!

Volume 27 (2012)

The Pocket Venus: Iconography and Intimacy in Victorian Miniatures

Nanette Thrush, Art Institute of Pittsburgh and Washington State University, Vancouver

!

The Pocket Venus: Iconography and Intimacy in Victorian Miniatures

Nanette Thrush, Art Institute of Pittsburgh and Washington State University, Vancouver

> To a genealogist history is a tournament of combining or competing families, whose subtle interplay and manoeuvres, never wholly to be understood, we can only begin to grasp by first analysing and clarifying their genealogies.
>
> Sir Richard Anthony Wagner, Historic Heraldry of Britain, 1939

The Eglinton Tournament of 1839 was the largest and most significant tournament of the early nineteenth century, and Lady Jane Georgiana Seymour (née Sheridan), Duchess of Somerset (1810-84), served as its Queen of Love and Beauty. In this capacity she rode in its opening parade, delivered the prize to its victor, and presided over its dinner and ball. Archibald William Montgomerie, 13th Earl of Eglinton, may have chosen to stage this event for several reasons—among them the pursuit of family pride, social prestige, political power, masculinity, or nostalgia—but none of these concerns alone sufficiently explain its popularity, both with its participants and with the public. In his pursuit of medievalism the young lord nearly bankrupted his estate: he alone spent between £30,000 and £40,000 on the event, in spite of the fact that each knight was responsible for his own arms, attendants, horse, weapons, and costumes. Furthermore, tournament memorabilia is found in myriad forms, from the expensive silver trophies and fancy dress costumes to the more modest ceramic pitchers and song sheets.

According to the reminiscences of her great great granddaughter, Georgina Thynne, Seymour "was the most beautiful of the 'Three Graces,' and was married off extremely well (and surprisingly happily) to Edward Adolphus, the 12th Duke of Somerset. . . . Georgiana's sister Caroline was none other than the writer, wit and feminist heroine Caroline Norton."[1] She was selected by the tournament organizers as the Queen of Beauty due to her physical beauty, but also her unassailable virtue as a newly-married aristocratic wife.[2]

Many images of Seymour exist today, including several showing her as the Queen of Love and Beauty. These include several images intended for public consumption, but also a small number meant for private viewing. Such a one is William John Newton's miniature portrait The

[1] Thynne, Georgina. georginathynne@gmail.com "Georgiana Seymour," Personal email (6 November 2012).
[2] Ian Anstruther, The Knight and the Umbrella: An Account of the Eglinton Tournament 1839 (Gloucester, England: Alan Sutton, 1986), 197.

Queen of Beauty, Lady Seymour, standing beside Lord Eglinton's helmet and breastplate, ca. 1839 (Fig. 1).

FIGURE 1: William John Newton, The Queen of Beauty, Lady Seymour, standing beside Lord Eglinton's helmet and breastplate, ca. 1839. Miniature. (Illustrated in Ian Anstruther, The Knight and the Umbrella, 1986, fig. 16).

Long considered decorative arts or even ephemera, portrait miniatures are once again in academic vogue. The publication of the Metropolitan Museum of Art's collection catalog, American Portrait Miniatures in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (Yale, 2010), marks new scholarly interest. Excellent collections in the Met and the Victoria & Albert Museum have both been emphasized by new exhibition space in the last decade, and prominent publications by the Yale University Art Gallery and the National Gallery of Scotland have also piqued interest.[3] Add to that the busy lecture and publication schedule of dealers like portrait miniature specialist Elle Shushan, whose gallery is in Philadelphia.[4] Eminent scholars such as Marcia Pointon have written about miniatures of late, and interdisciplinary academics like Hanneke Grootenboer have expanded our understanding of the cultural implications of these objects.

Portrait miniatures exist as a specific subset of portraits: personal, emotive, and individual. It would be difficult to overestimate their social import: Pointon argues that:

> Portrait gifts, we may infer, not only represent people, they also stand in their stead; as anthropologists have long recognized, gifts are part of a legal system of obliga-

[3] Perfect Likenesses: European and American Portrait Miniatures from the Cincinnati Art Museum (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006); Portrait Miniatures from the National Galleries of Scotland (National Galleries of Scotland, 2007).

[4] Elle Shushan Fine Portrait Miniatures. http://www.portrait-miniatures.com/home.htm. (18 January 2013).

tion, and, as Marcel Mauss most famously put it, "to make a gift of something is to make a present of some part of oneself."[5]

Four major painters created portraits (though not all miniatures) for those in the social set of Lord Eglinton. Sir William John Newton (1785-1869), Sir William Charles Ross (1794-1860), Robert Thorburn (1818-85) and Sir Francis Grant (1803-78) all had careers that brought them into the royal court.[6] There are several miniatures by these artists, and there are several of Lady Seymour, by some of them and by others. Nonetheless one, Newton's full-length, fancy dress, cabinet-size miniature, is unique.[7]

How we interpret works of art depends upon how we contextualize them. We can compare this miniature to other works representing members of Eglinton's circle and the elite of England of that time. Or we could compare it to other miniatures by Newton and his colleagues. However, if we read it as a work of heraldry, which Eglinton and his friends surely would have done, its meaning is entirely different. In reading the heraldry of the piece we find that this portrait miniature links Lady Seymour less to her husband, and more to Eglinton himself. Within the scope of miniatures, which are universally acknowledged to be gifts of affection, usually of a romantic nature, this is problematic. The Newton miniature was exhibited, to respectful reviews, at the Royal Academy in 1840. No one mentioned impropriety. No one made snide remarks about marital fidelity. And yet, this work, to me, today, reads so clearly of split allegiance, of sexual promises, and of intimacy.

Seymour appeared at the Eglinton tournament with 35 attendants, comprising Ballochmyle Archeresses and Atholl Highlanders. According to newspaper reports she wore a violet velvet skirt with golden heraldic wings, an ermine and miniver jacket and a crimson velvet mantle with diamond necklaces and a pearl crown. While depictions of her at the event vary her costume, in every instance they evoke a medieval queen.

!!

[5] Marcel Mauss, The Gift: The Form and reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies, 1950, in Marica Pointon, "'Surrounded with Brilliants': Miniature Portraits in Eighteenth-Century England," The Art Bulletin 83:1 (March 2001): 48-71.

[6] Daphne Foskett notes that Ross and Newton helped to keep the medium alive until the 20th century. Daphne Foskett, A Dictionary of British Miniature Painters (New York and Washington: Praeger publishers, 1972). Ross also produced several eye miniatures for Queen Victoria. Hanneke Grootenboer, "Treasuring the Gaze: Eye Miniature Portraits and the Intimacy of Vision," The Art Bulletin 88:3 (September 2006): 496-507.

[7] Though it won't be a point of discussion here, the Seymour miniature is unique in another way as well. As far as my research has revealed, there is only one other cabinet miniature showing a woman in fancy dress: Lady Paget as an Egyptian Princess by Fernand Paillet. While the portrait was made in 1891, it was modeled on a photograph from a ball 20 years earlier. Carol McD. Wallace, "A Passion in Miniature," American Heritage 35:6 (October/November 1984): 90-93. The only other similar works include earlier pieces such as Isaac Oliver's Richard Sackville, Earl of Dorset of 1616 which is also full-length and cabinet-size. Katherine Coombs notes that Ross's miniatures were often cabinet-size, roughly a foot and a half in length, but not enough data on Ross has been published to allow this to be confirmed. Katherine Coombs, The Portrait Miniature in England (London: V&A Publications, 1998), 108.

In Newton's miniature, Seymour is represented as a typical early Victorian beauty: oval face, deep- and wide-set dark eyes, dark ringlets cascading over the ears from a center part, pale, sloping shoulders. Changed from the proliferation of public images produced for mass consumption are the headdress, here a crown of flowers,[8] and a slightly different full-sleeved, low-necked gown, heavily bejeweled. The overskirt bears heraldic symbols, including the fleur-de-lis, but not the lions, of her husband's coat of arms. On her right are Eglinton's breastplate and helm, identifiable because of his heraldry. In terms of likeness, this portrait is probably close to the appearance of the "real" Seymour: her individualized features, slightly serious expression, less fashionable coiffure, and relaxed pose indicate a level of authenticity.

The artist, Sir William John Newton (1785-1869), had a very successful career, producing myriad portrait miniatures of beautiful young women. He was for many years the miniature painter in ordinary to Queen Victoria, and he was a respected and regular exhibitor at the Royal Academy. The majority of his miniatures of female sitters are as similar to one another as they are dissimilar to the Seymour portrait. For example, the half-figure, three-quarter poses are to the left or the right, hair is fashionably dressed, clothing is luxurious but not trendy or so specific as to become quickly dated. The two miniatures below, Lady in a Black Dress with White Puffed Sleeves (Fig. 2) and Anna James Powele (Fig. 3) are of the same sitter, or are so similar that they might as well be so.

FIGURE 2: William John Newton, Lady in Black Dress with White Puffed Sleeves, 1828, The Tansey Collection of Miniatures.
!

[8] This is what both the literature of the time à la Sir Walter Scott, and American tournament practice dictated the Queen would be awarded at the end of the tournament, as opposed to the actual crown worn by Seymour in other images.

FIGURE 3: William John Newton, Ann James Powele, 1833, location unknown.

In all of Newton's work there appears to be not a single other image approaching that of Seymour: the full-length, the fancy dress costume, and the accessories are unknown in his oeuvre. This says, to me, that the characteristics of the portrait of Seymour must have been dictated to him by the sitter, and/or by the patron. This conclusion is important for my interpretation of the piece because it adds to the emotive nature of the work.

In addition to recent interest in miniatures as a field, there has been a lot of attention paid to the ephemera of the Eglinton Tournament as well. In 2009 eight shields from the Eglinton Tournament were bought by James Knox, a trustee of the National Gallery of Scotland, for £8,000. The same year, dealers Abbott & Holder restored and attempted to sell some original watercolors from the event. Yale University was prepared to purchase them for £85,100, but the Art Fund blocked the sale and export of the works. The watercolors are now part of the collection at Dean Castle, along with seven additional shields.

As yet, though, all the miniatures and full-sized portraits of this social set from the tournament have remained in private collections. Images of Charlie Lamb and the Marquess of Waterford show them in their tournament armor and in that of Louisa Waterford she wears a fancy dress medieval gown perhaps used as part of the event. Another image – of Charlotte Lamb – was produced four years after the event, but still shows her in a medievalized jacket with an ermine trim.

The two female portraits, of Charlotte Lamb by Grant, circa 1843, and of Louisa Stuart (soon to be Lady Waterford) by Robert Thorburn circa 1839, have many similarities to the extant images of Seymour. As with many portraits of Seymour, both seem more reflective of a type than of an individual. Each dark, glossy-haired, fair-skinned, demure beauty wears a dress that combines elements of contemporary fashion and fancy dress medieval costume. Lamb's robe is trimmed with a royal ermine, and Stuart wears a fashionable dress with slashed, ruched sleeves. In each case it

would be almost impossible to discern anything about their personalities, though less so in the portrait of Lamb. A few differences may suggest reasons for this. First, at the time they were made, Lamb was already a married woman, while Stuart was a young unmarried girl. Furthermore, Lamb seems to have been nearly as unconventional as her husband. Sir Ian Anstruther relates the no doubt romanticized courtship of the pair: Lamb found the working-class Charlotte crying by the side of the road after having her virtue challenged by her employer, and promptly hauled her up on his horse and rode off into the sunset.[9] The stormy background of the painting accurately suggests the nature of their relationship. Stuart's, in contrast, is a Victorian stereotype, played out in thousands of keepsake annuals.

During the course of the Eglinton Tournament and its fancy dress ball Seymour seems to have worn several ornate dresses, each of which positioned her as a "queen." Seymour's husband, Edward Adolphus, Baron Seymour, 12th Duke of Somerset, didn't participate in the Tournament per se: he was Eglinton's Banner Bearer in the procession. This secondary role also contributed to his invisibility in Tournament images: I have not found a single instance of his appearance, except (perhaps importantly) his heraldry in the aforementioned Newton miniature.

There are four extant images that specifically show Seymour in forms intended for public consumption. Her beauty was extensively praised in the popular press, and images of her were made for private and public uses, in editions small and large, before and after the tournament. Her image was used in the public forum as almost a shorthand reference to the tournament, appearing far more often than that of any of the knights. Yet these are not images of her, but instead a single generic standard of femininity. Two of the images are from 1839, the year of the Tournament: Joseph Bouvier's lithograph, and a song sheet. The other two, lithograph portraits from 1841, bear similar iconography.

Bouvier's Lady Elizabeth Seymour as the Queen of Beauty, a lithograph of around 1839, shows her enthroned on a raised dais, dressed in the extravagant costume she wore to the tournament, including visual references to her husband's coat of arms of golden heraldic wings that decorate her skirt. In this image Seymour looks sweet and docile, but also equally generic as a type of Victorian beauty. However, this is not only true of images of Seymour, but of images of women in general, and especially those related to balls. Seymour is heavily idealized, presenting the height of Victorian passive female beauty. With the exception of her crown, her costume looks very much like the fashion plate showing medieval fancy dress and fashionable dress from Petit Courier des Dames of just three years prior. Sara Stevenson and Helen Bennett have remarked that such fashion plates reflect historical costume less than they do the effect of contemporary standards of beauty on the idea of historical costume.[10] In other words, the style of the fancy dress medieval costume on the left is more like the fashionable dress on the right than it is like any real medieval garment.

[9] Anstruther, 109-110.

[10] Sara Stevenson and Helen Bennett, Van Dyck in Check Trousers: Fancy Dress in Art and Life 1700-1900 (Edinburgh: Scottish National Portrait Gallery, 1978), 85.

Also of this tone is John Hayter's image of Lady Seymour from 1841 (Fig. 4). Hayter later went on to publish The Court Album: Portraits of the Female Aristocracy from 1850 to 1857, and although it did not include Seymour, the image is similar in style to those of her peers. His portrait of her, probably originally a drawing, was transferred into a line engraving by William Henry Mote, implying wide distribution and wide appeal. Hayter also had a close connection to the medievalist circle under discussion here: his brother, George, became official portrait painter to Queen Victoria in 1837.

FIGURE 4: William Henry Mote, after John Hayter, Jane Georgiana Seymour (née Sheridan), Duchess of Somerset when Lady Seymour, 1842. Collection of Georgiana Thynne.

Another, separate, publication commemorating the events of the day was a song sheet featuring Seymour (Fig. 5). In this work she is dressed in a medievalized gown, but is visually decontextualized. In fact, little effort is made at all to link her to the event itself. In fact, the striking similarity between this image and Newton's miniature Lady in a Black Dress underscores its generic quality. The image alone would tell us nothing of its social context: I rely instead on the text surrounding it, which reads in part, "The Queen of Beauty./ Song./ Written & Dedicated to/ The Right Honorable the Earl of Eglintoun./ By the Authoress of/ We Have Lived & Loved Together." This text contains two interesting points: that the author of the song is female, and that "The Queen of Beauty" is "dedicated" to the Earl of Eglinton.

FIGURE 5: Lady Seymour, Queen of Beauty at Eglinton, ca. 1839. Collection of Sir Ian Anstruther.

In spite of the efforts of the Tournament organizers to the contrary, has impropriety crept in? Is Seymour, herself, a gift to Eglinton? Of course the viewer knows she's not, but both the text and the sweet, passive woman pictured leave the matter open-ended. This introduces the problem of an illusion of romance between Eglinton and Seymour that I argue also pertains to the miniature produced by Newton. However, the public disbursement of a song sheet makes the implication even more problematic because such images were quite popular. Contemporaries noted with regard to the Eglinton Tournament that engravings and prints of Seymour filled every window in the London shops.[11]

There are three images of Seymour and Eglinton together, the first two of which are eminently explicable by their roles in the tournament. This is not to say that there is no sexual tension present, but rather that the tension is a product of the courtly love model, rather than a feeling between the people themselves. The medieval discourse of courtly love was used for centuries to mediate the power struggles between men and women. In this system, the woman was made inferior by her lack of an active role in the world, but this was balanced against the life of the man, who dedicated all his action to the wishes of the woman. This is strikingly similar to the Angel of the House discourse of the mid-Victorian era, which attempted to negotiate power relationships between men and women within the emergent middle-class doctrine of separate spheres. The power nexus that is called courtly love was central to at least the ideal, if not the real, medieval world, and became an important dynamic in medieval tournaments. In these events, men fought to distinguish themselves as the best knight, but then turned their prize over to the best woman present, who became the Queen of Love and Beauty. This is clearly paralleled in Victorian belief systems. For example, the anonymous author of the Passage of Arms at Eglinton contends ". . . that with

[11] Nathaniel Parker Willis, "Eglinton Tournament," in Famous Persons and Places (New York: James C. Derby, 1854), 190, 202.

[chivalry's] rise arose civilization, and that with its rise the fairer portion of the creation ceased to be slaves, and became equals, and then idols, often stimulating to deeds of the most heroic patriotism."[12]

There were two trophies made to commemorate the Eglinton Tournament: the Testimonial and the Goodwood Cup. The latter, a racing cup, was both given and won by Eglinton himself in a horse race of 1848. The former is an elaborately engraved, huge, iconographically-loaded trophy which testifies to a variety of issues, including social propriety (Fig.6). Two males of the Lamb family appear in person, surrounded by the achievements of the participating families, but all are deferential to Seymour as the Queen of Beauty. Although she had been pre-selected for her role, and although Eglinton's was a false victory, the two still enact the rituals of courtly love. The Goodwood Cup, intended for public consumption, is strikingly different. While the Eglinton Testimonial shows the serene and chivalrous moment after the event, the Goodwood Cup shows a much more violent scene. Two knights take on one, literally beating him and his horse to the ground. All three wear historically accurate chain mail and seem anything but ornamental, as the figures on the Testimonial seem. This fight as pictured is as unevenly matched as it is brutal. As a public statement, it tells of the strength but also justice of the knighthood – they had the power to vanquish one another, but did not use it against their lessers. Nonetheless the veiled threat of their strength remained.

FIGURE 6: James Cotterill, The Eglinton Testimonial, 1843, silver. National Museums Scotland.

[12] The Passage of Arms at Eglinton: 28 August, 18 (London: Printed by Stewart and Murray, 1839), 16.

!

In Edward Henry Corbould's image showing Eglinton's presentation to the Queen of Beauty, Lady Seymour, the influence of the courtly love discourse is visible (Fig. 7). Lady Seymour appears at the center of the stands, looking down over Sir Charles Lamb (Eglinton's stepfather and Knight Marshall of the tournament) and Eglinton, who are surrounded by heralds and the jester. Around her is a cluster of idealized young women, some of who talk to each other or to the men below. Eglinton bows slightly before her, and although she would have traditionally awarded him a crown of victory, here he is merely being presented to her. While he retains his helmet, the visor is open to reveal some of his face. However, concealing one's face, both then and now, is a mark of rudeness, of disregarding social convention. In jousting particularly, it implies that one is a foe, not a friend, and is on one's guard for attack. It can be argued that this apparent incivility only strengthens arguments regarding Eglinton's concern with masculinity. If he's not to receive her sexual favors, a balance between them must be achieved in some other way. Whether a conscious choice or not, retaining his helm maintains his power position in their relationship.

FIGURE 7: Edward Henry Corbould, The Lord of the Tournament as Victor Presented to the Queen of Beauty, 1839. National Library of Scotland.

While the relationships between Seymour, her husband, and Eglinton remain unknown, there are interesting tidbits to be found in looking at the specifics of the Tournament and its images. Public images, and most private ones too, link Lady Seymour inextricably with Eglinton, as does the song sheet. One significant way to read this is as a manufactured sexual tension. Victorians had a different conception of medieval courtly love standards than historians have today. Current research indicates that knights in the Middle Ages fought for not only a lady's honor, but also her very real favors. However, neither Victorian social mores nor the history of the times would have recognized this: rather, they idealized this male-female relationship into one of passionate but chaste adoration. While this may seem absurd to the modern mind, it is closely in line with the Victorian trope of the Angel of the House. These idealized women were fictions, and fictions they were supposed to remain. Therefore, allusions to and illusions of a romance between Eglinton and

Seymour would have been appealing, but any indicator of an actual consummation of their relationship would have been unacceptable.

While I acknowledge that it is a small detail, I believe that the appearance of Eglinton's heraldry in the portrait miniature of Seymour is critically important to its reading by their own social circle, if not ours. In the nineteenth century, reviving titles became a ruthless pursuit, requiring time, social and political influence, and often vast amounts of money, but resulting in a more complex, and therefore more consequential, coat of arms for the family. Five ancient titles were successfully claimed around the time of the Eglinton Tournament, including Eglinton's own claim in 1840 to be served heir male general to the Earls of Winton.[13]

Burke's Peerage, Baronetage and Knightage began publication in 1826 and was updated annually throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century. Such a publication allowed the aristocracy to index their titles, and those of their peers, as well as served as a guide to social precedence. This status was marked visually, through the means of heraldry.

The basics of heraldry were relatively simple. While its original purpose was to distinguish armored knights either in battle or at the tournament, and it thereafter became hereditary, it was primarily a language that describes kinship.[14] Heraldry is literally a visual language in which every coat of arms stands for a specific person; anyone else who uses the same arms uses them illegitimately.[15] The most prestigious heraldic crests were those that were quartered, preferably many times. These quarterings serve to reveal genealogy, acting as a visual language of heredity. As an example, Richard Temple-Grenville, Marquess of Chandos, had a crest prepared for himself between 1822 and 1839, showing his family's 719 quarterings.

These markings are socially and politically important because, as Brian Abel Ragen notes, "the symbols of power are in fact often the key to power itself."[16] Since the fourteenth century, the responsibilities of the Society of Heralds had included armory, the study of coats of arms, the recognition and ordering of armorial bearings, and concern with the conduct of public ceremonies. As Richard Marks, a historian of heraldry, argues, "it was the growth of the tournament as an elaborate social function which furnished occasions for the most extravagant forms of heraldic display and brought into prominence the heralds with their skills in recognition or arms and in marshaling the ceremonies."[17] Yet as tournaments waned in the post-medieval period, the most important part of heralds' activities became antiquarian and genealogical.[18] Their role as authorities of historical display commenced anew in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries with the renewed interest in historical pageantry, both private and public. Some were even hired to plan and

[13] Anstruther, 79, 83.
[14] Brian Abel Ragen, "Semiotics and Heraldry," Semiotica 110, no. 1 (1994): 17.
[15] Ragen, 13.
[16] Ragen, 5.
[17] Richard Marks, British Heraldry from its Origins to c. 1800 (London: British Museum Publications, 1978), 43-44.
[18] Marks, 43-44.

supervise the events: Queen Victoria herself appointed James Planché (1796-1880), later to become Somerset Herald, for her Bal Costumé of 1842.

This brings to bear the problems of heraldry at the tournament overall. Clearly heraldic identity was important to these men, but it was not as straightforward as one might assume. At the tournament, knights were announced by their heraldic identities. But it is also worth noting that at the Eglinton Tournament, the title of each knight was sounded after each event. Overall, heraldry should have played an important role in the Eglinton Tournament, but one of the most frustrating effects of the famous rainstorm was that all ceremonies preliminary to the actual joust were canceled, and most of the onlookers had no idea whom they were watching. As Sir Ian Anstruther writes:

> In the good old days, at a friendly Round Table such an event would have mattered hardly at all for, except in the case of an Unknown Knight who would, of course, have concealed his identity, the crowd would have known who the combatants were by their shields. In the present case the situation was different. Apart from the fact that to make a challenge had been Lord Eglinton's greatest ambition ! the omission of which at the coronation had actually caused him to hold the Tournament ! and apart from the fact that the crowd, too, after waiting so long in the rain, had expected to see a complete performance, the whole value of such a ceremony in the changed conditions of the 19th century would have been to announce the names of the competing knights.[19]

Thus the joust, arguably the most dramatic and most expensive moment of the day, was shrouded in confusion, at least for the public. However with the assumption that most of the commemorative images were intended for the tournament participants, we can be sure that they, at least, knew who was who.

Victorian miniatures were made as gifts, usually for a close friend or relation, and often for a spouse. While the intended recipient, and indeed the provenance, of this work are unknown, the inclusion of Eglinton's armor is important. In addition to identity, another thing that heraldry regularly marks is ownership. If a gift for Baron Seymour, the insertion of another man's heraldry is inappropriate. Yet Lady Seymour and Eglinton do not seem to have been such close friends that she would have given him an intimate gift. If the miniature was for another, unknowable, person, why include the armor at all? While the visual language of the miniature may not seem that problematic—if she is Queen, then Eglinton, by default, is King—considering the intended recipient makes clear its awkwardness. I believe neither man would be comfortable receiving such a miniature as a gift, but it is also hard to imagine it as a personal keepsake for Seymour or as a gift

[19] Anstruther, 204-05.

for a fourth party. The most obvious interpretation, that there was a romantic relationship between Seymour and Eglinton, is almost certainly untrue.

List of Illustrations:

FIGURE 1: William John Newton, The Queen of Beauty, Lady Seymour, standing beside Lord Eglinton's helmet and breastplate, ca. 1839. Miniature. (Illustrated in Ian Anstruther, The Knight and the Umbrella, 1986, fig. 16).

FIGURE 2: William John Newton, Lady in Black Dress with White Puffed Sleeves, 1828, The Tansey Collection of Miniatures.

FIGURE 3: William John Newton, Ann James Powele, 1833, location unknown.

FIGURE 4: William Henry Mote, after John Hayter, Jane Georgiana Seymour (née Sheridan), Duchess of Somerset when Lady Seymour, 1842. Collection of Georgiana Thynne.

FIGURE 5: Lady Seymour, Queen of Beauty at Eglinton, ca. 1839. Collection of Sir Ian Anstruther.

FIGURE 6: James Cotterill, The Eglinton Testimonial, 1843, silver. National Museums Scotland.

FIGURE 7: Edward Henry Corbould, The Lord of the Tournament as Victor Presented to the Queen of Beauty, 1839. National Library of Scotland.