate an unusually astute political awareness. He was ridiculed for his vanity and bombast, but was obviously a talented linguist and earned the friendship of celebrated literati. The markedly subjective nature of contemporary and later commentaries are a curiosity in themselves, and have certainly deterred previous attempts to invest scholarly time in the artist.

However, neither the dearth of research hitherto conducted nor the minor status of Jervas as an artist ought to discourage further and more varied study. The present thesis,

---

4 George Scharf, Catalogue Raisonné; or, A List of the Pictures in Blenheim Palace, London, 1862, pg. 194.
Conclusion

covering as it does his basic biographical history, professional and social relationships, mapping his most significant patronage networks, and making a first, belated, attempt to catalogue his oeuvre, may be seen as a starting point for further thematic exploration. Jervas’s multiple identities as society artist, literary editor, translator, dealer and connoisseur may be examined within the context of the contemporary redefinition of the manual artist as aesthetic intellectual. His decade on the continent is certainly worthy of further treatment, as part of a study of that community of expatriate scholars serving, and dependent on, the Grand Tourist industry. Jervas’s membership of the ‘New English’ community in Ireland could be a scholarly point of access to that beleaguered society, and the presence of faithful patrons in his career who held Irish offices in the 1680s and 1690s suggests a vibrant support network amongst members of that demographic. And finally, Jervas’s fortuitous adoption by the Whig elite could stimulate a broader examination of the manipulation of the visual arts by the political factions. That Jervas’s life and career engaged with such a wide range of contemporary phenomena and events is itself remarkable, and surely provides a point of departure for future scholarly endeavours.

For example, Sir William Handcock (1654-1701) (see Introduction pg. 23), James Clarke (c.1634-1709) (see Introduction pg. 21), and John Ellis (1646-1738) (see chapter 1 pg. 48).
APPENDIX A


This small well-polishd Gem (ye work of years)
In Dryden’s diction still more bright appears
Yet here how faint each Image seems to shine
Matchd with thy Souls rich unexhausted Mine
Whence endless Streams of fair Ideas flow
Rise in ye Sketch, or in ye Canvass glow
Where Beauty, waking in all her Forms, supplies
An Angels Sweetness or a Berkleys Eyes.

Nature in thee has all her Graces shown
And gave thee words to make those Graces known
In Raphael writ or if Leandro wrought
The Verse is perishd or the Piece forgot.
Evn Fresnoy painted with unfruitful pains
The Artist lost, ye Critic yet remains
Of Jervas only future Times shall tell
None practis’d better, none explaind so well
Thou only sawst what others coud not know;
Or if they saw it, only thou canst show

Like friendly Colors our kind arts unite
Each from ye mixture gathering sweets & light
Their birth, their features with resemblance strike
As Twins they vary and as Twins are like.
Smit with ye Love of Sister Arts we came
& met congenial, mingling flame with flame
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How oft in pleasing Labors of ye day
Long summer suns rolld unperceived away
At night we met each finding like a Friend
Something to blame & something to commend
How oft in fancy long amusement sought
& form the distant Journeys in our thought
    Smith with ye Love of Arts methinks we go
Together tread th’ Eternall Alpine Snow
Now catch ye word in some vast Ruins Shade
Now sleep where Tullys worthy head was layd
Each Ruin Fancy Times decays supplies
& sees Imaginary Romes arise
Notions awake & Images renew
From Art to Art ye pleasing Track pursue
Thou oer thy Raphael’s monument should mourn
I wait inspiring dreams at Maros um
Here arts rich Reliques for our Sorrows call
A mouldred marble or a faded wall
There…..
…..well studyd busts attract ye eye.
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‘To Mr. Jervas, with Fresnoy’s Art of Painting, Translated by Mr. Dryden’, by Alexander Pope


This Verse be thine, my Friend, nor thou refuse
This, from no venal or ungrateful Muse.
Whether thy Hand strike out some free Design,
Where Life awakens, and dawns at every Line;
Or blend in beauteous Tints the colour’d Mass,
And from the Canvas call the mimic Face:
Read these instructive Leaves, in which conspire
Fresnoy’s close Art and Dryden’s native Fire:
And reading wish, like theirs, our Fate and Fame,
So mix’d our Studies, and so join’d our Name;
Like them to shine thro’ long-succeeding Age,
So just thy Skill, so regular my Rage.

Smit with the Love of Sister-Arts we came,
And met congenial, mingling Flame with Flame;
Like friendly Colours found our Arts unite,
And each from each contract new Strength and Light.
How oft in pleasing Tasks we wear the Day,
While Summer Suns roll unperceiv’d away?
How oft our slowly-growing Works impart,
While Images reflect from Art to Art?
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How oft review; each finding like a Friend
Something to blame, and something to commend?

What flattering Scenes our wand’ring Fancy wrought,
Rome’s pompous Glories rising to our Thought!
Together o’er the Alps me thinks we fly,
Fir’d with Ideas of fair Italy.

With thee, on Raphael’s Monument I mourn,
Or wait inspiring Dreams at Maro’s Urn:
With thee repose, where Tully once was laid,
Or seek some Ruin’s formidable Shade;
While Fancy brings the vanish’d Piles to view,
And builds imaginary Rome a-new.

Here thy well-study’d Marbles fix our Eye;
A fading Fresco here demands a Sigh:
Each heavenly Piece unwearied we compare,
Match Raphael’s Grace, with thy lov’d Guido’s Air,
Caracci’s Strength, Correggio’s softer Line,
Paulo’s free Stroke, and Titian’s Warmth divine.

How finish’d with illustrious Toil appears
This small well-polish’d Gem, the Work of Years!
Yet still how faint by Precept is exprest
The living Image in the Painter’s Breast?
Thence endless Streams of fair Ideas flow,
Strike in the Sketch, or in the Picture glow;
Thence Beauty, waking all her Forms, supplies
An Angel’s Sweetness, or Bridgwater’s Eyes.
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Muse! at that Name thy sacred Sorrows shed,
Those Tears eternal that embalm the Dead:
Call round her Tomb each Object of Desire,
Each purer Frame inform’d with purer Fire:
Bid her be all that cheers or softens Life,
The tender Sister, Daughter, Friend and Wife!
Bid her be all that makes Mankind adore;
Then view this Marble, and be vain no more!

Yet still her Charms in breathing Paint engage;
Her modest Cheek shall warm a future Age.
Beauty, frail Flow’r, that ev’ry Season fears,
Blooms in thy Colours for a thousand Years.
Thus Churchill’s Race shall other Hearts surprise,
And other Beauties envy Wortley’s Eyes,
Each pleasing Blount shall endless Smiles bestow,
And soft Belinda’s Blush for ever glow.

Oh! lasting as those Colours may they shine,
Free as they Stroke, yet faultless as they Line!
New Graces yearly, like thy Works, display;
Soft without Weakness, without glaring gay;
Led by some Rule, that guides, but not constrains;
And finish’d more thro’ Happiness than Pains!
The Kindred-Arts shall in their Praise conspire,
One dip the Pencil, and one string the Lyre.
Yet shall the Graces all they Figures place,
And breath an Air Divine on ev’ry Face;
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Yet shall the Muses bid my Numbers roll,
Strong as their Charms, and gentle as their Soul;
With Zeuxis’ Helen thy Bridgwater vye,
And these be sung till Granville’s Myra die;
Alas! how little from the Grave we claim?
Thou but preserv’st a Form, and I a Name.
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Fig a. removed from electronic version of thesis for copyright reasons. Please refer to hardcopy.

Fig a. (above) – 19th century map of King’s county (co. Offaly). Outlined in blue is the barony of Ballycowan, where John Jervas (Charles Jervas’s father) was granted lands in 1666; in green is the barony of Clonlisk, where Sir William Flower and Captain John Baldwin (the latter being Charles Jervas’s maternal grandfather) were granted lands in 1667. In Clonlisk, no. 1 marks the location of Shinrone, no. 2 marks the location of Corolanly. In yellow is the barony of Geashill, heartland of the Digby family property (see chapter 4).

Original map (above) from http://www.botanicgardens.ie/herb/census/philips/offaly3.jpg

Left – map of Ireland, with Offaly (formerly King’s county) highlighted
Fig b. removed from electronic version of thesis for copyright reasons. Please refer to hardcopy.
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Fig b. removed from electronic version of thesis for copyright reasons. Please refer to hardcopy.
Fig c. Map of New Jersey. Cape May county is at the southernmost tip, and Gloucester county, home of John Jervas’s friend George Goldsmith from 1681, is north west of Cape May. The arrow points to Jarvis Sound.

Map from www.lib.utexas.edu/maps/new_jersey.html
Fig d. St Benet Paul’s Wharf, Queen Victoria St, London, where Jervas and Penelope Hume were married on 14 January 1726/27
Fig e. removed from electronic version of thesis for copyright reasons. Please refer to hardcopy.

**Fig e.** Richard Blome’s ‘Parish of St. James’s Westminster’, c.1689. Cleveland Court is outlined in red, showing the recently added east and west wings which form the forecourt to the original house.

Fig f. John Rocque’s ‘Plan of the cities of London and Westminster, and borough of Southwark’, dated 1746, published in 1747. The location of Jervas’s studio has been indicated with an arrow.

Fig g. View of the south façade of Bridgwater House, facing onto Cleveland Court, 1795, showing the remodelling by the Duchess of Cleveland c.1670. The east wing in which Jervas had his studio ran perpendicular to the main façade, to the right of this view; the entrance to his home and studio was therefore situated behind the palisade on the right. The east wing was destroyed by fire in 1786 or 1787, and remained undeveloped, as can be seen here, until 1796, when two houses and stables were built.

Fig h. Ordnance Survey 1:1,056 map of Westminster area (sheet 7, sub sheet 82), dated 1894-96. This view shows the area of Cleveland Court following the demolition of the old Bridgwater House, and erection of the present mansion (in red) of the same name. The building highlighted in blue is now 15 Cleveland Court, called Selwyn House. On this plot of land was originally the first residence in the south west corner of Cleveland Court, demonstrating that the original Cleveland/Bridgwater House was a little further east (to the right in this map) than the plot of the current Bridgwater House. The approximate location of Jervas’s residence is indicated in green.

Map from the British Library.
Fig i. Panorama of Cleveland Court, June 2009. Selwyn House, an ‘island’ residence’ is seen on the left, Bridgewater House in the centre, and to the right is the south end of Little St. James’s Street and the corner of 7 Cleveland Row.
Fig j. Ordnance Survey 1:25,000 map of Hampton (sheet 25, sub sheet 7), dated 1862-1868, showing Elm Lodge (highlighted) north of Hampton village.

Map from the British Library.
Fig k. Photograph of The Elms after the fire of 1913.

Photo from The Twickenham Museum www.twickenham-museum.org.uk/detail.asp?ContentID=196
Fig 1. A modern view of Woodbroke House, near Portarlington, Co. Laois. Jervas visited Woodbroke’s proprietor, Knightley Chetwode in the summer of 1729, an account of which visit Chetwode wrote to Dean Swift.

Photo from Savills Hamilton Osborne King online sales brochure at http://media.daft.ie/Woodbrook-House-Portarlington-Co-Laois/ezODiCzY8w7MKUJWBxxKdgtdu4t-JGiD8AnnWEaNak=.pdf
Fig m. Removed from electronic version of thesis for copyright reasons. Please refer to hardcopy.

**Fig m.** Title page of Jervas’s sale of pictures, 11 – 20 March 1739/40, held at his Cleveland Court home by the auctioneer John Heath.

Glasgow University Library Special Collections SM 1536
Fig n. Gerard Vandergucht’s frontispiece for the John Heath sale catalogue, reused by Christopher Cock for Jervas’s prints and drawings sale in 1741.

© Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, Netherlands
Fig o. removed from electronic version of thesis for copyright reasons. Please refer to hardcopy.

Fig o. Gerard Vandergucht’s frontispiece (fig n) – detail of Jervas portrait

© Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, Netherlands
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Fig p. Sketch after a Van Dyck family portrait, formerly in Jervas’s collection, now in the Stedelijk Prentenkabinet in Antwerp.

Image from John Rowlands, ‘Sketch for a Family Group by Van Dyck’, *Master Drawings*, vol. 8, no. 2 [Summer 1970], pg. 162.
Fig q. Advertisement in the newspaper *Collection for Improvement of Husbandry and Trade*, which appeared on 29 March, 26 April and 16 August 1695, unpaginated. ‘Mr. Jarvis, Long-Acre’ is listed in the middle of the third column.

© The British Library (image from The Burney Newspaper Collection)
Fig 1a. Matthew Prior CR P17.
This sketch was executed in Paris in 1699, and is Jervas’s only identified art work predating his return to London from the continent in 1708-1709.

© Portland Collection (image from Witt Library, Courtauld Institute)
Fig 1b removed from electronic version of thesis for copyright reasons. Please refer to hardcopy.

Fig 1b. *The Death of Ananias*, after Raphael’s cartoon in Hampton Court. Engraved by Gérard Audran (1640-1703) c.1698-1703, after a drawing by Jervas. Worcester College, Oxford. Dr. George Clarke print collection, vol. 3, items 7 (plate size 59.6 x 72.5 cm).

Photographed at Worcester College, Oxford
Fig 1c. *Paul and Barnabas at Lystra*, after Raphael’s cartoon in Hampton Court. Engraved by Gérard Audran (1640-1703) c.1698-1703, after a drawing by Jervas. Worcester College, Oxford. Dr. George Clarke print collection, vol. 3, items 10 [deep crease in centre] (plate size 59 x 70.1 cm).

Photographed at Worcester College, Oxford
Fig 1d. Jervas’s plan of the Stanze di Raffaello in the Vatican, sent to George Clark 28 November 1699, indicating where each of the murals and ceiling frescoes were situated. Worcester College, Oxford, Ms 181 f.515v-516r.

Photographed at Worcester College, Oxford.
Fig 1e. ‘The Death of Germanicus’ (1627) by Nicolas Poussin (1594-1665), now at The Minneapolis Institute of Arts, Minnesota. The Duke of Shrewsbury commissioned Jervas to make a copy of this painting for him in 1704.

© Minneapolis Institute of Arts (image from institution website)
Fig 1f. removed from electronic version of thesis for copyright reasons. Please refer to hardcopy.

Fig 1f. Charles Talbot, 1st Duke of Shrewsbury (1660-1718) after Sir Godfrey Kneller, in the National Portrait Gallery, London (no. 1424).

© National Portrait Gallery, London (image from institution website)
Fig 1g. ‘The Transfiguration’ (1516-1520) by Raphael (1483-1520), now in the Vatican. Jervas purchased in 1702 what was widely believed to be Raphael’s cartoon of the lower half of the composition.

© Vatican Museums (image from institution website)
Fig 2a. removed from electronic version of thesis for copyright reasons. Please refer to hardcopy.

**Fig 2a.** Robert Walpole CR W20.

Fig 2b. ‘The Holy Family with Ss Elisabeth and John the Baptist’ (1650s) by Nicolas Poussin (1594-1665), now in the State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, no. 1213. Walpole bought the painting for £320 in 1735, when Jervas had some doubts about the attribution to Poussin.

© State Hermitage Museum (image from institution website)
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Fig 2c. removed from electronic version of thesis. Please refer to hardcopy.
Fig 2d. removed from electronic version of thesis. Please refer to hardcopy.
Fig 2e. ‘Deer, Dog and Cat’ CR Nonp1.
Jervas painted this and a pendant entitled Dogs and Still life for the Drawing Room at Houghton. Both are now in The State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg.

© State Hermitage Museum (image from institution website)
Fig 2f. removed from electronic version of thesis for copyright reasons. Please refer to hardcopy.

Fig 2f. ‘Pope Clement IX’ (1669) by Carlo Maratti, now in The State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, no. 42. Jervas purchased this portrait in Rome during his second visit between October 1738 and May 1739, and on his return immediately sold it to Walpole for 200 guineas.

© State Hermitage Museum (image from institution website)
Fig 2g. ‘Venus Resting in a Landscape’ attributed to Andrea Sacchi (1599-1661) now in The State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, no. 127). Walpole bought this painting for £52.10s from Jervas’s posthumous sale, sixth day [17 March 1740] lot 401.

© State Hermitage Museum (image from institution website)
Fig 2h. Catherine Walpole née Shorter CR W4 (left) and Dorothy Townshend née Walpole CR T17 (right).

Fig 2i. The Dining Room of Wolterton Hall, Norfolk, 2008. Wolterton was the home of Walpole’s brother Horatio Walpole. Jervas provided a series of whole length portraits for the house, including the three here (from left) of Queen Caroline CR C14, King George I CR G5 and King George II CR G21.

Photographed at Wolterton Hall
Fig 3a. Cartoon Gallery at Hampton Court Palace, 1819.
The cartoons have been on long-term loan to the V&A Museum since 1865; Henry Cooke’s replica set was hung in the Hampton Court Cartoon Gallery in the 1990s.

Image from William Henry Pyne, Published in *The History of the Royal Residences*, London, 1819
Fig 3b. Thomas Pelham-Holles, 1st Duke of Newcastle (1693-1768), CR P10. Newcastle was Lord Chamberlain at the time of Jervas’s appointment as Principal Painter to the King.
Fig 3c. removed from electronic version of thesis for copyright reasons. Please refer to hardcopy.

Fig 3c. Jervas’s copies of his coronation portraits of King George II and Queen Caroline CR G37, CR C30. This pair were commissioned by the Crown for the Corporation of the City of Bristol in March 1731/32.

© Bristol City Council
Fig 3d. Queen Caroline (1683-1737) and her son William Augustus (1721-1765), Duke of Cumberland, CR C52. This image is an engraving after the oil painting, still in the royal collection.
Fig 3e. removed from electronic version of thesis for copyright reasons. Please refer to hardcopy.

Fig 3e
Top left: William Wollaston (1660-1724), by Jervas after Dahl CR Copy49.
Top right: Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727), by Jervas after Kneller CR Copy33.
Lower left: Dr. Samuel Clarke (1675-1729), a copy by Jervas after his own original CR C76.
Lower right: John Locke (1632-1704), by Jervas after Kneller CR Copy27.
Payment to Jervas in February 1737/38, ‘for drawing the following Pictures by Order of Her Late Majesty viz. Sr. Isaac Newton, Mr. Wolaston, Mr. Lock and Mr. Samuel Clarke at Half Length’.
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Fig 3f. King George II on horseback, the figure by Jervas, the horse and landscape by John Wooton, 1732, CR Coll2. Vertue records that Queen Caroline examined this picture when it was in Wooton’s studio, when, ‘the Horse &c was much approv’d off, but the King’s not thought to be like, was much spoke against from thence’.
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Fig 3g. Sir John Brownlow (1690-1754), 1st Viscount Tyrconnel, CR B26. The sitter was invested in the newly-revived Order of the Bath in 1725, in which regalia he is depicted. The chapel of Henry VII in Westminster Abbey is the spiritual home of the Order, and its inclusion in the background left suggests that the portrait was designed to commemorate his investiture.
Fig 3h. George Brudenell (1685-1732), 3rd Earl of Cardigan, CR B30 (left) and Elizabeth Brudenell née Bruce (1689-1745), Countess of Cardigan, CR B27 (right). Husband and wife are depicted in full peers’ robes, and the inclusion of Westminster Abbey in the background right of each painting indicates that they were intended to commemorate the sitters’ attendance at the coronation of King George II and Queen Caroline on 11 October 1727.
Fig. 4a. William, 5th Baron Digby (1661/2-1752) CR D4. This painting is sometimes attributed to Jervas, but given the clothing and apparent age of the sitter is more likely to have been executed in the 1680s or 1690s, in spite of the inscription on the plinth of ‘1715’.
Fig 4b. Alexander Pope’s epitaph on the tomb of Robert and Mary Digby, children of William, 5th Baron Digby.

Photographed at Sherborne Abbey, Dorset.
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Fig. 4c. Robert Digby (c.1692-1726) CR D3.
   Lord Digby’s son
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Fig 4d. Mary Digby (c.1690-1729) CR D2.  
Lord Digby’s daughter
Fig 4e. removed from electronic version of thesis for copyright reasons. Please refer to hardcopy.

**Fig.4e.** An unidentified woman of the Digby family, probably one of Lord Digby’s daughters CR D6.
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Fig 4f. An unidentified woman of the Digby family, probably one of Lord Digby’s daughters CR D7.
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Fig 4g. Frances Scudamore (1684-1729) and her daughter Frances CR S4.
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Fig 4i. Charles Jervas self-portrait, 1725, CR J3.
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Fig 4j. A gentleman, possibly Martyn Baldwin (1651–1725), Jervas’s maternal uncle CR B5.
Fig 5a. Dean Swift by Jervas, CR S22.
Executed between 1709 and 1710, this portrait is now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford.
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**Fig 5b.** Thomas Betterton (1635-1710) by studio of Kneller (left, National Portrait Gallery, London, no. 752) and the copy by Alexander Pope (right, the Earl of Mansfield, Scone Palace).
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Fig 5c. Notice in the *London Gazette* of Saturday 10 April 1725 announcing the imminent publication of Pope’s *Odyssey* which could be collected by subscribers from Jervas’s home in Cleveland Court.
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Fig 5e. Title page of Niccolò Machiavelli [and Charles Jervas (transl)], *The Marriage of Belfagor*, Dublin 1719.
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Fig 5f. Frontispiece by John Vanderbank (1694-1739) of Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra and Charles Jervas [Jarvis] (transl), *The Life and Exploits of the ingenious gentleman Don Quixote de la Mancha*, London, 1742.