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Synopsis

This thesis seeks to examine the nineteenth-century art collections and architectural style of the original buildings at the University of Sydney in order to demonstrate ways in which visual material may be employed to shape public perception of an institution. I shall argue that the architectural style of the original university buildings was specifically chosen with particular aims which extended beyond the mere establishment of a tertiary institution for the colony. I will also argue that the style shaped the character of the institution, contributed to the maintenance of law and order in the colony, linked the colony more firmly than hitherto to the mother country and provided social benefits for the founders of the institution.

The instant history and character thus imposed upon the institution was reinforced by the assembly of a portrait collection in emulation of other collections of portraits at leading institutions of the colony and the mother country, including the Oxbridge universities. Once the building proclaimed that the institution was comparable with the great universities of the world, the subjects of the portraits at the university could be placed in the class of founders of a great historical institution, thus at the same time enhancing the reputation of the institution and the individuals.

The construction of an identity through visual images was extended by the benefactions of Sir Charles Nicholson, the principal donor of works of art to the university in the nineteenth century. I argue that his intentions in relation to his collections were didactic but were also concerned with the entrenchment of the imperial hegemony over the colony, and again with the enhancement of his personal reputation. This analysis shows how, by a complex of personal ambition and aspiration for the colony, the style of the buildings and the art collections formed were used to establish the colony as civilized and the new university as a bastion of English tradition.
For guidance and support in writing this thesis, I would like to thank my supervisors, who were Associate Professor Joan Kerr for the initial stages of the thesis and Dr. Robyn Cooper for the main body of the work. I also wish to acknowledge the assistance of the University of Sydney Archives staff. Other individuals and institutions to whom my thanks are due for information and assistance are Dr. Patricia Simons, Sir Oliver Miller, Mr. Colin Anson, Lord Clifford, the National Portrait Gallery, London; the Museum voor Schone Kunst, Ghent; the Huntington Library, California and the Niedersachsisches Landesmuseum, Hanover.
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Introduction

The nineteenth-century collections of the University of Sydney and the situation of the university within the cultural milieu of the colony have never been discussed, or if so, it has only been in a general or superficial way. This thesis sets out to redress the obvious lacuna in relation to both the history of the university and the history of the university art collections. Further, it goes some way to redressing the general lacuna which exists in relationship to nineteenth-century art collections in colonial New South Wales, a subject for which the literature is regrettably sparse.  

The art collections at the university are a subject of considerably neglected significance, not only in terms of recording the collections and in relationship to nineteenth-century colonial art collections generally, but chiefly in terms of colonial culture. Although the choice of the Gothic style for the main buildings at the university has been discussed in terms of architectural history, it has not been analysed in relation to the way in which the style projected the image of the colonial university, which, as I will propose in this thesis, was linked with the art collections.

To date there have been three histories of the University of Sydney published: G.L. Fischer, *The University of Sydney 1850–1975* (1975), R.A. Dallen, *The University of Sydney, Its History and Progress* (1925,1938), and H.E. Barff, *A Short Historical Account of the University of Sydney* (1902). Fischer's pictorial history is composed principally of photographs with captions and information but no interpretation, although reproductions of three paintings are included for illustrative purposes. Barff and Dallen both include lists of portraits, indicated in the index of Barff as 'pictures in the hall', with a similar entry by Dallen. Barff devotes a few lines to Nicholson's benefactions:

The tapestries and pictures which adorn the walls were all his gifts ... the most important was the Museum of Egyptian Etruscan, Greek and Roman antiquities ... collected by him ... at considerable cost.
This echoes Nicholson's own letters of benefaction to the University. Both Barff and Dallen outline steps taken in erecting the original buildings. Nowhere in any of this literature is either the use of the Gothic style for the buildings questioned, or the significance of the works of art analysed in terms of understanding the reasons for and the results of their existence at the university.

The extent to which Australian colonial culture was dependent on the mother country is generally recognised. Nowhere is this more apparent than at the University of Sydney, its style and courses, and in relation to this thesis's particular line of enquiry, the collections which were formed. Bernard Smith has pointed out that 'our European based culture came to us in small transportable things ...' and he comments on 'the degree to which material things have shaped our heritage'. George Nadel writes:

The intellectual history of early Australia reveals the attempt to cast the colonial mind into a mould of the old world. This was no political conspiracy on the part of the conservatives, nor despite appearances, an attempt at sowing loyalties in outposts of the British Empire, the colonists simply drew on ideas they knew.

While Bernard Smith's points are indisputable, Nadel's complacent acceptance of the status quo is not affirmed by this thesis. Although it will not be asserted that the 'Englishness' of colonial culture was due to a conspiracy, it will be shown that there were other than passive elements at work. While it must be agreed that Richard White's assertion that the visible symbols of culture constructed by colonial society 'encouraged immense pride ... in their own progress', it will be contended that the collections at the University of Sydney were also used in the interests of imperialism.

The argument to be addressed in this thesis is that whilst works of art can be appreciated for their aesthetic qualities alone, the meaning of the work of art is closely linked to its use. I will argue that, in relation to the years 1850-1900 the collections and style connected with the University of Sydney, be they paintings, sculpture, items of antiquity or a particular approach to architecture, were used to signify a chosen set of values, and thus to shape
the public perception of the institution as well as the way in which the university functioned. This effect was achieved in spite of the fact that in some cases the works of art are copies and not originals. The collections and architectural style of the university were significant factors in establishing the institution as one which would perpetuate imperial dominance of the colony while apparently instituting political independence and even a national Australian identity through training native-born potential administrators who in theory could be drawn from any strata of colonial society.

The subtext to this complex situation has to do with the manoeuvring and subtleties of colonial society. While on the one hand the rhetoric of the university's founders concentrated on the magnificence of the colonial university with its Gothic buildings and so on and the preparations for a great future, as asserted by F.L.S. (Futurity) Merewether and others, on the other hand, it will also emerge that the style of the university buildings and its art collections were a means of advancing the worldly interests of the founders themselves and there was personal gain for them in terms of status and reputation. 7

The historical location of the thesis must also be considered. While the sparsity is already noted of information on collections not only at the university but also in the general context, information on the period of colonial history addressed in this thesis is readily available. The following short survey, however, provides a brief but important body of information against which the arguments advanced and events described may be understood.

By the 1850s the population in eastern Australia was 400,000 of which only four per cent was educated. About one third of the population was urbanised. From 1851 the gold rushes tripled the population and by 1861 the population of Sydney was 95,789. 8 In 1858, however, there were only thirty-three students attending the University of Sydney. 9 The discovery of gold left Australians probably the richest citizens in the world per capita at that time, although the increased wealth was also due to exports of primary products such as coal and wool. 10 As a result of the increased prosperity of the 1850s, Sydney could boast a number of
modern improvements. These included gaslight, sewerage and a running water supply. By 1855 there were some suburban trains and by 1858 telegraphic communication existed between Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide. 11 Closer physical links with the old world were provided by the introduction in 1856 of combined sail and steam ships, which negotiated the voyage between Melbourne and London in only sixty-five days. 12 The steamships were not always reliable, however, as instanced by the drowning of Professor Woolley when the steamship London sank in the Bay of Biscay in 1866. The modern improvements in colonial life were not available to all citizens, for colonial society was one of marked social hierarchies. 13 Divisions between rich and poor, landowner and currency lad, intellectual and mechanic were distinct and bitter. While the University of Sydney would 'lead to an increase in the education of the youth of the higher classes', 14 the streets of Sydney were 'infested by a large number of vagrant children' and 'the house accommodation of the working classes of Sydney (was) admitted on all hands to be deplorably bad.' 15 The elite of the colony suffered from conflict amongst themselves and were unsettled by issues such as the shortage of labour, the land question and the proposed introduction of self government, as well as moves towards democracy and suggestions that the United States of America, not England, should provide a model. Conneil and Irving have isolated racial, religious and industrial conflict as features which contributed to a populist radicalism amongst other orders in colonial society in the 1850s. 16

The state adopted methods of control based on 'associational' and cultural processes. It was suggested that by schools and learning, by frequent exhibitions of painting and sculpture that 'the ardent minds of the sons of the soil may be prevented from running to waste, may be raised above the unsatisfactory pursuit of sensual enjoyment to revel in the lofty and inexhaustible pleasures of the intellect.' 17 Educational organisations such as the Schools of Arts and the Mechanics Institutes, which were well patronised, were used, however, not so much to instil moral values, but as examples of self government, order and regularity which would be advantageous to the ruling classes in controlling society. 18
It will be argued in this study that the associationism resulting from the style of the new university, the planning of which was vested in the hands of English ex-patriates whose aim was to establish a stable institution and society and then return to the mother country was an important factor in maintaining both control of society and links with the mother country.

A number of cultural institutions and societies were initiated by the wealthy and elite of the colony. Founders of the university and particularly Sir Charles Nicholson, played a prominent role in most of them. The Public Library was established in 1826 by Governor Darling. Nicholson was elected to the committee in 1838 and by 1854 he was president. Other prominent citizens associated with the University of Sydney also held office. The Mechanics Institute (School of Arts) was founded in 1833. Nicholson was president from 1844–51 and delivered several lectures on geology, science and Egyptology and two lectures in 1842 on 'The application of taste to the arts'. Nicholson was also vice-president of the Philosophical Society of New South Wales and a committee member of the Australian Museum. There were also private groups of intellectuals, such as the Stenhouse circle of which Professor John Woolley was a member. Another prominent member was Daniel Deniehy, who proposed the appointment of the select committee to enquire into the university’s expenditure of funds. The arts did not receive universal support by any means, one evidence of which is the Sydney Morning Herald report of 17 July 1857 on the failure of the opera. The promising Sydney Magazine of Science and Art, in its second issue, for instance, dealt only with labour-saving machinery for extracting stumps of trees and omitted any reference to art.

The Society for the Promotion of the Fine Arts in Australia was established in 1847. Sir Charles Nicholson was elected first president, an office he held for two to three years. As with other societies all the committee members were prominent Sydney citizens, many of whom were also associated with the university but there were no artists on the committee. The Society's exhibitions of 1847 and 1849 are only two of a list of eighteen important exhibitions held in the colony by various organisations between 1840 and 1877.
The Australian Artists' Society of 1850 was short-lived, although it met with initial enthusiasm. In 1855 a sketch club was formed under the presidency of Conrad Martens. Chronologically the next important art association to be established was the New South Wales Academy of Arts, founded on 25 April, 1871. Edward Reeve, the curator of the Nicholson Museum, was the instigator and first secretary of the academy, and Professor Charles Badham, the second professor of classics at the university, gave the address at the first conversazione. There were other activities of a cultural nature, including a demand for domestic portraits and busts referred to in Chapters II and III, but these examples outlined above serve to set the scene in the colony in the second half of the nineteenth century.

In spite of the burgeoning cultural activities, Professor Badham, for one, regarded the citizens of Sydney as philistines. In 1882 his opinion of colonial society was that:

This country now presents, what to European eyes, are strange phenomena, (1) an enormous amount of wealth in the hands of men utterly illiterate, (2) the learned professions including the church with very little learning to divide between them, (3) the mercantile classes of all grades very much below the standard of their congeneres in western Europe in literacy and intellectual tastes.

The following chapters will investigate the way in which the style and art collections established at the University of Sydney were accommodated within the environment outlined above.

In terms of methodology, this study concentrates on the unique and particular, that is, works of art and styles, and seeks to draw from them conclusions which will support the argument. I also seek to place the particular material examined in a social, political and economic as well as art historical context. Therefore, if Pascoe's analysis of Australian historiography is taken as a model, the methodology of this thesis leans toward his formist category, in that it concentrates on the particular, but also to his mechanist/sociological category in that the social context is taken into account. In terms of art history the objects discussed
are in most cases examined as documents of history as well as within the framework of nineteenth-century art history. As an adjunct to these approaches the taste exhibited in the choices of the Gothic style and the particular works of art has also been taken into account from the viewpoint expressed by T.J. Clark, who maintains that:

"taste seems to me a category which always disguises under its generality and appearance of an immediacy of intuition, a complex construction of understanding - of the place and significance of objects in a certain, sometimes very impoverished and sometimes very rich, notion of history."

It should be noted at the outset that this thesis deals mainly with one class of society - the educated bourgeoisie. Further, there are few if any references to two particular groups, that is, women and aborigines. The material used deals largely with the elite of colonial society who were the founders of the university, and whose interest in it has to some extent been preserved by documentation. The general public were excluded from the university, except as sightseers; even documented comments on the buildings and portraits for instance came from either members of the educated elite or their mouthpiece, the press. Favourable comments from this class were not always forthcoming, however. Was the independent thinker, wit and member of parliament, Daniel Deniehy, referring to the foundation of the university, to which he was opposed, when he wrote:

"What we have to do for the present in this young country is to lay the foundations of society, and I say put in as many corner-stones and ashlar as you can, in the shape of thoroughbred gentlemen of the best stamp ..."

These sentiments, expressed by Deniehy in his highly satirical lampoon of colonial society, are disturbingly similar to those of the founders of the University of Sydney.

There are few references to women in this thesis because they were most notable by their absence from anything to do with the foundation of the university and were not admitted as students until 1881 let alone as teachers. Research to date has uncovered no nineteenth-century references to aboriginals in relation to the university. This does not necessarily imply that the founders
had no knowledge of aboriginal culture. Indeed, Sir Charles Nicholson, on his return to England, addressed a learned society on the topic of aboriginal rock art. Yet whilst in Australia he did not see fit to include any aboriginal artefacts in his collections, let alone provide a museum for them, as he did for the artifacts of other ancient civilizations, for instance the Roman and Egyptian. His actions in this regard indicate that there was something else at work, for they coincide with nineteenth-century imperialist ideology generally. In analysing the history of museums, Brian Durrans points out that 'colonized societies were not thought complex or important enough to deserve museums of their own, as were provided for ancient Mediterranean civilizations or the high arts ...'

To introduce the argument in this thesis, the first chapter is devoted to the Great Hall and the reasons for the choice of the Gothic style of architecture. It would have been possible to build in styles other than the Gothic, yet no other style was considered. The reasons for this choice relate to theories of associationism, to colonialism and empire-building and in particular to reinforcing the link between the colony of New South Wales and the mother country. The Gothic style of architecture was used to impose an instant but pseudo heritage upon the newly established university.

Chapter two deals with the painted portraits at the university. In view of the paucity of literature on nineteenth-century portraiture and because of the colonial situation in New South Wales, the nineteenth-century English context for portraiture is briefly surveyed in order to provide a framework for the discussion. The introduction of portraits of founders, benefactors and academics, and especially their placement in the Great Hall is discussed in relation to funding, commissioning artists, and execution. The main argument in this chapter, however, relates to the reasons for the implementation of a portrait tradition, its effect on the university and the benefits in terms of their personal reputation and prestige to the sitters. The portrait busts and statues are dealt with in a similar way in chapter three. Encompassing both chapters is the underlying theme of patronage. Local portrait painters were not chosen for commissions until the late nineteenth century but on the other hand, the
majority of the sculpture was produced in the colony. These choices are examined. It will be shown that the official portraits, both paintings and sculptures contributed to the artificially imposed heritage and strengthened the image of the colonial university as a bastion of British tradition.

Sir Charles Nicholson, the principal benefactor and prime mover in matters of culture at the time the university was founded, is the subject of chapter four. Nicholson's collections are discussed in the light of his own background in the visual arts and culture as well as in relationship to local and English collections in general. The variety of Nicholson's benefactions is outlined, followed by an examination of each section, including pictures, tapestries, manuscripts and antiquities. Sir Charles Nicholson was the chief donor of works of art to the university in the nineteenth century. He was aware that not all the paintings he donated were of a high calibre, although his other benefactions had more integrity, but his aspirations to a high moral stature and a position in English society were fulfilled through his own insistence on the value of his benefactions. Nicholson's intentions in relation to his benefactions, the reasons for donation - whether items were given through expediency or as genuine benefactions - are seen in relationship to the effect they had upon the university and the personal prestige he himself acquired through setting himself up as a benefactor.

In summary, the reasons for producing this thesis are based on Bernard Smith's view of the philosophy of history. He asserts that the value of history is as an understanding of the past which is of great importance in ordering our future. 37 This thesis presents an analysis of the nineteenth-century art collections and style at the University of Sydney. Both collections and style played a major role in establishing the identity of the institution, re-inforcing the link between the colony and the mother country and enhancing the reputation of certain individuals. This study of the nineteenth-century collections and style at the University of Sydney thus contributes to an understanding of the legacy of colonialism which shaped the first university to be established in Australia.
Chapter I

The Great Hall

No visitor to Sydney should think of leaving it without seeing this seat of learning. It is not only the finest specimen of architecture in the Colony, but it is one that would do honour to England.

J. Waugh, The Strangers' Guide to Sydney, 1858

The Great Hall of the University of Sydney, which was Edmund Thomas Blacket's masterpiece, was inaugurated in 1859. Why was the Gothic Revival style of architecture chosen for this 'magnificent pile'? Was the choice incidental or deliberate and was the significance of the architectural style directed solely to members of the university or was there a hidden agenda, designed to achieve far-reaching effects?

plate 1

The imposing and ornate stone building, replete with gargoyles and battlements, sat isolated and splendid, prominently situated on the brow of a hill surrounded by the neglected cattle-grazing pastures of Grose Farm. It was outside the toll gates in Parramatta Road, like an outpost guarding the city. Because of its isolated position two miles from the city centre, the university was distanced from its undistinguished aspects, far from convict penitentiaries, barracks, slums and the disorder of the mercantile port. It was, however, clearly identifiable from Sydney to the east and from vantage points miles to the north, south and west.

When the Grose Farm site was granted to the university in 1855 there were only seven enrolled students and forty years passed before the enrolment exceeded one hundred. Yet the buildings erected were so expansive and so expensive as to deplete funds intended for teaching. One of the university's founders, F.L.S. (Futurity) Merewether, asserted that the buildings were intended 'not for present requirements, but ... for a great future'. That may explain the commodious proportions of the buildings, but their ostentatious style suggests that the founders' intentions were directed beyond mere teaching. Yet how could an almost empty building have any effect at all upon society?
T.J. Clark may provide a clue:

We usually mean by the word 'society' ... a set of means for solidarity, distance, belonging and exclusion ... orders of this sort appear to be established most potently by representations or systems of signs.

Could it be that the Great Hall of the University of Sydney was more than the sum of its parts and if so, what was its significance?

The Great Hall can be seen as a manifestation of art which is apparently straightforward and stable, but about which there is the irony of the enormous, highly decorated building intended for a university yet minus the appropriate number of students; but is this apparent straightforwardness an illusion?

In this chapter the Great Hall will be discussed in terms of its symbolic meaning, as an object which functions as a sign because of conventional or habitual associations understood by the viewer when the object (the Great Hall) is seen in a particular context. Broadly speaking the symbolic meanings of the fabric of the buildings will be discussed in relation to culture, civilization and knowledge. The ideological implications of the building will be discussed in terms of justifications which mask the self interest of a particular group of society. To be more specific it will be argued that whilst ostensibly designed to educate the youth of the colony, the building served the interests of a few elite who were successful leaders in colonial society and who desired to establish not only their political authority but also their cultural authority within the colony as well as in British society. At the same time this elite section of colonial society wished to rid the colony of the stigma of its foundation upon convict labour and yet still retain close ties with the mother country. It will be suggested that the Gothic style of the Great Hall had a part to play in these ambitions.

The isolated but prominent site chosen for the Great Hall has already been described, but what was the style chosen for this building, thought to be the finest specimen of architecture in the colony? The initial recommendation was for an Elizabethan style to be constructed in brick with stone mullions and coigns; only
the necessary parts of the building were to be erected. Edward Deas Thomson, the Colonial Secretary, and the politician William Charles Wentworth, both members of the university building committee, were instructed to procure plans and specifications from England. The reason for the switch to Edmund Thomas Blacket as architect later in 1854 is not recorded, but Blacket's 'great ability and taste in medieval architecture' particularly his expertise in the 'later Tudor' style was noted. Blacket's first plan was considered 'much too insignificant for the site' and a more extended façade of much greater architectural pretension was ordered. Details of the Early Victorian Gothic Revival plan for the Great Hall and eastern face of the quadrangle and its origins, which were modern but embellished with correct archaeological details have been described elsewhere, but for the purposes of this thesis it is appropriate to note that various features of the Great Hall were borrowed from Westminster Palace, particularly the hammer beam roof.

To illustrate his plan Blacket presented the building committee with a Presentation View of the Proposed University Building of 1854. The elevation was drawn by Blacket himself but he engaged the most outstanding landscape artist then in Sydney to supply the picturesque foreground and embellishments. The painting shows an imposing and ornate Gothic building, from the principal entrance of which one could command a vista of a future avenue of trees. Later the extended plan was further aggrandized by the change of building material from the utilitarian brick to the more impressive sandstone. The original intention of building only the most necessary parts was completely abandoned. It was agreed that the first section of the university to be built would be the magnificent Great Hall.

Why was the Gothic style chosen? When Blacket pointed out to the university senate that 'we shall have to determine which of all architectural styles shall be used whether, in fact, the new Building shall be Gothic or Roman or Greek', the committee had already expressed a preference for the 'Elizabethan' style, and Blacket himself recommended Gothic as suitable for a university building.
In 1850 Sydney's most important public building from a social and political view was Government House, begun in 1838 and supervised by Mortimer Lewis. The imposing, heavily crenellated and military-style Gothic structure was designed by the English architect Edward Blore who also designed Sir Walter Scott's Gothic Revival house Abbotsford besides contributing to Buckingham Palace. Whether Sir Charles Nicholson made Blore's acquaintance before or after the erection of the university building is not known but Nicholson possessed two watercolours of the University of Sydney by Edward Blore, one of the exterior and one of the interior of the Great Hall. The most important public buildings in England from a social and political viewpoint were the new Gothic Houses of Parliament by Sir Charles Barry and Augustus Welby Pugin, opened in 1852.

Both Nicholson and W.C. Wentworth who was on the senate of the university, lived in Gothic-style houses. Wentworth remodelled his Vaucluse House to include Gothic features similar to some included in Government House and Nicholson purchased Lindesay in 1845. Although austere it was the first domestic building in the colony to be labelled 'Gothick'. Nicholson's preference for the Gothic style was allied to his love for the novels of Sir Walter Scott which he read aloud all his life. It is clear from Nicholson's own comments about the Great Hall that he understood the theories underlying the resurgence of the Gothic style in England. Several possible contacts could have contributed to his enthusiasm for the style. By an interesting coincidence Nicholson attended the University of Edinburgh at the same time as Thomas Carlyle one of the great apologists for the Middle Ages, so presumably he would have been aware of Carlyle's ideas. It is also possible that Nicholson met John Ruskin through their mutual acquaintanceship with the Queen's physician Sir James Clarke and the artist Adelaide Ironside. The third founder of the University, Francis Lewis Shaw Merewether, also wanted an 'English' style for the Great Hall, as his motto for the university indicates: 'Sidere mens eadem mutato'.

The prominence of the English Houses of Parliament and the colonial Government House in public life would have been a compelling model for the great new institution to be erected in the colony.
of New South Wales. Many issues arise from the choice of the Gothic style but it is difficult not to be aware that underlying all the issues was the personal ambition of the founders. If as Ruskin maintained a building is 'a kind of monument' to the owner or builder, then the university senate were immediately putting themselves on the vice-regal level by choosing the same style as the residence of the Queen's representative in the colony. The most obvious reason for the choice of the Gothic style is that it was very fashionable, but was there more to it than mere fashion?

Gothic was a style with which the entire world of European civilization was familiar, and its use for the university building was seen as a sign of the maturity of the colony. The great Gothic-style hall would indicate that the colony was now civilized, cultured, educated and up-to-date, no longer embarrassed by the brutality of convictism or the greed of the gold fever, but ready to make its debut on the world stage. Indeed, Nicholson did not hide his aims in this regard. His report to The Select Committee on the University of 1860 placed the buildings in an international spectrum. They were, he said, 'a suite of buildings which from their style and execution would form an ornament to any of the capitals of Europe ... The influence of the University extends', Nicholson claimed, 'through the whole colony (and) has raised the character of this colony throughout the world.' The lustre of the pretentious buildings enhanced not only the reputation of the university in the capitals of Europe but also the reputations of those associated with its planning. As chancellor of a university which from the appearance of the building was in the class of the great universities of England, Nicholson's personal prestige was enormously enhanced. It was the building, not the students or professors, which gave the university status.

To realise such ambitions it was necessary to build in a clearly identifiable style, but there were other styles just as familiar to the public as Gothic, for instance the Greek style. The austere but dignified Sydney College buildings (now Sydney Grammar School) in which the university had its genesis are Greek style. Admittedly that style lost favour in the colony after 1845 although it was
still used for commercial and funerary buildings. Not only did Nicholson, for one, prefer the Gothic, but he did not like Greek style. 'A Grecian building', he said, 'is wholly unadapted for purposes such as those aimed at. The greatest difficulty is found in adapting a purely Grecian building to the ordinary wants of public institutions'. Nevertheless there was the example of London University which Wentworth originally proposed in 1849 as the model for the University of Sydney. From 1836 the University of London was partly housed in the Greek Revival-style Somerset House, the neo-Greek University College of 1827-28 was designed by William Wilkins and in 1870 the London University acquired a Greek Revival building in Burlington Gardens.

Once the Bill to Inaugurate the University of Sydney was passed by the Legislative Council in 1850 the founders of the university wanted nothing to do with London University, however, and there was no chance that they would choose an architectural style in any way similar to London's. Wentworth's use of London University as a model had been a ploy to get the bill through the Legislative Council. As the most powerful politician in the colony, Wentworth had taken up the cause of the university, but as a staunch conservative he had to use a number of devices to get the bill passed. He was at the time contemplating a system of colonial peerage or 'bunyip aristocracy', and as a graduate of Cambridge he would have favoured a colonial Oxbridge to train future conservative leaders of the country. Wentworth had to appeal to the conservatives to gain support in the Legislative Council, but his argument had to be radical enough to appease the democrats. He had to seem to lean left and so proposed an institution which would be colonial and cheap and also secular, the last point would upset the clergy and appeal to the radicals. His models were colonial universities in Canada and U.S.A. but the system proposed was based on London University's. His argument to the conservatives was that if the government failed to educate the colonial youth to their responsibilities in government they themselves would have failed as a government and he also stressed the problems of sending students overseas for higher education. Far from breaking down distinctions in society and restoring the natural equity of man as Wentworth had postulated, the institution was designed
to educate or even create the elite of the colony. 24

This aim had been revealed by Deas Thomson, the Colonial
Secretary, before the bill was brought before the Legislative Council
and it was to the Oxbridge tradition which the University of Sydney
turned for a system to 'educate a body of men suited to fill the
highest political office.' 25 In contrast to the commercial and
scientific orientation of London University, Oxford and Cambridge
produced graduates conscious of a nation (England) 'to which every
hour gives wider authority over distant lands ... and (which) must
finally regulate the industry no less than discipline the intellect
of the human race.' 26

Apart from requiring the foundation professors to be graduates
of the Oxbridge universities, a sure way to link the infant university
with that English tradition was to house it in buildings which were
associated in people's perception with the old universities of the
mother country. This had always been the intention, as Nicholson
admitted upon being questioned by the Select Committee of the
University in 1860. 'The Elizabethan style, or rather the later
Tudor style is eminently qualified for such purposes, being thoroughly
English in its character and associations. The great academical
institutions of the Mother Country all belong to that period.' 27

It was the principles of associationism which were called upon
to provide the desired link. Nicholson was conscious that it was
the process of historical evolution which had endowed the Oxbridge
universities 'the great sanctuaries of learning in our native land',
with their particular character, as opposed to the colonial institution,
the main buildings of which were planned and built within five years.
This was because, according to him, the new university was situated
in a country where the citizens were 'unable to build upon the memories
of the past, with no lineage of great names, without the prestige
of local associations.' 28 Today the narrow mindedness and British
chauvinism of this view is obvious but then it was accepted by
sections of colonial society who either saw themselves as colonial
aristocrats or who wished eventually to return permanently to the
mother country as did Nicholson, Wentworth and Merewether.
All other heritages upon which the colony had relied for its foundation were ignored. In general aboriginal culture, if noticed at all, was regarded in terms of ethnography, the convict heritage was a source of shame and feats of exploration both before and after 1770 were ignored except for those of Captain James Cook.

The iconography of the Great Hall reflects this attitude. Of the thirty-six great English men depicted in the stained glass, only one, the Englishman Captain James Cook, had any connection with Australia. One of the stained glass windows was a donation of William Long, whose contribution was more than double that of other donors, although this was not acknowledged. William Long, although a graduate of Cambridge, was the son of a convict and it must be assumed that his larger contribution was related to a desire for respectability, but as neither this nor his other gifts to the university were adequately acknowledged it appears that he was written out of early university history because of his convict origins. Among the proliferation of gargoyles and heads representing English types which decorate the Great Hall there are a few examples of indigenous flora and fauna, but nowhere is there any reference to the Aboriginal people. Neither convicts, explorers nor Aboriginals would provide associations which could meet the aims of the founders. As stated above the aims included the linking of the University of Sydney not only with the Oxbridge tradition, but also with the British Crown, as well as elevating the reputation of 'this lately abject and despised colony, whose name was used in the mother country as an epithet of scorn and a bye-word of reproach' in the words of the first principal of the university, Professor John Woolley.

The founders of the University of Sydney could have been confident that the ideas of associationism with which they hoped to invoke the Oxbridge tradition, were familiar to the citizens of Sydney. Every owner of a popular cottage ornée was, whether consciously or not, putting into practice the cult of nostalgia through associationism. Publications which dealt with these ideas were well known and in circulation in the colony from the time of the Macquaries who did much to popularise Gothick architecture, which was the precursor of the more archaeologically correct Gothic Revival style
of the university. A copy of Archibald Alison's Essays on the Nature and Principles of Taste, first published in 1790 in Edinburgh was bequeathed to the Australian Subscription Library in 1830. The Rev. William Gilpin's Observations Relative Chiefly to Picturesque Beauty made in the Year 1772, on Several Parts of England; particularly the Mountains and Lakes of Cumberland and Westmoreland (3rd edition, London, 1792) now in the Mitchell Library, Sydney was also available. 32 Blacket brought with him from England Pugin's pattern books of Gothic ornament, including The Present State of Ecclesiastical Taste in England now in Fisher Library at the University of Sydney (and endorsed with Blacket's name).

The constant use of the word 'association' in connection with the architecture of the university by Nicholson and his colleagues indicates a deliberate strategy or at the very least the presumption that the idea was commonly understood in the colony. At the inauguration of the Great Hall on 18 July 1859, Nicholson stressed the associational qualities inherent in the building, but at first he linked them to art, 'there is an intuitive and all pervading principle in our moral nature that enables us to find enjoyment ... in those abstract and often indefinite (but no less real) impressions that spring from and are associated with manifestations of art'. He pontificated, thus setting up the associational theme and putting the Great Hall into the category 'art'. After referring to abstractions such as 'higher destinies of mankind' and 'objects such as those which constitute the charm of the older countries', he became more specific when at the conclusion of his revealing speech he directed the students' attention to associations inherent in 'the whole circumference of this stately hall (in which) we are reminded of those who as princes, philosophers, poets, divines, orators and statesmen (significantly placed last for emphasis) have for a thousand years given such imperishable lustre to the name of Britain' (again placed last for emphasis and to be linked with "statesmen"). The message was clearly absorbed by one of the first graduates, William Charles Windeyer, who agreed that 'the associations connected with the great universities have had their influence on the characters of the men educated in them' and that 'good buildings (such as the Great Hall) have a great effect'. 33
It was publicly asserted by all those connected with the university that associations aroused by buildings in the style of Oxford and Cambridge would elevate and cultivate the taste of colonial youth. The importance attached to the Great Hall and its associational characteristics overwhelmed all other more practical considerations. The Great Hall was finished at enormous expense by 1860 but the university had no lecture rooms, locker rooms or reading rooms for students, which may account for the dramatic scarcity of students. The public emphasis was directed to the 'taste of colonial youth' rather than towards the true agenda of this associationism, which was to lock the colony into the conservative Oxbridge system of tertiary education which would perpetuate bonds with England, the mother country, by providing locally born administrators for the colony, yet administrators who were educated to be totally loyal and subservient to the interests of England.

The associationism of the Gothic style in the colony was generally understood in relation to nostalgia for the motherland. The Gothic style at the University of Sydney was likewise related to nostalgia but also to the artificial formation of an elite ruling class in the colony as shown above. In England the Gothic style encompassed more complicated issues, some of which applied to the colonial Great Hall. It is common knowledge that there were links between the English Gothic Revival and the twin fears of destabilization of society as a result of the French Revolution and fear of such a violent revolution in England, together with nostalgia for an idyllic past in the face of rapidly changing industrialized society which placed emphasis on the individual. The Gothic revival offered a model of a society based on the feudal values of medieval England. Patriotism, and social order and control would result. New South Wales, by the mid-nineteenth century, was not industrialised to any extent, therefore there was no call for the use of associationism in opposition to this aspect of society. But the two issues of allegiance to the Empire (wider than the training of future administrators, but vital for those whose fortunes and social position were dependent on the consanguinity between the colony and England) and law and order, were becoming a problem for conservative colonials in the 1850s.
Could the associationism of the Gothic Great Hall have any effect on these problems? For some colonials the example of the United States of America provided a more desirable model than England. J.D. Lang called for an Australian Declaration of Independence. Such ideas were seen as a threat by the conservatives debating the Constitution Bill in 1853. Wentworth, during the debate, called for a 'conservative one (constitution) - a British and not a Yankee Constitution'. The discovery of gold which brought increased prosperity to individuals was only one of the destabilising influences in colonial society in the 1850s. With the prospect of self-government there was dissension amongst the ruling classes, while at the same time there was idleness and drunkenness among the working classes. Disorder and violence resulted from religious, racial and industrial conflict. Political processions and obstruction of the streets around Parliament House were banned between 1846 and 1853. Members of the ruling class in Sydney were so harrassed by gangs that public meetings were called for the defence of 'life and property' in 1844 and 1850. Neither church nor family exerted strong control over colonial society in the 1850s. Pardoned ex-convicts were no longer subject to the dictates of the church which preached duty and submission to the Government, nor was the family a strong controlling element, for most extended families were left behind in England.

All this unrest called for an assertion of British authority and a re-imposition of the social hierarchy in which the Queen of England was supreme. It created the need for a symbol which would re-establish an allegiance to England, a symbol which embodied the authority of history, culture, education and civilization, which could be used in an associational sense as a stabilising example. Government House had provided one such symbol, but the erection of the Great Hall provided the opportunity to create another symbol particularly appropriate to the conditions of the 1850s. The Great Hall was isolated from the evils of the city, it was more recent than Government House, the references to history were more obvious in the resemblance to Westminster Hall (a reminder of the authority of the British Empire), in the stained glass windows depicting the rulers and great men
of English history, the angels and the gargoyles; and significantly
the Great Hall was accessible to the general public (but only as
sightseers) who flocked to see it. John Woolley recalled that 'every
Sunday we have now, even in the worst weather, about a thousand
people who come to the place to see and admire the buildings.' 37
A music festival held in the Great Hall in July 1859 attracted fourteen
hundred people. 38 The Sydney Morning Herald summed up the
significance to the general public of the Great Hall in its report
of the opening:

The University Hall ... this noble building ... constitutes
a memorial of the past as well as a promise of the future.
It reminds us that we belong to a nation which for ages has
possessed seats of learning where the highest attainments
of which the human intellect is capable have been reached
by thousands .... 39

The hordes of Sunday trippers make an ironic contrast to the scarcity
of enrolled students. Yet in attracting the general population and
confronting them with the huge new building designed in the Gothic
style associated in the colonial consciousness with the authority
of the mother country and the Oxbridge tradition, the Great Hall
was fulfilling the covert purpose for which it was constructed, although
with its lack of students its overt purpose appeared unsuccessful.

When justifying the expense incurred in erecting the Great
Hall, Sir Charles Nicholson quoted the example of Toronto University,
founded in 1827: 'I was rather struck to see how much more elaborate
is the design of the University of Toronto', he said. 40 It is arguable
that the heavily ornamented Gothic style used at Toronto was also
a device related to nostalgia and associationism. The Toronto building
is more like French than English Gothic. It could be suggested
that the conservative and defeated French elements in Canadian
society were endeavouring, through the use of the French Gothic
Revival style, to reassert their hegemony over Canadian society,
which had been lost in Wolfe's victory over Montcalm of 1757 in the
neighbouring French stronghold of Quebec. After the Peace of
Versailles in 1783 the importance of the English domination of Canada
would have increased. It is only possible to speculate on whether
Nicholson took Toronto and its significant style as an example
for the University of Sydney. From the wording of his comment it appears that he actually inspected Toronto University himself. 41

Did anyone question the instant history imposed upon Sydney University by the choice of the Gothic style? Did anyone see that the choice was linked to an attempt by certain leading citizens to mould the future of the colony and at the same time to take advantage of the social status conferred upon the designers of the edifice?

It seems that the Great Hall was understood in terms of nostalgia and as a symbol of England and culture by a proportion of the population to judge from the many comments on the building which compare it to the ancient universities of the mother country. It also seems that only a few people comprehended the idea that the university would be seen by the outside world as viable only or mainly because it had an imposing Oxford-like hall, and that a colony with such an edifice must therefore be seen as civilized, one that had sloughed off the identity of a penal settlement. Nicholson, Merewether and Woolley knew this. Nicholson spoke of the university as an edifice which 'should in its external and material aspects symbolise its moral ends and attributes.' 42

Such a comment hints at the contradiction between making a symbol and making meaning from a symbol. At the Oxbridge universities the meaning came first, the content or substance of the institution shaped the outer form, that is, the building. Both Oxford and Cambridge resulted from slow organic growth, both were founded in the thirteenth century, Oxford by a convergence of religious communities of Cistercians, Franciscans and Carmelites upon an already established eighth century nunnery of St. Fredeswide; the first building at Cambridge was a school of theology. As a result of a close association between church and scholarship, the buildings naturally followed the ecclesiastical model of the Gothic cathedrals, that is, the substance influenced the form. In Sydney, on the other hand, the form was created first and from that it was hoped to create the substance. The university Great Hall was only an imitation of all that it was supposed to stand for, used in much
the same way that Disneyland recreations are used today, that is, whilst the building seemed to stand for one thing there was an underlying meaning hidden from the casual observer.

William Sharpe Macleay was one who drew attention to the speedy erection of the Great Hall in comparison to the ages required for the evolution of Oxford and Cambridge and the Gothic cathedrals of England. He curtly asserted that the building had nothing to do with the education given in it, but at the same time confessed that he did not know what the objects of the founders were. 43 Here Macleay was judging the building in terms of consequences, not significance, but perhaps he suspected that there were motives other than teaching involved. To the select committee appointed to enquire into the university the building symbolised extravagance. Daniel Deniehy who proposed the appointment of the select committee attacked the university in parliament as having a 'Twelfth Night cake and ginger-bread style of decoration'. He argued that the university should follow the simple American rather than the Oxford style of architecture and devote the money saved to promoting more professors, more books, more scientific apparatus, a sick and superannuation fund for professors, but more than all, travelling fellowships and scholarships. 44 Deniehy made it clear that he understood what was really going on through his satirical play, How I Became the Attorney-General of New Barataria.

The ideological implications of the Gothic-style Great Hall were never spelled out of course and no contemporary or present historian has commented on them. Yet the Gothic building provided a framework for the new university which followed the conservatism of the old English universities and provided leaders for colonial society who supported the British empire. 45 The Hall provided a location in the colony for ceremonies of pomp and circumstance and English ritual which impressed the people.

Nicholson, Wentworth and Merewether all left the colony to live permanently in England. The university, symbolised by the building, for without the building it would have been insignificant, provided Nicholson in particular with an entrée to fashionable
society. He met the Queen and Prince Albert when the University of Sydney stained glass windows were displayed for them at Windsor Castle. 'There was a large gathering of people of the Court, including the French ambassador and other political celebrities.' He received a baronetcy for 'educational advancement of the colony of New South Wales,' as well as honorary degrees of D.C.L. and L.L.D. from Oxford and Cambridge in 1856. When a large illustration of the interior of the Great Hall appeared in the Illustrated London News, Sir Charles was credited with the establishment of the university, and the university was credited with the development of the distinct resemblance which Sydney bore to the 'old world'. Many visitors to Sydney admired the Great Hall. Anthony Trollope wrote that it was 'the finest chamber in the colonies ... no college either at Oxford or Cambridge possesses so fine a one.' The Gothic style chosen for the Great Hall reinforced the link between the colony and the mother country and provided an instant though artificial heritage for the university.

The Gothic Great Hall is in many ways a monument to the founders of the university. It was their taste, their ambition for the colony and for themselves and their enthusiasm which saw it through. Whilst Nicholson gained much from his association with it, he also contributed a great deal in time and money and had a genuine and typically Victorian aspiration to improve society. The style of the Great Hall was intimately connected with the nineteenth-century portrait collection with which it was later decorated.

In conclusion, in this chapter it has been shown that the Gothic style was deliberately chosen for the Great Hall, although other styles were possible. The Gothic style was used to provide a symbolic link between the University of Sydney and the Oxbridge tradition, and through this it contributed to the continued subservience of the colony to the mother country at a time when other allegiances were being promulgated. The Gothic-style Great Hall was highly decorated to produce an edifice which would impress not only visitors to the colony, but also Europeans and English inhabitants, with the idea that Australia was a sophisticated, stable and civilized country, which had forever left behind its convict origins. While the
physical accommodation of the students was neglected, their aesthetic education was, it was hoped, being enhanced by the building. It was the Gothic-style Great Hall which represented the university rather than the students. Underlying all this lay the personal ambition of the founders. The impressive building provided a background for their own social aspirations in Britain as well as in colonial society.
Chapter II

The Portraits

(The Great Hall) ... had not, as in the great old Universities ... pictorial forms of their own universities' sons, of those who have done so much to build up England's great renown. But we have adorning these walls, portrait paintings of Professors, benefactors and others ...

On its completion, the Great Hall was seen as an ideal place in which to hang portraits of university notables. The grandeur and size of the Gothic hall could accommodate large, formal portraits, statues and busts, and the imposition upon the university of an instant heritage, as discussed in the previous chapter, could be expanded by a portrait collection which would emulate the portrait traditions of English universities and public institutions. More than ever before, in the nineteenth century it was fashionable in England for institutions to honour important individuals with an official portrait hung in a public building. In Sydney, other public institutions besides the university were also establishing collections of portraits, and certain individuals saw that a portrait collection at the university would serve a variety of purposes, both functional and symbolic, for the university, as indicated above, as well as for individuals for whom such works of art would become accessories to their public positions and signs of their importance in public life as well as their status as gentlemen.

The University Collection acquired, from the 1850s to the early twentieth century, portraits in a variety of styles and genres, including full-length official portraits, three-quarter length portraits, drawings, medallions, miniatures, caricatures, busts and full-length statues. In some instances there are multiple depictions in various media of the same subject. Such a diversity of genres is characteristic of Victorian portraiture in general. Most of the portraits to be discussed are official depictions of people associated with the development of the university, and a number of these official and semi-official portraits were produced outside the colony.
This chapter will concern itself mainly with the painted portraits, and the following will concentrate on sculpture. To support the discussion, only the most representative of the range of portraits in the University Collection will be discussed. How do the nineteenth-century portraits at the university fit into the general context of portrait painting? What difficulties were encountered and what were the final products? And lastly, could the university be seen as a patron of art?

In studying nineteenth-century portraiture, certain difficulties are encountered, and any attempt to interpret the significance of the portraits from the University Collection must be hampered by a lack of secondary analytical material dealing with nineteenth-century portraits in general. Studies of nineteenth-century English portraiture mainly take the form of the catalogue with a short introductory essay, for instance, Richard Ormond's Early Victorian Portraits from the National Portrait Gallery (1973). There is some interpretative material in Sara Stevenson's A Face for any Occasion (1976) but this deals with portrait engravings, not painting. David Piper's The English Face (1957) covers a vast chronological span, and therefore does not go into great detail. The only published articles so far discovered are Marcia Pointon's 'Portrait Painting as a Business Enterprise' in Art History (1984) which deals with eighteenth-century modes of operation, and Mary Cowling's 'The Artist as Anthropologist in mid-Victorian England' in Art History (1983). There is, however, secondary material available on eighteenth-century portraiture, for instance the Reynolds exhibition catalogue (1986) which provides a useful historical context for the precursors of nineteenth-century portrait painters. The lack of any specific study of nineteenth-century portraits is surprising in view of the fact that many Victorian painters, such as Luke Fildes and von Herkomer, made their fortune at this time from portrait painting.

No analytical study of portraiture in Australia has been attempted. The only text on Australian portraits is Eve Buscombe's Artists in Early Australia and their Portraits (1979) which is a valuable catalogue of Australian portraits before 1850. Nothing has been written on non-Australian portraits in Australian collections. Even primary material on nineteenth-century Australian portraiture
is at times elusive. For instance, the portrait painter William Griffith was working in Sydney in the 1850s. He was paid £200 for a full-length portrait, Sir William Westbrook Burton, of 1844 so perhaps could have been considered competent to paint university notables, but whether he was ever considered is impossible to know as nothing at all is known of him after 1854. 3

In view of the above-mentioned lack of a general guideline, the following analysis of the portraits is principally based on primary material. In support of the analysis, an endeavour will be made to place the portraits in social, economic and political as well as art historical contexts and draw conclusions on that basis.

Before the 1850s there was no significant demand for large official portraits in the colony, although the smaller portrait, commissioned by the ambitious middle-class patron and destined for the wall of the domestic villa was relatively popular. 4 Therefore, in searching for a context in which to discuss the university portraits, the colonial status of Australia must be taken into account, and the English attitude to portraiture will be considered.

Traditionally, the public portrait was the preserve of rulers, aristocrats, wealthy merchants and illustrious scholars. The public portrait thus represents status, both social and intellectual. Traditionally there have also been certain conventions followed by the portrait painter. The idea of the official portrait and the appropriate mode of representation of the sitter was codified by Alberti in the fifteenth century. He restated Plutarch's ideas as follows: "When they were painting Kings, the painters of antiquity, if there was some defect in their models, tried to mend it as best they could, keeping the likeness". 5 This, together with Lomazzo's instruction to keep in mind the 'sign' of the dignity of the subject, and the Petrarchian theme of a series of 'illustrious men', are concepts adhered to, in a modest fashion, in the official portraits in the University Collection. 6 For instance, the inclusion of the silver mace in the H.W. Phillips portrait, Sir Charles Nicholson (1859), exemplifies the 'dignity' of the sitter and of the office, while the cosmetic approach to the
huge ears of the first Provost of the university, Edward Hamilton, in George Richmond’s drawing of him, follows the directions of Alberti. Such evidence can be drawn from a less flattering photograph of Hamilton in the university archives. As Richard Ormond observed, the variety of images of Victorian personalities is an advantage to the scholar. 7

In nineteenth-century England, the expansion of demand for portraits in general was related to the interest in the individual and preoccupations with anthropology, physiognomy and phrenology. Charles Darwin’s Origin of the Species and the classification of species begun by Linnaeus were also contributing factors to the interest in portraiture. The cult of the individual, which fostered the demand for portraits was further entrenched by the establishment in 1882 of the Dictionary of National Biography, which included in its original form biographies of all national notables.8 On the other hand, the National Portrait Gallery, which will be discussed later, was a result of the expansion of portrait painting. But it was probably the cult of hero worship and the intense interest in history and biography, developed in the Victorian era, which led to the great popularity of the large public portrait in particular.

During the second half of the nineteenth century, public life in Britain expanded as the country became industrialised, mechanised and urbanised. As a result of the rapid development of industry and commerce, many public, official and business organisations were founded and developed in an era of marked prosperity for the ruling classes. The presentation portrait became a fashionable way of celebrating the contribution of the important figures within these mercantile and public institutions. Board rooms, town halls and universities were transformed into public shrines commemorating the great and famous.9 By the nineteenth century there were quite extensive portrait collections at Oxford and Cambridge Universities. Since the seventeenth century the portrait of Elias Ashmole has hung in the Ashmolean Museum, and in May to June 1844, the Cambridge Antiquarian Society held the first exhibition of ‘University and College Portraits’ in the Founders' Building of the Fitzwilliam Museum. 10
The period under discussion saw the popularisation of photography. The Daguerrotype produced a 'faithful miniature likeness' for the price of 'one guinea exclusive of frame'. It was only the bottom end of the portrait painting market which was affected and the prestige of the 'live scale public portrait as an object of pomp and circumstance' retained its prestige. Photography was originally thought to be superior to painting because of its supposed veracity, but its disadvantage was that it could neither flatter nor conceal blemishes. Many portrait painters, however, used the Daguerrotype and other developments of photography as the basis of the portrait. An example of this practice can be seen in the half-length pastel portrait by Myra Felton, John Woolley (no date) showing the subject in academic dress. Because of its size and medium this portrait does not fall into the class of the official portrait, although it has hung for many years in public areas of the university. The Woolley portrait is based feature for feature on the photograph of Woolley by Edward Dalton, of Dalton's Royal Photographic Gallery, 245 George Street, Sydney. Myra Felton and Edward Dalton both employed photography and the medium of pastel and crayons to produce portraits. Another pastel portrait of Woolley in the University Collection, by an unknown artist is also based on Dalton's photograph. It is likely that both portraits are posthumous as Woolley dramatically drowned and was publicly mourned in the colony.

The Royal Academy in London had always provided exhibition space for portraits since its foundation in 1768. In spite of Sir Joshua Reynolds' hierarchy of genres in which history painting took precedence, a sample analysis of exhibitions at the Royal Academy from 1824 to 1832 shows that there were more portraits exhibited than any other genre (although a proportion of the portraits were miniatures). The exhibition of a portrait at the Royal Academy proved advantageous to both artist, in terms of reputation, and the sitter, whose social standing was elevated by association with an institution under royal patronage. According to a critic of the Royal Academy exhibiton of 1859, the 'portrait ... is still the mainstay of academic art in this country and forms the staple of the display provided annually for the edification of the public in Trafalgar Square.'
Reviews for the exhibition of 1859, when Sir John Watson Gordon's Sir William Montague Manning and the engraving of H.W. Phillips' Sir Charles Nicholson (both now at the university) were displayed, dealt with portraiture before any of the other genres and although this order of precedence is unusual, it could have been the result of public interest in the portrait. Nevertheless, the standard of portraiture was not considered impressive by this reviewer, who found in the most important East Room of the Royal Academy, seventy 'staring effigies ... of no value or interest except to their owners'. The implication is that any value was social, not artistic. In general the reviewer found the portraits 'stiff, opaque and lifeless ... stolid evidence of human weakness and vanity and of supremacy of money over mind.'

Such acerbic criticism was not limited to this particular critic, yet portrait painting was given the ultimate imprimatur with the opening of the National Portrait Gallery in London in 1856. The priorities of the National Portrait Gallery were different to those of the Royal Academy as Lord Palmerston's speech in support of the Bill for financial support for the National Portrait Gallery indicated. His words could have inspired the founders of the University of Sydney:

There cannot be a greater incentive to natural exertion, to noble action, to good conduct on the part of the living than to see before them the features of those who have done things which are worthy of our admiration and whose example we are more induced to imitate when they are brought before us in the visible and tangible shape of portraits.

The National Portrait Gallery was not set up as an art gallery, but as a record of individual faces and achievements classified for historical reference. The fashion for honouring famous personages with a portrait was thus firmly established in England by the mid-nineteenth century.

In the colony of New South Wales one sees a similar tradition established following the example of the portrait tradition in Britain. The social, political and economic climate of Sydney in the 1850s and 1860s, which has been alluded to earlier, was one which was well able to support such a portrait tradition. By the 1850s
There were several colonial institutions which owned official portraits; not only vice-regal institutions such as Government House but also commercial bodies, including the Sydney Chamber of Commerce, commissioned portraits.

The first to be commissioned were those of colonial governors such as the first official portrait of Governor Lachlan Macquarie by Richard Read Senior, which was commissioned by the residents of Windsor and now hangs at the Court House, Windsor, not at Government House which was not occupied until 1844. The next governor's portrait, Sir Thomas Brisbane, was painted by Augustus Earle (c.1826) in Australia, although 'it was agitated that the portrait should be painted in London, but we are happy to find Mr. Earl (sic) had had his right', wrote a journalist of the day. Although this portrait and those of all subsequent governors hang at Government House today, portraits of the first four governors, Phillip, Hunter, King and Bligh were not hung at Government House until after 1890. After Earle, the next Australian artist to be commissioned by Government House was George Follingsby who painted Sir Hercules Robinson P.C., G.C.M.G., the fourteenth governor from 1872-1879. The portrait of Sir Richard Bourke (eighth governor 1831-1837) was painted in England by Andrew Morton on the order of James Macarthur, a foundation member of the University of Sydney senate. The portrait was sent to Sydney in 1841. Lieutenant Governor Sir Ralph Darling was also painted by Morton and the portrait was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1838 with the caption 'Painted for the Colony.' Although the Sydney artist Oliver Rose Campbell painted both Sir Charles Fitzroy and Sir William Denison 'life-size' in oils, these portraits were the property of the Exchange Company and were hanging at the Sydney Chamber of Commerce in 1859. The English painter Richard Buckner painted these two governors for Government House. It seems that Buckner did not, however, specialize in the official portrait for he exhibited only portraits of women at the Royal Academy. Besides these portraits, there were at Government House depictions of King George III (1800) and Queen Charlotte (1800) both after Sir Joshua Reynolds, presented by the widow of Governor King in 1843. Therefore, by 1860 there were probably seven or eight portraits at Government House, of which only one was painted in Australia.
The High Court of New South Wales has a collection of portraits of which the first two to be acquired were painted in Australia, J.A. Gilfillan's Sir Francis Forbes (Chief Justice 1824-1837) and Joseph Backler's Sir James Dowling (Chief Justice 1837-1844). 25 Although Sir Alfred Stephen (Chief Justice 1844-1873) was also painted by both Gilfillan and Marshall Claxton, the portrait at the High Court is by J.P. Knight R.A. 26 It was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1861 with the citation 'Painted for the Bar and Solicitors of Sydney'. 27 From the time of Stephen, portraits of the Chief Justices of New South Wales were commissioned by the Bar and presented to the Court, 28 but by the 1860s there were only three portraits, and moreover the portraits of the Chief Justices were only displayed together as a collection for the first time in 1977 when the present Court House in Queen's Square was completed.

Another institution which helped to establish this tradition in the colony was the Sydney County Council, founded in 1842 (but which had a chequered existence until 1857). The Town Hall does, however, have portraits of all but four of the Lord Mayors of Sydney, plus other official portraits such as those of Prince Albert and Queen Victoria by F.X. Winterhalter. The Churches, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, have only sporadic representations of their leaders - they may have been more concerned with spiritual than with temporal immortality. The members of the State Government of New South Wales are mainly commemorated by official photographs.

In the colony the display of portraits at exhibitions was also considered of great importance by certain individuals. The ambitious Colonial Secretary, Edward Deas Thomson, whose portrait was shown at the Society for the Promotion of the Fine Arts in Australia exhibition of 1857, wrote to Professor John Woolley, saying, 'I am apprehensive that the change of position of the portrait in the exhibition may lead to unpleasant remarks ... could not another place for it be found without displacing Sir Charles?' 29 The portrait of Sir Charles Nicholson was by O.R. Campbell, and that of Deas Thomson by Capaldi of Rome (1855) now owned by the Mitchell Library, (catalogue number 304). Deas Thomson was painted plate 10 again by Capaldi for the university.
In summary, in the colony of New South Wales there was an interest in following the English tradition of commissioning portraits of important members of society, and several small groups of portraits had been assembled by the 1850s to 1860s and were hanging in important colonial institutions.

To what extent, then, did the university foster this incipient tradition? As a result of the desire of the founders of the university to have portraits in the Great Hall, by the 1860s there were portraits of Sir Charles Nicholson (1859) by H.W. Phillips, Sir Francis Forbes (not dated but before 1854 and signed 'Hart'), Sir William Montague Manning (1858) by Sir John Watson Gordon, Sir Edward Deas Thomson (1865) by A. Capalti. These were soon joined by James Macarthur (1863) also by Capalti and W.M. Tweedie's Rev. John Woolley (1866).

There was also a bust of Sir Edward Deas Thomson (1854), a statue of William Charles Wentworth (1861) and an enormous statue of Captain Cook. In total there was the same number of portraits at the university as at Government House in the 1860s. By 1885 there were twelve portraits in the Great Hall and two over life-size statues, three portraits in the library plus at least two busts. Like the Government House portraits, most of the university portraits were painted overseas, only two or possibly three were executed in the colony. The university, however, owned more portraits than any other institution except Government House, but as I point out later, the university did not commission them.

The founders of the university pursued the idea of a portrait collection right from the inception of the institution. What were the reasons for this great enthusiasm for portraits? As suggested previously, the Great Hall with the English associations inherent in the Gothic-style architecture and stained glass windows representing the great personages of English history was intended to create an instant heritage for the new University of Sydney. One way of expanding this instant history was to 'adorn these walls (with) portrait paintings of professors, benefactors and others' in emulation of the Oxbridge universities and other English institutions. As one commentator put it in 1924, 'the record (of the stained glass) does not cease, rather it is taken up inspiringly by the painted portraits upon the walls and statues which flank the entrance.'
The relationship to Britain would be further reinforced if the portraits were painted by English not colonial portrait painters. This is the real reason for the preference for portraits painted overseas rather than by local artists, although there are a number of other reasons for not commissioning local artists. (This point will be taken up later in the discussion of how the portraits were commissioned.) Although the founders were anxious that portraits should hang in the Great Hall, press reports of its inauguration on 18 July 1859, which was presided over by Sir Charles Nicholson, do not mention any portraits hanging there, but a description of the suite of buildings in an article anticipating the opening of the Great Hall noted that the university library (now the senate room) was 'graced by the well-known, large and much admired portrait of Sir Charles Nicholson.' The portrait was soon moved, for Professor John Woolley wrote to the university senate, pointing out 'that it was the wish of subscribers that the portrait of Sir Charles Nicholson should hang in the University Hall.' Woolley would have been familiar with the portraits at Oxford as he was a graduate of that university, and was keen to establish the link between his alma mater and the University of Sydney. By Commemoration Day of the same year (1859) a Sydney newspaper made it known to the colony that 'the well-known full-length portrait of Sir Charles Nicholson Bart. in his robes as Provost was hanging above the dais in the Great Hall.' Sir Charles kept the newspaper cutting.

plate 4

The Nicholson portrait, with its effect of old-fashioned grandeur was obviously painted to match the Great Hall. Without it the walls would have been bare except for the Gobelin tapestry Joseph and

plate 15

His Brethren, loaned and subsequently given to the university by Nicholson. In the foreground of the portrait the touch of red in the regal carpet which distances and elevates the subject in importance, would have enlivened the sombre walls of the hall, above which were the flashing stained glass windows. The magnificent gold braided chancellor's robe shown in the portrait also contributed to the effect of reinforcing the function of the hall itself as a place of ceremonial occasions and historical associations. Thus an artificial air of history was introduced to the hall by a large official portrait of a person who was associated with the foundation of the
university, so determining a pattern for the establishment of a portrait tradition at the university. And right from the start there was an element of personal satisfaction for the sitter in having a portrait hung in the Great Hall. Both these factors - the emulation of historical English institutions and fashions in an effort to link the university to the Oxbridge tradition, plus the personal advantage to the sitter - were the principal reasons for the creation of a portrait collection at the university.

The founders of the university, whose portraits are included in the University Collection, were leaders in colonial society. Most of them had some familiarity with English universities and other institutions where portraits were on view, for instance Wentworth and Merewether were educated at Cambridge. Nicholson was a graduate of Edinburgh University and he also received honorary degrees from both Oxford and Cambridge. It is possible that as a child he saw the historical portraits at Petworth, as his father was the agent for the Earl of Egremont. James Macarthur, who was a member of the first university senate and a close associate of Sir Charles Nicholson, had been involved in commissioning the portrait of the sixth governor of New South Wales, Sir Richard Bourke, KCB, by Andrew Morton a task assigned to Macarthur because of his reputation as 'a custodian in the colony of the cultural heritage of Europe'. These men and others on the university senate would have been well aware of the significance of the official portraits hanging in English institutions.

In the colony the most prestigious location for portraits was Government House. A portrait collection at the university would help establish its (the university's) position in the colony as one of similar importance to Government House. The wish to create an association between the new university and Government House is demonstrated by the appointment of Edward Hamilton as the first provost of the university. It was not just Hamilton's fine record at Cambridge which prompted his appointment, but the fact that in the colony he moved in vice-regal circles.

It seems that the initiative for the portrait collection rested mainly with Nicholson, for even before Woolley wrote to the senate
about his portrait, Nicholson had arranged to borrow a portrait of Deas Thomson from the Sydney Chamber of Commerce to hang on the opposite side of the Oxford window (of which Nicholson was the donor) to his own portrait. In view of Deas Thomson's position of power in the colony, second only to that of the governor, this may have been a diplomatic move by Sir Charles who was by 1860 the provost of the university. The move also indicated that it was already thought more important to have a portrait hanging at the university than at the Chamber of Commerce. It is possible that the portrait borrowed from the Chamber of Commerce is the portrait of Deas Thomson as a young man of which the provenance is unknown except that it has been included in the University Collection for many years. The early arrival at the university of these two portraits, soon to be followed by a depiction of James Macarthur and others, confirms the suggestion that establishment of both a portrait collection celebrating individuals connected with the university, and a historical tradition in emulation of other important colonial and English institutions were important priorities of the founders of the university.

There are other reasons for the desire to install a portrait collection in the Great Hall. One of these concerns the personal advantage to the sitter. The Oxbridge universities had portraits of their founders and famous scholars dating to pre-Elizabethan times as mentioned previously. In the nineteenth century the portraits at the University of Sydney were compared to portraits of historical figures at the 'great old Universities', thus the portraits in the Great Hall placed their subjects in the context of history as founders of a great institution. It could be argued that the sitters placed themselves in the same class as '... our glorious (king) Alfred (who) provided amidst the fens and forests of Oxford a home of union and refuge for the poor scattered scholars' and 'our illustrious sovereign (whose name) will be perpetuated and remembered in connection with that of the University of Sydney.' Portraits of Nicholson, Wooley, Deas Thomson, Mereweather and others figured prominently at the university, thereby ensuring that their names were also perpetuated like that of Alfred. Although Woolley's portrait was painted specifically for the students, who held him in great affection, it appears
that there was in some cases an element of self aggrandisement in
the commissioning of the university portraits.

A portrait destined for the Great Hall but painted overseas
and in some cases exhibited at the Royal Academy not only confirmed
the position of the sitter as a person of consequence in the colony
but also provided a cachet for those negotiating social circles in
the mother country. Most of the founders returned to England
to live. The portrait of James Macarthur is a case in point. As
noted earlier, Macarthur was aware of the social implications of the
official portrait, particularly if painted overseas and hung in a
public institution. This form of public recognition of his place
in society and history would have been particularly acceptable to
Macarthur as he had felt it necessary to reject that other form of
public recognition, a knighthood, because of his family history. 43

The personal advantage accruing to Sir Charles Nicholson
through his portrait results from a more complex set of circumstances.
Although it cannot be denied that Sir Charles' motives in promoting
the university were highly altruistic, it must be admitted that an
advantageous side-effect was that of personal self advancement.

**plate 4** Henry Wyndham Phillips' portrait, Sir Charles Nicholson (1859) was
not exhibited at the Royal Academy, but the engraving of the
portrait by J. Richardson Jackson was shown there in 1859. 44

**plate 9** J. Richardson Jackson (1819-1877) was an English engraver of
considerable repute. He changed from his initial specialization
of line engraving to mezzotint and specialised in portrait work. As
long after his death as 1912 his work brought the respectable sum
of up to £1/5/5. 45 It is interesting to note the slight variations
between the portrait and the engraving, the latter shows a more
regal figure with a slightly larger head and a more upright stance.
While Nicholson's portrait was much admired in the colony 46 the
engraving provided a more effective vehicle for publicity, not only
for the university but for Nicholson personally, both in the colony
and in England. That the engraving had a wide circulation is
evidenced by the known copies which survive at the university
(two), the Mitchell Library Sydney, the British Museum and the
National Portrait Gallery, London. 47 There are doubtless others
in obscure places, one commentator, in reminiscing on the
history of the university recalled his pleasure in encountering the engraving at the end of World War I 'on a stairway of a country inn in England'.

But although the engraving of Nicholson's portrait was shown at the Royal Academy its function was social rather than artistic, as was the case with most Victorian portrait engravings. The social rather than artistic function of engravings was also paramount in the colony, for example, when Professor John Woolley was drowned a commemorative engraving of the 'lamented Dr. Woolley' was published by the Australian Journal. According to Hilary Beck the first criterion for producing an engraving was human interest. She also points out that such reproductions were used for political and personal propaganda. Engraved portraits of national heroes such as the Duke of Wellington, the Prime Minister and of course, Queen Victoria, were popular. The engraving of Nicholson's portrait should also be seen in this context. The overall popularity of engravings and the increased demand for them was fostered by the rising popularity of illustrated periodicals such as the Illustrated London News. These journals were read by the increasingly prosperous nineteenth-century middle class. The periodicals reproduced engravings, some of which related to the colonies, accompanied by articles stressing allegiance to the growing British empire and the Queen. There is no doubt that the engraving of Nicholson's portrait was used to promote both the university and himself. The commentary accompanying the head and shoulders version of Richardson Jackson's engraving of Nicholson which was published in the Illustrated London News referred to Nicholson as '... the first Australian colonist who has been honoured with a baronetcy', which, the writer asserted was in reality 'an honour paid to the colonies at large for their loyalty to the mother country'. The writer also referred to Nicholson's part in producing the 'scheme of a colonial university based on the system of the universities of the mother country' and to the royal charter which Nicholson obtained for the University of Sydney. Attention was also drawn to engravings of the university buildings in an earlier article. In the article stress is continuously laid on the connections between Britain and her colony, New South Wales and on the assumption that all things colonial should follow the example of the 'mother country'.
Yet the engraving also served as a vehicle of self advertisement for Nicholson personally, particularly as it was reproduced in a journal as widely circulated as the Illustrated London News, thus allowing the possibility of his image being viewed not only 'in Royal Palaces throughout Europe ... (but also in) the humblest cottage' as well as in colonial mansions and outback shearers' huts. 53 This advertisement of Nicholson as an important public figure would have been a great advantage to him on his return to England to live permanently in 1862. He had had such an intention in mind as early as 1856, before his portrait was painted or engraved. 54 Before Nicholson emigrated in 1834 at the age of twenty-six he would scarcely have been a figure in London society, as he was born at Cockermouth in the north and educated at the University of Edinburgh. When he returned to live in England, according to Wooley, 'he aims at no aristocracy but has good literary connections in which, of course, a few social swells are included', but another contemporary stated that Nicholson knew all the literary, social and political figures of the day in London. 55 The engraving of Nicholson's portrait as Provost of the University of Sydney would have added to his fame. Therefore, whilst the portraits (of which the above is just one example) contributed to the historic atmosphere of the Great Hall, in imitation of the ancient universities of the mother country, at the same time they unquestionably enhanced the reputation of the sitters.

Once it was established that portraits should hang at the university, the Great Hall became a desirable location for a portrait. The fashion for public testimonials was followed in the colony and in many cases the money donated was used to commission a portrait to honour the individual. It was not unusual for the donors to direct that a portrait should hang in a specific location, as was the case with Sir John Watson Gordon's Sir William Montague Manning (1858). 56 It was required that this portrait should be hung in the Great Hall of the university, and the direction was implemented after the portrait had been exhibited at the Royal Academy, London in 1859 and listed in the catalogue as 'painted for New South Wales etc.'. 57 The important point is that the portrait was commissioned and arrived at the university at least a year before Montague Manning had any official connection with the institution. He did not become a member of the university senate until 1861. 58
The portrait, though not especially distinguished in the context of English portrait paintings, would nevertheless have created a powerful impression in the colony, mainly because of its dimensions (238 x 148 cm.). The few other portraits of this size in the colony were of leading figures such as Governor Fitzroy. Nicholson's portrait, commissioned a year later in 1859, is smaller. A certain audacity is implied in commissioning such a large-scale work, then requiring it to be hung at the university. No doubt its power added lustre to the university hall, but it is impossible to gauge the advantage gained from this imposing portrait by its subject, Sir William Montague Manning. His distinguished career took him from a middle-class English background and legal education at London University through the colonial political and legal hierarchy to become, amongst other high public offices he held, one of the most outstanding chancellors of the university. Manning's is only one of the many portraits and busts which were the result of public testimonials whose donors directed that the portrait should be placed in the Great Hall. On the other hand, some committees only directed that the portrait should be hung in a public place, for instance the testimonial fund for James Macarthur's portrait directed that it should be 'placed in one of the public buildings in Sydney' so that the portrait was not originally intended for the university specifically. To some sitters, an affection for the university as well as a wish to be remembered as a great man were the primary motives for the desire to see their portrait in the hall. F.L.S. Merewether had retired from public life and lived in seclusion in England by the time his portrait arrived at the university in 1878, but he wrote that 'it will be a great pleasure to ... think of its holding a place in the Hall'.

Perhaps one of the incentives to start a portrait collection stemmed from the acquisition of the first portrait in the Collection, Sir Francis Forbes (not dated, signed 'Hart'), which was acquired before the grant of the Grose Farm site for the existing buildings. Its acquisition was casual in the extreme, as it was one of a number of miscellaneous items including 'a clock, a portrait of Sir Francis Forbes, two maps, two blackboards with stands, and a pair of large globes' taken over by the university from the defunct Sydney College in 1852. Although Sir Francis Forbes, who was the first chief justice of the colony,
had no connection with the university (he died in 1841) his elegant portrait was displayed in the Great Hall, perhaps as a reminder of the link between the Sydney College of which Forbes was chairman, and the university, or more likely for convenience. This casual beginning to the portrait collection prefigured the lack of any articulated policy in acquiring portraits. In many cases the portraits were the result of public testimonials and of the sitters' own efforts and personal financial contributions. The testimonial for James Macarthur, for instance, raised only 77 guineas which was inadequate for a portrait, and it seems that Macarthur himself made up the shortfall, for he is listed as the donor. 62

Although Nicholson encouraged the acquisition of portraits, the evidence also indicates that in most cases the impetus for the portraits at the university came from the individual not the university as a body, no matter how important the individual was in the history of the university. The fact that there is no painted portrait at the university of the first provost, Edward Hamilton, is revealing. The only representation of Hamilton in the University Collection is a drawing, a copy after George Richmond (1809-1896) which was given to the university in 1912 by Hamilton's family. 63 Hamilton had no need to bolster his reputation with a portrait, as he held a secure position in society in the colony, (which he left in 1855) and in England. 64 If there had been an official university policy to honour university personalities with a portrait, surely a more imposing representation of Professor John Smith, first professor of chemistry and experimental physics, than the small black bust of him at the university, would have been more appropriate. The only known portrait of Smith, painted by A. Reid (1844-1908) of Aberdeen, c. 1885 was commissioned by the Royal Society and is held by the Mitchell Library. Similarly there was no portrait of Professor Morris B. Pell, first professor of mathematics and natural philosophy, until the omission was rectified by his family as late as 1957. Dr. Henry Grattan Douglass is acknowledged by contemporaries to have initiated the idea for the establishment of the university, but there is no official portrait of him, either, at the university. A small personal keepsake, in the form of an oval miniature painting, is the only known depiction of him. 65
The absence of portraits of Edward Hamilton and other important figures in the development of the university, confirms the argument that it was not the university or senate as a body which was interested in establishing a portrait tradition. Rather, it was individuals who were associated with the university, ambitious to see themselves linked with a major institution. Such individuals were not interested in the aesthetic dimension of the work, but were, in fact anxious to capitalize on the prestige of having their own image in the impressive, and potentially historic Great Hall. Furthermore, some of these individuals hoped to reap the additional social advantage accruing from 'going abroad' to have their portrait painted, thus being identified with the class of person who would have their portrait painted and hung at the Royal Academy in England.

In summary, the reasons for the desire to have a series of portraits at the university are diverse. The most obvious was the desire to reinforce the instant historical tradition bestowed upon the university through the Gothic-style Great Hall. Portraits of great men displayed in the hall were meant to remind viewers of the traditions of the 'great old universities' of the mother country, thus adding one more link in the chain which bound the university to Britain. It was not only the portrait tradition of the mother country which was the model, but also portrait collections of other important public institutions in the colony, for instance Government House, whose collection was rivalled by the collection of portraits at the university after a few years. Because the official portraits represent status and satisfied a desire to be commemorated in history as an important person, public testimonials in the colony sometimes resulted in a portrait, whose donors wished to see the painting placed in the university hall. As a result of this fashion, the burgeoning collection at the university was expanded, but the custom was not without advantage to the sitters as the portraits in the Great Hall provided prestige in the colony and in some cases also in England. The early acquisition of a portrait from the Sydney College may have prompted individuals connected with the university to assemble portraits in the Great Hall. There was no official acquisition policy, however, and most of the portraits were the result of individuals' own efforts and not a consequence of official university initiative.
How were these portraits at the university commissioned and what were the difficulties encountered? The portraits which hung at the university, although given the status of an official public portrait by placement in the Great Hall, were for the most part not commissioned by the university, but by the sitters themselves, sometimes with funds raised by a public testimonial and sometimes paid for out of their own pocket. As mentioned previously, some testimonial fund committees gave specific instructions for hanging the finished work, but they also in some instances specified the nationality of the artist to be commissioned. In 1860, the committee which failed to raise sufficient funds for James Macarthur's portrait, nevertheless directed that the moneys raised from the testimonial to Macarthur be 'employed in obtaining Mr. Macarthur's portrait by some eminent artist in London'. 66

Apparently similar directions were attached to the public subscription for Sir Charles Nicholson's portrait, over which there was some controversy. The Fine Arts column of the Sydney Morning Herald suggested that once Marshall Claxton had departed from Sydney (in 1854) his 'mantle descended on a greater (portrait painter) than himself' one Oswald Rose Campbell, whose portrait of Sir Charles Fitzroy was famous in the colony, although it did not hang at Government House. Therefore, the writer continued, there was 'no necessity of sending to England for an artist to produce a life-like representation' of Sir Charles Nicholson. Public opposition to that idea came from Professor John Woolley, a very close friend as well as colleague of Nicholson's; on the other hand the suggestion of a colonial commission was supported by Thomas Mort, Joseph Cox and others as well as the satirical columnist 'Peter Possum' who wrote that:

The portrait of a colonial statesman to be hung in the theatre of a colonial university ought surely to be painted by a colonial artist – even if only of average talent and attainments a fortiori by a gentleman of Mr. Campbell's genius and skill. 67

Such an argument seems logical and patriotic, but in considering the issue of commissioning the university portraits two aspects of the situation must be borne in mind. The first is that the hidden agenda, that is, the idea of hanging portraits in the Great Hall to further entrench the instant history and tradition imposed upon
the university, to bind it to the English system and to foster allegiance to the mother country, was not designed to assert the independence of the colony or the university. A portrait painted in England would surely serve this underlying purpose more effectively than one painted by even an eminent colonial portraitist.

Secondly, although there was the beginning of a tradition of public portraiture in the colony, the question arises as to whether there were, in fact, portrait painters with the skills necessary to produce the large official portraits required. By the 1850s, although there were a few well-known portrait painters operating in Sydney, in nearly every case there seemed to be some drawback. Charles Rhodius (1802–1860, arrived Sydney 1829, active until 1858) who painted a full-length oil portrait, Robert Campbell (Mitchell Library picture storage 538) and Joseph Backler (1813–1859) who executed many family portraits, were both ex-convicts. William Nicholas (1809–1854) painted a large portrait, Bishop William Grant Broughton (1843) but Nicholas worked only in watercolour. The official full-length portrait, Sir William Westbrooke Burton by William Griffith (arrived Sydney 1838, died 1870, active until 1850) was found to be 'deficient in both (drawing and effect)' by the Sydney Morning Herald critic. Although Richard Noble (arrived Sydney 1847 and left 1865) trained at the Royal Academy Schools, London and painted an official portrait, Robert Johnston (1865) showing the subject in naval uniform with a background of Sydney Heads, and also Mary Stewart (1855), Governor Fitzroy's daughter, which hangs at Government House, Parramatta among others, he left the colony in 1865. He is reputed to have had only one arm (not necessarily a drawback) but his portrait of Johnston is his only known full-length portrait and the portrait of the Hon. Mary is somewhat provocative. James Anderson, who arrived in Sydney in 1854 and who was suggested for the portrait of Governor Sir William Denison but failed to gain the commission, continued to produce portraits in the colony until 1872, but he was a confirmed alchoholic. The accomplished Henry Robinson Smith (active 1847–1854) is unknown after 1854. Conway Hart, (active 1853–1860s) the supposed painter of Sir Francis Forbes (signed only 'Hart!') only seems to have worked in Melbourne. Already mentioned is Oliver Rose Campbell (1820–1887).
Little is known of his portrait of Sir Charles Nicholson, although it was not executed for the university. Sir Charles must, however, have been relatively pleased with this portrait, for when he viewed it in the artist's studio he took the well-known owner of a famous picture collection, Mr. A.B. Spark, with him. 73 But by 1859 O.R. Campbell had moved down market, 'he begged to announce that he had lately added photography to his profession'. 74 Nicholson had his portrait for the university painted in England. Marshall Claxton was trained at the Royal Academy Schools and exhibited nine portraits and seventeen fancy pictures at the Royal Academy, London, before his arrival in the colony in 1850, moreover his patron was the Englishwoman, Baroness Coutts. Claxton was closely associated with the university for he had a studio at the Sydney College from 1850-1852. The university operated at the Sydney College from 1852 until 1857. Claxton designed the university's first seal and there is a portrait of a lady, dated c. 1852, in the University Collection, said to have been given by Sir Charles Nicholson. Claxton was a portrait painter of note in the colony, his subjects included Bishop William Grant Broughton (1852), Rev. William Cowper, both owned by St. Paul's College at the University of Sydney, Rev. Robert Forrest (1854) the headmaster of the King's School and the Chief Justice Sir Alfred Stephen (1860) as well as numerous private portraits. But Claxton left the colony in 1854, the year in which Nicholson was elected provost of the university. 75

The position in general is well illustrated by the controversy over the official portrait of Sir William Denison, finally executed in England by Richard Buckner. The proposed choice of Anderson was supported by Joseph Sheridan Moore, as mentioned above, whose claims were somewhat overstated it must be admitted. 'It makes no matter that we have Mr. James Anderson of a Scotch (sic) Society of Painters, and a student of and exhibitor at the Royal Academy, London, living amongst us. We cannot give him the order because he is here - we must send it "home to England"'. 76 In spite of support from the press for some colonial painters, it seems that the portrait painters working at the mid-century in Sydney were largely unacceptable because of convict origins, peripatetic
habit or lack of training, skill and experience in painting large portraits. All these factors would doubtless have detracted from the prestige of a locally painted portrait. For these and other reason stated earlier, most of the early portraits which were hung in the Great Hall of the university were not painted in the colony.

For a colonial gentleman who aspired to have his portrait painted in England, the selection and commissioning of an artist was an involved business. Either due to a restriction of funds or lack of contacts, the portraits of the founders of the university were generally not painted by Royal Academicians. Neither of these restrictions applied to Sir William Montague Manning, however. He commissioned Sir John Watson Gordon R.A., P.R.S.A. for his portrait which was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1859. Manning had been educated and practised law in London, and therefore may have had some contacts. To date no details of the commission have come to light. Although Watson Gordon was a Royal Academician he was not regarded as an outstanding portrait painter, either in his own lifetime or in retrospect. Richard Ormond remarks that the artist was one of a group of nineteenth-century painters who 'were capable of surprisingly good work, but their portraits lack the sense of grand design and painterly panache characteristic of their ancestors'. The opinion of the critic writing on one of Watson Gordon's portraits exhibited at the Royal Academy at the same time as the Manning portrait, was that 'it did not provide the painter with much to congratulate himself on'.

For a person who had never lived or worked in London, such as Sir Charles Nicholson, finding an artist for his portrait would have had its difficulties. Nicholson could have sought advice from Thomas Woolner, a regular exhibitor at the Royal Academy, and whom he had known well in Sydney. By 1859 Woolner was again in England. So was Marshall Claxton, but during the first few years of the existence of the university (1850-1854) Claxton had not received commissions from the university (the design of the seal was the result of a competition), therefore advice from him would hardly have been forthcoming. If Nicholson had wished to support a colonial artist working in London, he could have
sought out Robert Dowling. He had left Tasmania in 1857 and successfully exhibited at the Royal Academy in the 1860s and 1870s. His fine and imaginative portrait, Francis Ormond (c.1885) hangs at Ormond College, Melbourne University. Nicholson's close friend Adelaide Ironside had also left Sydney for England in 1855. Nicholson pursued a correspondence with Miss Ironside for a time, but her interest lay in the field of history painting and there is no evidence that she was ever consulted about portrait commissions, although through her friendship with Ruskin, Nicholson could have made contact with the art world. 

For his full-length portrait in the robes of chancellor, Nicholson chose to commission Henry Wyndham Phillips R.A. (1820-1868) the younger son and pupil of the eminent Victorian portraitist Thomas Phillips. Although H.W. Phillips' portrait of Sir Colin Campbell (first Baron Clyde, c. 1856, the suppressor of the Indian Mutiny) hangs in Glasgow City Art Gallery and a copy of the engraving by G. Zobel of 1856 is in the National Portrait Gallery, Phillips' work did not receive the acclaim of his father's portraits. His portraits exhibited at the Royal Academy between 1838 and 1868 include Charles Kean and Robert Stevenson. No doubt Nicholson had seen the portrait of Captain Hay by Thomas Phillips which was in Sydney in 1856 and which was described in glowing terms by the Sydney Morning Herald and was said to have cost 300 guineas. But the senior Phillips died in 1845, ten years before Nicholson needed his portrait for the Great Hall. It is likely that it was Sir Charles Nicholson's friend Sir James Clarke, the Court Physician who recommended H.W. Phillips, for Phillips' portrait of Clarke's colleague, the Physician-in-ordinary to Prince Albert and Queen Victoria, Sir Henry Holland, Bart. was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1857, when Nicholson was in England.

One of the main reasons for difficulty in commissioning portraits was a chronic shortage of money. The members of the university always wanted a first-class result at a bargain price. The commission for the portrait of the first Principal and Professor of Classics, the Rev. John Woolley illustrates the difficulties which Woolley and some others faced, and the trouble taken to obtain the right
results which it was felt could not be obtained in the colony. When
John Woolley left Sydney for England on 26 December 1864, he was
in a state of depression and concerned with the turn of events at
the university. Although Woolley felt threatened by his peers,
he was greatly loved by his students and kept up a correspondence
with his ex-student William Charles Windeyer. When Woolley was
short of money for his portrait, he wrote to Windeyer on 25 September
1865,

I am in a fix about the picture. If Sir A. Denison would
give me a small subscription instead of a munificent one
on ... (indecipherable) ... I could bring you a far finer
work of art for 100 pounds or certainly 120 pounds. [Sir
Charles has contributed 10 pounds]. I could get a first
class half length. Now A.D. is fig (fixed) on a full length
I must do it on the cheap and as a painting it will, I fear,
be inferior. I am applying to Woolner to advise me. I hope
our men know how truly I thank them. 86

Woolley's desperation is evident from the fact that he was relying
on Sir Alfred Denison for an extra subscription. By 1865 Denison's
direct association with the university had ceased although he had
been in the colony when his father was governor and had been an
original member of the university senate. 87 Alfred and Henry
Denison had bestowed £100 for one of the side windows in the Great
Hall. Denison was still, however, on friendly terms with former
colonial associates such as James Macarthur. 88 Alfred Denison,
in encouraging Woolley to have a 'full-length' was conversant with
the significance of scale in portraiture, as his father, whilst governor
of New South Wales had been painted in the colony by O.R. Campbell
and in England by Richard Buckner. Woolley's deference to Alfred
Denison's wishes implied that it was Denison whom Woolley hoped
would pay for the portrait.

The artist Woolley chose was William Menzies Tweedie, a relatively
minor painter, whose work was refused by the Royal Academy after
1874. There is no evidence to suggest that Woolley met Tweedie
through Thomas Woolner as he had hoped. Woolley's connection
with Tweedie probably came through the son of William Wilberforce,
Samuel Wilberforce, Dean of Westminster in 1845 and Bishop of Oxford
from 1845-1869, whose portrait by Tweedie was exhibited at the
Royal Academy in 1863. 89 It is very likely that Woolley saw
this portrait on his return to England, for his great friend at Oxford had been Dean Arthur Penryn Stanley, a fellow of University College, Oxford, who was appointed Dean of Westminster in 1883 whilst Samual Wilberforce was Bishop of Oxford. Therefore it could be surmised that Woolley received advice regarding his portrait, not from Woolner, but from his colleagues in the church.

But even after Tweedie had been commissioned, Woolley's troubles continued. 'My picture is to cost £150/8/- or £157/10/-', he wrote to Windeyer, 'I have £150 and ... am willing enough to pay the £7/10/- balance. But that doesn't include frame and cost of transport ... Nicholson intended to canvas our ... Australian ... but (he was) now canvassing for Merewether's picture, therefore I cannot disturb him.' Woolley named seven other men whom he suggested that Windeyer might canvas for him, but added 'don't do this if you don't fancy it. The picture would only have to stay, til I can afford the frame, at the studio'. Nicholson, the driving force behind the portraits, contributed the balance, even though he was by then living permanently in England.

The problems encountered by Woolley indicate the parsimonious attitude of the supporters of the university and of the university itself in relation to works of art. They wanted the most prestigious - Sir Arthur Denison was fixed on a full-length and Woolley himself was anxious that the portrait be considered a 'work of art', but Woolley could not afford it, and the others were not prepared to pay for it. The portrait was actually cheap. If Woolner had advised Woolley he may have suggested his Pre-Raphaelite colleague John Everett Millais, whose full-length portrait of John Ruskin (1854) cost £350, more than twice the sum available to Woolley. By the 1860s, paintings by Millais were selling for as much as £1000.

Other sitters also suffered from insufficiency of funds. The Plate 12 shortfall in the subscription for James Macarthur's portrait was due to unrealistic expectations of members of the testimonial committee and possibly fewer donors contributing than had been expected, for the committee specified that 'the subscription be limited to one or two guineas - the latter sum entitling each subscriber to
a proof impression of a steel engraving to be executed from the painting'. Seventy-five donors gave one guinea and two gave two guineas, totalling £82/19/-, an inadequate sum for a portrait, let alone a steel engraving, no evidence of which has been found. The portrait is listed in the University of Sydney Calendar of 1885 as given by the sitter, no mention of public subscription appears. Macarthur did not commission an 'eminent artist in London', but an Italian painter in Rome. There are several possible reasons, the first being that traditionally portraits by Italian artists were cheaper than those by English artists. The price was not insignificant considering the shortage of contributed funds, for although Macarthur was not poor, he was not as rich as he had thought and by 1863 he had decided not to remain in England permanently but to return to Sydney to live, partly because of the high cost of living in the mother country. An indication that price was indeed a consideration can be seen from the fact that Macarthur's portrait is a three-quarter length, which was cheaper than a full-length such as the portraits of the other founders of the university. Secondly, the choice of an Italian painter may have been influenced by Macarthur's youthful tour of Europe which included Italy.

The artist whom Macarthur commissioned in 1863 was Alessandro Capalti (1810-1866) of Rome, a history painter who also specialised in portraits of the society matrons of Rome such as La Princesse Gwendoline Borghese, and Adelaide Ristori. He exhibited at the Royal Academy, London, between 1851-1858. Once Macarthur had decided upon an Italian artist he was probably attracted to Capalti because of his impressive three-quarter length portrait of the Colonial Secretary, Edward Deas Thomson of 1855. This portrait, now owned by the Mitchell Library, Sydney, was a great success, not only in New South Wales, but also in Rome, where it was exhibited and described as a portrait 'worthy of van Dyck, a perfect work', but the critic added gratuitously, 'it is a misfortune that this picture should be destined for Australia, a country which up to now has not learned to value fine arts.' Macarthur would doubtless have seen and admired this portrait on its arrival in the colony.
While Macarthur probably chose an Italian for reasons of economy, the Colonial Secretary, Deas Thomson seems to have had no difficulty in commissioning his own portrait for the university. He was one of the most frequently painted members of colonial society, probably due to his high office and the respect in which he was held in the colony. When he became chancellor of the university in 1865, the portrait which had been borrowed from the Sydney Chamber of Commerce by Nicholson must have been thought inadequate. Another portrait was commissioned and paid for by public subscription. 101 Again Capalti was the artist commissioned, but this portrait was a full-length, bigger than those of Sir Charles and the Rev. Woolley, but similar in dimensions to Sir William Montague Manning. Although there are a number of portraits of Deas Thomson, this is the only full-length, 102 which is an indication of the importance of the hanging site as well as the pretensions of the sitter.

Perhaps because of his public position Deas Thomson did not have any difficulty in raising funds. The first Capalti portrait of 1855 was paid for with a proportion of the testimonial funds raised for him before his departure from the colony on a tour of Europe in 1854. 103 In 1857 he was again canvassing for subscriptions for a portrait to be placed in the Legislative Council, although he did not wish it to replace that of Sir Charles Nicholson. Was there some rivalry in the matter of portraits? 104 It cannot be argued that Deas Thomson commissioned an Italian because of shortage of funds, but perhaps he had a naturally frugal nature. He did not engage in a lavish life style in Sydney. On his tour of Europe in 1854 he visited Italian art museums, and this may have inspired him to commission an Italian artist for his first portrait. 105

In view of the critical acclaim of the first portrait it is not surprising that the full-length for the university was commissioned from the same artist.

It was the exception rather than the rule when nineteenth-century official portraits in the University Collection were commissioned in New South Wales. This was the case with only two of the official portraits, Rev. Charles Badham D.D. (1875) (the subject was the second professor of classics and logic from 1887-1883) and
Rev. Canon Allwood (no date), the vice-chancellor from 1867-1883. Both portraits were painted in Sydney by Giulio Anivitti. In a succession of official nineteenth-century portraits painted overseas, these two portraits interrupted the established tradition, which, however, returned to the overseas pattern with the portrait of William Charles Windeyer (not dated) by the English artist Arthur J. Foster. All the same the tradition of overseas patronage was never subsequently as strong as it had been before the portrait of Badham.

Why did Badham and Allwood break the pattern? Neither of these men appears to have had a strong attachment to the 'mother country', as did Nicholson, Wentworth and Merewether, and although both were Oxbridge graduates, each was partly educated outside England. Both men, like Woolley, were ordained priests of the Church of England, and therefore presumably, had more spiritual than commercial interests. Canon Allwood was born in Jamaica, then a British colony, and after gaining his degree at Cambridge, he returned to Jamaica and later emigrated to Sydney in 1839. Charles Badham was partly educated in Switzerland and after his study at Oxford he worked in Europe, forming life-long associations with European as well as English scholars. Therefore, neither of these men were likely to have a pressing need to present the image of the English gentleman whose residence in the colony was merely an interlude and not a life-long commitment. Nevertheless, both were willing to conform to the portrait tradition, which by the 1870s was well established at the university.

But apart from the loyalties and origins of these two men, there was a more cogent reason for them to have their portraits painted in Sydney. Both were original members of the New South Wales Academy of Art, founded in 1871. At the first conversazione of the academy, held on 7 August 1871, Professor Badham gave the inaugural address. After outlining his ideas of art and beauty, Badham called on the audience to support the academy and not to allow it to 'pine and perish under the shade of their indifference'. Badham's own sincerity would have been in doubt had he not
commissioned Giulio Anivitti, the first teacher of painting at the academy, when a public testimonial collected funds for his portrait.

Giulio Anivitti (1850-1881) was an Italian who trained at the Accademia di San Luca in Rome under Alessandro Capalti, the artist who painted portraits of Deas Thomson and James Macarthur. Anivitti emigrated to Brisbane with the sculptor Simonetti, then came to Sydney in 1874. From 1875 he taught at the New South Wales Academy of Art and acted as curator of the Academy's picture collection. Anivitti's portrait, Charles Badham, won a gold medal at the annual exhibition of the academy in 1875, and this, no doubt was the reason that Canon Allwood also commissioned Anivitti for his portrait. As a pupil of Capalti, Anivitti may have had connections with the university through Deas Thomson, who was chancellor when the portraits of Badham and Allwood were painted. A connection is indicated by the partly indecipherable paper label attached to the verso of the Badham portrait.

The examples of methods and difficulties of commissioning portraits examined so far represents the general trend in portrait commissions at the university. The early rejection of local colonial painters for a variety of reasons left the sitters with the task of finding and commissioning an artist overseas. Often this was difficult, and it was exacerbated in many cases by insufficient funds for a portrait which would meet the expectations of the contributors to the testimonial fund for the sitter. Nevertheless, the prestige of having a portrait painted overseas was some compensation. The parsimonious attitude of both the subscribers and the university may have been due to naivety, but more likely it was a case of on the one hand wanting a temple of worthies but on the other hand not wanting to put up the money, either from ignorance or meanness. The arrival of Giulio Anivitti in the colony provided an opportunity to commission an artist trained overseas in the conventions of the public portrait but working in the colony. The success of Anivitti's portrait of Badham promoted confidence in colonial portrait painters. The practice of 'going abroad' to have a portrait painted was gradually eroded towards the end of the century. It was not until
Sir John Longstaff emerged as a society portrait painter that the custom of commissioning artists overseas for portraits at the university became obsolete.

The incidence of Australian commissions for portraits coincided with the rising nationalism of the 1890s as the colony anticipated federation. Although Australian artists were commissioned, it still remained the province of the individual to arrange for portraits to be painted and presented to the university. Thus Percy Spence’s Mr. Justice R.E. O’Connor (1892) who was a fellow of Senate from 1891–1892 was presented to the university by his wife. Spence’s Sir Philip Sydney Jones (1885), vice-chancellor, was presented to the university by members of the medical profession. Alfred Paxton Backhouse (1900), another vice-chancellor, was painted by Sir John Longstaff, and this portrait, painted at the turn of the century, introduced an extended period of patronage of Australian portrait painters of high standing, who were regularly commissioned throughout the twentieth century. These include many works by Longstaff, Walter Bowring and Sir William Dargie, as well as portraits by Louis Kahan, William Dobell, Clifton Pugh and Guy Warren to name only a few. The first woman to receive a commission for a university portrait was Ethel Stephens (1880?–1944). She painted her father, Professor W.J. Stephens (1829–1890), not dated, and others, John Henry Challis (no date), and Sir Normand MacLaurin (1911). In the twentieth century the eminent Archibald Prize winner, Judy Cassab has been commissioned several times.

What were the stylistic conventions followed in the portraits in the Great Hall? Did they have anything in common with the accepted conventions of the official public portrait in which likeness is often subservient to the portrayal of an idealised version of the sitter, which at times conveys more about the office than the man? Was the portrait collection really like collections in the old institutions of the mother country? Should the portraits be considered as works of art, agents of social advancement or historical documents? And finally how were they received by the sitters themselves and by the public?
There is no doubt that Sir Charles Nicholson's portrait was intended for a large public hall, its grandiose scale precludes its display elsewhere. Nicholson's portrait is extremely formal, betraying no element of personal taste or individuality. The full-length side-on pose with drape, chair and table is a stock pattern, but one which is used more often in the eighteenth century than the nineteenth century, for example Sir Joshua Reynolds' Hon. Charles Townsend (1767). In contrast, George Richmond's portrait, Thomas Worsley (c.1840), vice-chancellor of Cambridge University, is a much more informal presentation of a seven-eighths length seated figure, wearing an academic gown, not vice-chancellor's robes, and casually holding his mortar board at an angle on his knee, quizzically addressing the viewer with a direct gaze. But Nicholson stands, looking down on the viewer, elevated and distanced by a strip of red carpet, with the light falling from right to left upon the gold braid of the chancellor's robes and the silver of the mace.

A subtle contradiction may be found, however, in his resolute but not elegant stance, the proud bearing but the slight inclination of the head, the modest smile, but distanced gaze. For aesthetic reasons the nose is straightened and the large ears disguised, as shown by comparison with the photograph of Nicholson held in University of Sydney archives. There are no accessories which could date this work, the drape, table cloth and chair are subdued and plain to achieve this end, but also to focus attention upon the chancellor's robes. This portrait appears to be a somewhat idealised likeness of Nicholson. It is the chancellor's robe which confronts the viewer rather than the man himself, as the painting essentially portrays the office not the man. In commissioning an English artist whose work was hung at the Royal Academy, Nicholson obviously wanted a result that had a certain credibility as a work of art, but above all the work was intended to bear historical significance for the university.

The portrait of Professor John Woolley also conforms to requirements of official portraiture in scale, although this portrait reveals some of the personal characteristics of the sitter. The most striking feature of Woolley's portrait is the Neo-gothic accessories. Woolley is posed against Gothic panelling which could have been designed
by Pugin for a pulpit. The distinctly church-like atmosphere created by this 'pointed or Christian' decoration is, however, a domestic interior in which the languidly posed figure casually rests an elbow on a mantelpiece decorated with Gothic carving above a fireplace surrounded by a Gothic fender. The brilliant crimson academic gown which contrasts with the black of the clothes worn by Woolley creates the focal point of the work, and yet in spite of this striking contrast of colour, the figure is inert, as if suffering from an enervating lack of vitality. Although Woolley had, on his departure from Sydney in 1864 been described as having 'eager vivid look, and gracious mien/ The general humanist, the special friend/ The Scholar, Patriot and brave divine', the drooping pose and strained expression indicate the depression from which Woolley suffered whilst he was in England. 113 The books shown in the portrait are a standard indication of scholarship, but the Gothic references however, relate directly to Woolley's personal taste, which is apparent from his very long and detailed lecture on Tennyson's *Idylls of the King*, delivered to the Darling Point Mutual Improvement Association on 18 December, 1860 and probably also to the Sydney Mechanics Institute. 114 The iconography of the portrait is also remarkably compatible with the interior of the Great Hall.

In the context of public portraiture this portrait is in some ways ambivalent. The dimensions and doctoral robes indicate a formal public portrait which was intended to place Woolley in the historical context of the foundation of the university. Yet the informal pose, in which Woolley gazes directly out, meeting the viewer at eye level, yet awkwardly cut off by the oddly placed chair, and the inclusion of accessories which relate to Woolley's personal preoccupations also reveal a sentient human being.

The public portraits at the university do not always portray the 'office'; some, such as Sir William Montague Manning represent power, indicated through the style of the painting. The main characteristic of this portrait is its immense size, commented upon earlier. The proportions are not life-like, the head is small in comparison to the body, but this adds to the impression of the height of the figure. The height is further accentuated by
the viewpoint from which the work is done, that is, from below
the level of the table. The red panel behind the upper part of
the figure also draws the eye upwards to the face as it is the only
brilliant colour in the work. The implication is that the painting
should be hung high, placing the subject in a commanding position
and enhancing the impression of grandeur. The low viewpoint was
also advantageous to the artist, as the best portraits were hung
high on the wall above head level at the Royal Academy. That
this theatrical effect in the Manning portrait was intentional can
be seen by comparison with another full-length portrait by Watson
Gordon The First Marquis of Dalhousie (c.1835) in which the
viewpoint is level with the subject's shoulder. This figure
stands casually with feet apart and head slightly cocked, a direct
gaze and indicating with his right hand his robes of office. The
effect is one of arrogance, but not of the command and control
exhibited in the Manning portrait. The figure of Manning is shown
with feet modestly and formally together in a position of attention.
The black frock coat and black bow tie are only relieved by a white
shirt with high collar and a slim, undecorated watch chain, the
typical mid-century dress of a conservative bourgeois gentleman,
correctly outfitted for his profession of the law, a figure of stability
and assurance. In spite of the audacity shown in the commission
of such a huge painting, mentioned earlier, the self assurance of
this subject allowed for a certain modesty, for the portrait was the
result of a public subscription on the occasion of Manning's
knighthood, and yet there is no indication of the imperial honours
he had won. The viewer does not meet with any bold confrontation
in the gaze of the sitter, which is directed out and over the right
shoulder. As the torso faces left the impression is one of
uncomfortable stiffness and aloofness. The expression on the face
is serious and withdrawn as if engaged in deep thought. The
power of this portrait resides in the scale of the commanding,
centrally placed figure. Although the portrait is not an outstanding
example of Sir John Watson Gordon's work, nevertheless, the painter
obviously understood how to convey the dignity and commanding
presence of the sitter. This portrait is a celebration of the
individual and an instrument of power.
Less compelling in its evocation of power is Capalti's Deas Thomson. Again the standard black suit is shown, but Deas Thomson wears on the left breast his Companion of the Bath decoration which he received in 1856. Attention is drawn to this by the self-consciously placed left hand on the hip, directly below the medal, thus creating a light-toned area surrounded by the black and drawing the eye to that side of the work. This was a stock pose, frequently used in the eighteenth century by Sir Joshua Reynolds and his colleagues. In the Deas Thomson portrait, details such as the florid carpet and the disturbing contrast of the red drape and the green tablecloth distract attention from the figure, and contribute to a less successful evocation of power than is seen in the austere figure of Manning. Although there is undoubted skill shown in the arrangement of the Manning portrait, in both these works the artists have concentrated upon projecting the powerful individual rather than on any effort towards artistic innovation.

James Macarthur could be compared to both the above-mentioned works. Again this portrait denotes the individual, rather than the office, but it is an image of conservative respectability rather than an evocation of power. This extremely formal work shows Macarthur as a cultivated aristocratic gentleman with absolutely no reference to his colonial birthplace, his association with the university as a member of the first senate, or his occupations of pastoralist and politician. The execution of the painting is technically very competent, but the style is conservative, devices such as the ionic column, the hand on the book, the tablecloth and matching drape framing the figure had all been repeated endlessly and with more imagination in the eighteenth century by Pompeo Batoni.

At the university the convention of the very formal and conservative style of public portrait was firmly established by the 1890s when Lady Windeyer gave the portrait of her husband, William Charles Windeyer (c. 1887) by the English artist A.J. Foster, showing the subject formally posed in the robes of his public office of Chief Justice. Lady Windeyer could presumably have chosen instead Tom Roberts' Windeyer (1892) which is not so formal in style. The comparative lack of formality may have been the reason that the Roberts was not given; on the other hand, ironically, it may have
been considered that a work by the English painter A.J. Foster (now largely forgotten) was more prestigious.

Could it be said that the university portraits painted in the colony differ substantially from those executed overseas? The portraits of Badham and Allwood are equal or superior in style and execution to the portraits painted overseas. But although skilfully painted, and in Badham exhibiting considerable flair, both are extremely conservative. In the Rev. Charles Badham, Anivitti found a subject whose appearance and style he could easily adapt to the Italian Renaissance tradition of portraiture within which he appeared to work. The Italian Renaissance scholar Paolo Lomazzo codified in 1584 the correct pose for a man of honour, as one in which the 'honourable personage' should 'rest himself without moving ... carry his body upright with his face more upright than downwards, bear the parts of his body afar off one from the other ... stretching forth his right hand with a kind of magnificency ...'. 119 Badham was a distinguished orator, therefore the oratorical gesture of the hand with the open palm was appropriate. It was appropriate also in terms of Badham's religious and teaching vocations, as the gesture derives from the language of signs developed in the fifteenth century by the Benedictines, and denotes demonstration. 120 Physically, Badham's domed head, flowing white beard and aquiline features could be compared with Donatello's St. Mark or to the prophets from Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel ceiling. The flowing academic robes with hood arranged asymmetrically over the right shoulder also have a neoclassical connotation. The mace, in the place of honour to Badham's right, signifies authority, as in the portrait of Nicholson.

Although in a poorer state of repair, due to overcleaning early in the century, the portrait of Canon Allwood is also distinctive. The stock pose has a neoclassical background similar to Capallii's James Macarthur but here there appears in the distance a building which could be the university. The formal three-quarter length seated pose shows the Canon partly cut off from the viewer by the architectural construction on which his hand rests. The background drape is not as flamboyantly composed as in the Badham, allowing the interest to centre on the stylised folds of the cassock, which
call to mind the fluted column of Roman architecture, thus creating a static pose, the stillness of which accords with the direct gaze of the sitter.

Other public portraits at the university painted in New South Wales later in the nineteenth century cannot be distinguished from earlier portraits in the collection painted overseas, and lack the panache of the Anivittis. Percy Spence's Mr. Justice R.E. O'Connor (1892) is academic and stiff, although his Sir Philip Sydney Jones (1895) seen in three quarter view shows a little more imagination. Ethel Stephen's Sir Normand MacLaurin (1911) a half-length study of a man in the robes of vice-chancellor includes no accessories and is quite similar to the plain presentation of the Merewether portrait (c.1878 unknown English artist). It conforms to requirements of the public portrait in its essentials but is modest in size and straightforward in style. Nevertheless in the early twentieth century a more distinctive style of portraiture emerged in the university portraits, for instance Sir John Longstaff's Professor John Irvine Hunter (1929) includes Australian landscape details in the background.

The nineteenth-century portraits at the university are on the whole stiff, formal and very conservative in style. While it could not be said that the nineteenth-century portrait collection at Cambridge University is exactly avant-garde, portraits in that collection by George Richmond, Holman Hunt and George Frederick Watts for example, are far more relaxed and imaginative in pose and confident in execution than most of the portraits at Sydney. Even the Cambridge portraits, however, appear conservative in comparison with portraits by French artists of the same era, for example Edgar Degas' Portrait of Durante in the Burrell Collection, (Glasgow Museum and Art Gallery) although the Degas work does not quite fit the category of 'official portrait'.

How were these portraits received by the critics and the sitters themselves? On the whole there was little critical acclaim for the
portraits under discussion, which is not surprising as their primary function was other than artistic. The Phillips portrait of Nicholson was described as 'well-known, large and much admired' but this was in the context of a report on the Great Hall. In university records it was described in similar terms. Not everyone in the colony was of a similar opinion, however, for the poet Charles Harpur wrote an ironic inscription for the portrait:

The semblance of a senatorial spirit
Whose bright claims even Envy could not smother;
So deep his genius, and so large his merit,
That none could fathom one or measure 'tither:
And being thus untestable they led
Most men to hold them but attributed.

Woolley's portrait was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1866 with the caption 'The Rev. Dr. John Woolley, late principal of the University of Sydney. Painted for the students of the University a few weeks previous to his sailing for Australia in the unfortunate steamship London'. Woolley himself had been satisfied; 'I think it is a good one (portrait)', he wrote to Windoyer, 'a flattering likeness and a good piece of art'. Nicholson was prepared to be more critical, 'I have not yet seen the picture ... from what I hear I rather fear that whilst it may have some merit as a work of art, it will not be successful as a likeness', he wrote. Obviously both Nicholson and Woolley required both a likeness and a work of art. The reception of Woolley's portrait by one journalist on its arrival in Sydney was non-committal. 'A testimonial portrait, painted by one of the first English artists, has just arrived in Sydney, and the occasion is therefore opportune for presenting the accompanying engraving of the lamented Dr. Woolley. The portrait just arrived in Sydney is the result of public subscription.' Despite the somewhat laconic comment, the fact that the portrait was mentioned at all in the local press is an indication of its importance in the colony at the time, although the interest was also inspired by the drama of Woolley's death by drowning. Merewether was also pleased with his portrait, his friends in England admired it, said it was a good likeness and a good painting. The few imperfections were corrected before it left the artist's studio according to Merewether, whose rather smug description of the painting omitted the name of the artist.
The first university portrait commissioned in the colony was the most successful as a work of art in the eyes of the local critics. As mentioned previously at the annual exhibition of the New South Wales Academy in 1872 at Clark's Assembly Rooms, Elizabeth Street, Sydney, Anivitti won a gold medal for his portrait of Professor Badham. The *Sydney Morning Herald* critic wrote that the exhibition as a whole was 'decidedly the most attractive exhibition the society has yet been able to produce ... the number of exhibits (was) greater and on the whole, they (were) of a higher order of merit'. 131 Sadly there was no mention of Anivitti, but the review of the Intercolonial Exhibition, 1875 in which the portrait won the prize for portraiture described the Badham portrait as 'the most noticed and admired; it is indeed an admirable picture and conveys a pleasing idea of the learned and eloquent original although some of the drapery is rather stiff'. 132

Public critical acclaim would no doubt have contributed to the prestige of these portraits, but siting them in the Great Hall provided a more widely recognised distinction in the eyes of the general public than would have been gained from critical reviews read by a limited proportion of the community. At the same time these stylistically conservative but nonetheless impressive (in the eyes of many colonials) formal portraits conferred on the Great Hall a semblance of tradition in emulation of institutions of the mother country.

Before the conclusion of this chapter it must be noted that there is a disturbing lack of any official portraits of women in the University Collection. The only nineteenth-century portraits of women are Mrs. Blacket and Mrs. Woolley, both domestic portraits donated by their descendants. The twentieth century has seen little improvement, there are only four portraits of women, plus one very recently given by a donor who noted the dearth at the University Exhibition of 1988. 133 The lack of nineteenth-century portraits of women relates to the fact that no women held official positions at the university in the nineteenth century. The closest in style and size to a nineteenth-century official portrait of a woman is Tremayne Lark's *Miss Fairfax* (no date), Hon. Secretary of the Ladies' Committee formed to raise money for the Women's College.
This portrait is not part of the University Collection though, it belongs to Women's College, University of Sydney.

Thus, in conclusion, it is apparent that there was no coherent policy in regard to patronage espoused by the university as a body towards commissioning official portraits in the nineteenth century. Nevertheless a coherent pattern emerged, but what prevailed was largely the taste of individuals associated with the university, and their style of patronage was conservative in the extreme. The emphasis was on recognisable representation of an individual, which entailed an image of respectability and power in all but a few cases. Except towards the last decade of the century, artists working in the colony were not considered appropriate. Other institutions with collections of portraits followed a similar pattern of overseas patronage, but this was in contrast with the policy of the Art Gallery of New South Wales, which began purchasing Australian work as early as 1889. This highlights the ambivalent status of the portrait, for in many cases its importance was not seen in terms of art, but in relation to social issues. The Art Gallery was collecting art for art's sake, but other institutions like the university saw the portrait, not in relation to art, but as contributing to an historical tradition, as well as the above-mentioned social function. Thus the portrait was regarded not only as a likeness, but also as a commodity, which when purchased was expected to produce certain desired effects, beneficial, in the case of the university portraits to both the institution and the individual.
Chapter III

Portrait Busts and Statues

The portrait busts and statues at the university have a similar raison d'être to that of the painted portraits. A representative selection of the official portrait sculpture at the university will be discussed in the following chapter. Benedict Read's Victorian Sculpture (1982) provides a scholarly source of background material and context for this study of the nineteenth-century busts and statues in the University Collection. Examples have been chosen from a general collection of sculpture at the University of Sydney which represents a history in miniature of sculpture in New South Wales for the period addressed in this thesis. The collection includes early sculpture made in the colony, such as the bust by Charles Abrahams William Windeyer (1844). Abrahams was active in New South Wales in the 1840s and is said to be the first sculptor in the colony. There are also statues and casts which were brought into the colony, for example William Beynes' (1795-1862) Helenus Scott (1828) and William Grinsell Nichol's Captain Cook. Casts of the Elgin marbles and busts of Queen Elizabeth I, Mary Queen of Scots, Lorenzo de' Medici and Shakespeare were given by William Long in 1859, one year before Sir Charles Nicholson gave his collection of antiquities. These donations have not been acknowledged in university history, probably because of Long's convict forebears. There are numerous plaster busts of famous medical men but little has been discovered about them. except that they were given by a number of individual members of the medical profession to embellish the Anderson Stuart building. In the collection there is also some sculpture of Italian origin but the majority of the sculptures were executed in the colony by sculptors who include Thomas Woolner, Archille Simonetti, Tommaso Sani, Emile Leysalle and James White, none of whom were Australian-born. Australia's most famous native-born nineteenth-century sculptor, Bertram Mackennal, is represented by the Peter Nichol Russell Memorial and two other smaller works. Women sculptors have a small representation from Dora Ohlfsen (1867-1948). The following discussion will, however, concentrate on sculpture representing official personages, dating from 1854 to 1894.
In comparison with the painted portraits, the collection of official portrait sculpture at the university is small. Obviously a marked preference for paintings is indicated. As previously noted, the majority of painted portraits were executed by English artists, and were often private commissions, or at least the results of the individual sitter's own efforts and taste. Most of the sculpture, on the other hand, was the result of public or university funded commissions, which included specific instructions to the sculptor, as in the case of the Challis statue. While a majority of the university sculptures were executed in New South Wales, those produced overseas were not commissioned in England, like a number of the portraits, but were produced in Italy. This was even the case with the Wentworth statue, although judges had been appointed in London to decide upon a sculptor. Therefore, it was the English fashion only, for displaying commemorative statuary, particularly in relation to Oxford and Cambridge, which was followed at the university. Yet in view of the English associations of the Great Hall and the works of art procured for its decoration together with the increasing production of portrait busts and commemorative statues in England in the mid-nineteenth century it is surprising that no busts or statues were commissioned in England. Paradoxically there are marked Italian and French influences found in the sculpture to be discussed. Although the university did commission some of the sculpture, once again there was no articulated policy in this regard.

Regardless of where the sculptures were commissioned, as mentioned, it was the English fashion for commemorative sculpture which was emulated at the university. Therefore the following brief survey of the position of English sculpture in the mid-nineteenth century will provide a context for the sculpture commissioned for the university. The escalating popularity of the portrait bust and statue in England was in part the result of the neoclassical movement and the many antique prototypes which were available, as well as the influence of artists such as Flaxman. The cult of the hero, which was directly related to the Napoleonic wars, the death of the Prince Consort and the rebuilding and decoration of the Houses of Parliament also created a demand for public portrait sculpture. Among other public institutions, Oxford and Cambridge Universities
were prominent patrons of sculpture; their collections include representations of famous scientists, academics and patrons. 4

Nevertheless, British sculpture was not highly regarded by serious critics in the nineteenth century. According to William Michael Rossetti, British sculpture was poor. 5 Ruskin was silent on the subject and the Royal Academy did little to encourage sculpture. 6 Moreover, English sculptors had difficulties in procuring suitable faultless marble, which was not obtainable in England. Marble was often imported from Carrara at considerable expense, a life-size piece cost £100 in 1849 and importation was slow due to shipping delays and strikes. 7 Therefore, although the portrait bust and statue were popular in England, there were difficulties associated with production. In spite of these drawbacks 'more money than ever, it is credibly stated, is now in the course of expenditure upon marble chipping and smoothing', wrote Palgrave in 1866. 8

Was there a preference in England for European, rather than English sculptors? If so, were the individuals responsible for commissioning sculpture for the university following a trend? It is difficult to know without pursuing a detailed study of commissions for sculpture in England, but from the evidence available it seems unlikely. In London, the most visible nineteenth-century sculpture by an Italian was Baron Marochetti's Richard Coeur de Lion (1851) which was exhibited at the Great Exhibition and then placed before the Houses of Parliament. Yet Marochetti was not universally popular with English critics or sculptors, and was said to have gained commissions through his friendship with Prince Albert. 9 The French thought their own sculptors were superior to the best nineteenth-century Italians, such as Bartolini and Tenerani. 10 But there was little interest in French sculpture in England until the advent of naturalism in English sculpture, when French sculptors such as Carpeaux began exhibiting at the Royal Academy from the beginning of the 1870s. 11 Art auction records indicate that apart from Canova (died 1822) and occasionally Thorvaldsen and Hyram Power, the most popular nineteenth-century sculptors on the English art market were English. 12 In summary, there is no indication that the English preferred European sculptors and therefore it cannot be argued
that the university followed an English trend when Deas Thomson, Wentworth and Peter Nicol Russell commissioned Italian sculptors to immortalise them in marble. Yet the significance of these three commissions should not be over-rated as these were the only sculptures commissioned for the university in Italy and their commissioning may have been partly due to expediency.

In the colony before the 1860s, however, if a colonial commission had been desired, there was Charles Abrahams, a product of the English and French Academies. He arrived in Sydney in the 1840s and took advantage of the discovery of marble on the Abercrombie River in New South Wales in 1842. Abrahams held exhibitions of portrait busts in Sydney in February and October 1845 and in 1846 he showed twenty-one portrait busts. Included in the 1845 exhibits were busts of Charles Windeyer, Dr. (later Sir Charles) Nicholson and the Hon. and Mrs. Deas Thomson. Another possibility was the English sculptor William Grinsell Nicholl, who arrived in the colony in 1851. He also had studied at the Royal Academy schools, probably under Flaxman, and had been employed at the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. In Sydney Nicholl opened a Sculpture Gallery in Dowling St. Woollahoomooloo. Nicholl's Governor Gipps (1849) is included in the University Collection, but has never been accorded the official status of display in the Great Hall. The Nicholl statue of Captain Cook which stood in the Great Hall at the university for forty years was not admired by the critics. Apart from Abrahams' Charles Windeyer and Nicholl's Governor Gipps which the university acquired by donation, the first commissions for sculpture for the university were from European sculptors.

How were the commissions for the works to be discussed negotiated? Deas Thomson commissioned Odoardo Fantacchiotti of Florence (1809-1877) for his bust of 1855, while Thomson and his family were taking a Grand Tour of the continent. Fantocchiotti was born in Rome and died in Florence. According to Benezit his reputation gained him admission to many academies, although he is not widely known today. He is represented by a monument to the engraver Raphael Morghen in the church of Santa Croce, Florence; in the Turin Museum and in Cincinnatti, U.S.A. As affirmed on the plinth of the bust, it was paid for by public
subscription. The bust was sculpted in Florence in the same year that Alessandro Capalti of Rome was commissioned by Deas Thomson for a portrait, referred to earlier. It was obviously convenient to have both bust and portrait executed whilst the busy colonial secretary was on holiday with his family in Italy. Deas Thomson was in England from 1854-56 and could therefore have commissioned an English sculptor, but whilst in England Deas Thomson was representing the colony in seeing the New South Wales Constitution Bill through the Imperial Parliament. Official matters took precedence over sculpture. As already noted Deas Thomson's bust was sculpted by Charles Abrahams in Sydney, but this later Italian work was commissioned specifically for the university and has always been exhibited prominently there.

plate 31 William Charles Wentworth, likewise, commissioned an Italian, Pietro Tenerani (1789-1869) of Rome for the full-length statue of 1861 which now stands in the Great Hall. This commission was the result of long deliberations. The committee to collect funds for the Wentworth statue was formed at a public meeting in Sydney on 19 December, 1853, the public subscription yielding £3000. The subscription committee comprised about eighty members, the most prominent at the top of the list being Wentworth's political colleague Sir Charles Nicholson, speaker of the Legislative Council, followed by members of the Select Committee to Draft the Constitution (of which Wentworth was chairman), H.G. Douglass, T.A. Murray, George McLeay and James Macarthur. Murray (known as Murray of the Monaro, a powerful landowner) moved that the testimonial should take the form of a statue, which, although unusual, according to Murray, had a precedent in Edward Bailey's Sir Richard Bourke. Murray also suggested that the statue, which Mr. Thomas Barker said should be of 'colossal proportions', might be appropriately erected before the proposed new parliament house (never built). Wentworth was gratified and agreed. Although it was the practice to assemble a large subscription committee, it was unusual to nominate the form of the testimonial before the sum raised was known. The Deas Thomson testimonial committee, which was collecting at the same time as the Wentworth committee, did not commit themselves to a bust until the total of the subscription was ascertained.
How was this proposed statue of colossal proportions commissioned? Soon after the Wentworth subscription committee was formed, Thomas Woolner, the Pre-Raphaelite sculptor then working in Sydney, wrote to his father announcing that he came here (Sydney) chiefly to try to get a statue of Wentworth the Sydney folks have been subscribing towards: they have already raised nearly three thousand pounds. I fear I have but little chance, tho' I am the only sculptor, they are afraid to give it to anyone whose name they are not familiar with. 

Woolner thought his rival was the English Edward Hodges Bailey R.A., whose life-size bronze, Sir Richard Bourke (1841) referred to by T.A. Murray, had been produced in England and unveiled in Sydney in April 1842. Bailey was also responsible for the Nelson statue in Trafalgar Square, London. Woolner hoped that because he had executed a successful portrait medallion of W.C. Wentworth (1854) the commission would be his:

I should have been quite sure of the statue, but one sharp and wise gentleman suggested that there was no reason I could do a statue because I had done a medallion, no matter how admirable: this notion frightened most of them and a few who fought for me were beaten: the consequence is they are going to appoint judges in London to decide upon a Sculptor.

It seems that neither the committee nor Wentworth wanted the work to be executed in Sydney or by a sculptor with colonial associations, even though Woolner was quite well-known in London. All the same his correspondence suggests that he was having difficulty in obtaining commissions when he left England in 1853, although his monument to William Wordsworth of 1851 at Grasmere received critical acclaim in the Spectator and his design for the Wordsworth national memorial was shown at the Royal Academy in 1852. In spite of Woolner's burgeoning reputation his relentless pursuit of the commission points to the difficulties and competition young sculptors faced when seeking a large commission. 'I must return to England', wrote Woolner, 'I make a great sacrifice in doing this (because he had established a reputation in Sydney) but the statue is £2000 commission and too good an opportunity to allow any chance to escape'. Although Woolner submitted a sketch for the statue, he wrote that he 'had but little hope as Wentworth knows nothing of art and
will not understand my sketch', implying that in London it was Wentworth who would decide upon the commission. 28 Ford Madox Brown, after meeting with Woolner in December, 1854 wrote in his diary: 'Poor Woolner, the lag has some idea of being done by some greater artist - and going down to posterity more beautiful'. 29

The appointment, by the New South Wales Wentworth committee, of judges in London not only shows colonial dependence on English taste but also indicates both a lack of confidence in their own (colonial) taste and ignorance of the conditions of the London art world. Once again New South Wales is seen as an extension of the motherland. But although Woolner claimed that judges were to be appointed in London, no references to them have been discovered to date. In Europe, Wentworth and his family led a peripatetic life and spent only five months living in London between 2 June 1854 when Wentworth arrived in London, and mid 1856. In the interim they lived in Brussels and Paris, whilst Wentworth travelled to London from time to time to attend to constitutional business for the colony with Deas Thomson. 30 Wentworth's relationship with any committee of judges in London set up to commission his statue would necessarily have been sporadic.

Wentworth seems to have assumed the responsibility of selecting a sculptor himself. He was in touch with the Italian sculptor Baron Carlo Marochetti who not only was responsible for the friezes on the Arc de Triomphe but as mentioned earlier for the Richard Coeur de Lion statue and who moved in Court circles. 31 Did Wentworth see himself as an Australian Coeur de Lion guarding the Australian Houses of Parliament? Wentworth also consulted Alexander Munro and then he invited John Gibson to accept the commission, but Gibson refused, 'saying his hands were too full of work'. 32 Thus Wentworth's first preference was for an English sculptor, but his efforts to commission an Englishman failed.

Finally Pietro Tenerani (1789-1869) was commissioned when there was no success with the English. He was a faithful pupil of Thorvaldsen and a leading Italian sculptor of his day. His studio was in Rome, but he had exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1846 and 1854 and at the French Salon of 1841, where his work was
criticised by Gautier for its simplicity. Wentworth went to Rome twice to sit for Tenerani, in 1858 and 1859. When in Rome, the Wentworth family visited Adelaide Ironside, whom they had known well in Sydney and Wentworth bought an Ironside painting. As Adelaide Ironside was on very good terms with the sculptor John Gibson who also had a studio in Rome and who had refused Wentworth's offer of a commission for his statue, it is tempting to speculate that it was Adelaide Ironside who assisted Wentworth in his search for a sculptor, and who may even have introduced him to Tenerani.

The commission for the bust of Peter Nicol Russell (1877) also went to an Italian sculptor, G. Benzoni of whom little is known in Australia. The bust was given to the university by Lady Russell and was probably originally commissioned for the family who lived in England from 1860. The circumstances of the commission are unknown, but Peter Nicol Russell's nephew John Peter Russell (1858-1930) was too young at the time of the commission to have had any influence in the choice of a sculptor. In any case he had not then embarked upon his distinguished career as an artist, which was financed by the Australian P.N. Russell iron foundry and engineering firm. The Russell family's association with Bertram Mackennal (1863-1931) to whom they gave financial assistance as well as patronage also occurred later than the commission of Benzoni. The link between Mackennal and the Russell family can be seen in the imposing Peter Nicol Russell Memorial monument which was also given to the university by Lady Russell to commemorate her husband, who had endowed the school of Engineering at the university with a gift of £50,000 in 1896.

All the other official portrait sculpture at the university was commissioned in Australia. Although Woolner was disappointed over the Wentworth statue, he received commissions for portrait medallions from Sir Charles Nicholson. Woolner met Nicholson upon his arrival in Sydney and through him met other members of Sydney society. Five medallions commissioned by Nicholson remain in the University Collection. They are profiles of Sir Charles Nicholson himself; Mr. Thomas Barker, donor of a substantial scholarship
of one thousand pounds in 1853, as well as one of the windows
of the Great Hall; Sir James Martin, Chief Justice and a member
of the university senate from 1858–78; W.C. Wentworth who presented
the bill to incorporate and endow the University of Sydney in the
Legislative Council, and Sir Charles Augustus Fitzroy, official visitor
to the university from 1850–55 also governor of the colony. In
1854 Woolner was paid twenty-five pounds for each medallion in the
colony, although as he wrote to his father 'in England they would
not give me twenty-five pence'.

The Charles Abrahams bust Charles Windeyer (1844) is included
in the collection because of his son W.C. Windeyer's prominent
role at the university; the commissioning of the bust obviously
had nothing to do with the university and the bust itself was not
received until the twentieth century. Apart from the Woolner
medallions the earliest bust of a university personage commissioned
in Australia is the posthumous bust Professor John Smith (1886)
by James White. Smith was the first Professor of Chemistry and
Experimental Physics at the university and a pioneer photographer.
Nothing is known of the commissioning or of how the bust came
to the university. It was executed a year after Smith's death,
the year in which his fellow Scot, James White arrived in the colony.
White had earlier worked as an anatomical modeller in the Surgeon's
Hall at Edinburgh University which provided a tenuous link with
the medical profession in Sydney. James White was also commissioned
in Sydney for the official portrait of another prominent medical figure
at the university Professor Thomas Peter Anderson Stuart (1894)
of which a slightly different version exists at the Prince Alfred
Hospital, with which Anderson Stuart was also associated.

There was no suggestion that the over-life-size memorial statue
John Henry Challis (1893) should be commissioned anywhere else
but in Sydney. When the estate of Challis was finalised and 'the
university ... (was) relieved from the claim which had been made
for duty on Australian assets ... out of the large amount saved
by this compromise an expenditure (was to) be authorized to a
sufficient sum for the erection of a marble statue in memory of Mr.
Challis'. There were two sculptors under consideration, Giovanni
Fontana and Archille Simonetti. Fontana's application for the
commission was supported by the Italian consul, as well as by Sir Arthur Renwick, a member of the university senate and later vice-chancellor (1889-91), who wrote, 'the Italian consul Dr. Murana is anxious that M. Fontana, sculptor, should have an opportunity of creating the statue of Challis for which funds have been voted by the university'. Fontana's bust Sir Henry Parkes is in the council chambers at Parkes, New South Wales, and his work was exhibited at the Melbourne Intercolonial Exhibition of 1888. Fontana offered to make the statue for $1000. This was a very modest sum in comparison with Wentworth's statue which cost about $2500 in 1861. Archille Simonetti's application, on the other hand was supported by Mr. Justice Peter Faucett, another member of senate, who 'strongly recommended Signor Simonetti', who would 'undertake the work at a very moderate cost.' Archille Simonetti (1838-1900) obtained the commission. He had arrived in Australia in 1871 and by 1888 was established as a leading sculptor in the colony. He was the instructor in sculpture at the New South Wales Academy of Art and was commissioned for the Governor Phillip Monument (1889-1897). Of more importance for his commissioning for the Challis statue was his work on St. John's College at the university, of which Mr. Peter Faucett was an early supporter.

In view of the enormous sum of $250,000 bequeathed by Challis the discussion of a cheap commission for the statue by the university chancellor, Sir William Manning, appears parsimonious to say the least. On the other hand, there was economic instability in the colony at that time, with falling wool prices and strikes in the pastoral industry leading up to the Great Depression of the early 1890s. Therefore money tenaciously fought for was not to be disposed of injudiciously. Manning had, through considerable personal effort, forestalled the Department of Inland Revenue in England in the matter of the Challis estate, as Challis had not lived in the colony for some years prior to his death in Europe. Nevertheless, the general attitude regarding payment for works of art at the university was one of stinginess, as observed in the discussion of the portrait commissions. Whilst an impressive result was required, there was almost always an unwillingness to spend an impressive amount of money.
Simonetti was also commissioned for the bust Sir Arthur Renwick (1892) in spite of Sir Arthur's earlier support for Fontana. Sir Arthur Renwick was both benefactor and vice-chancellor of the university (1889–91, 1900–02, 1906–08), but his bust, like many of the portraits, was commissioned by his family and was given to the university by Lady Renwick in 1912. The bust has since then been situated in the Great Hall.

While he was chancellor of the university a bust of Sir William Montague Manning was commissioned by the university from public subscription and university funds. The sculptor commissioned was a Frenchman then working in Sydney, Emile Leysalle (born Paris 1834, died ?). Little is known of Leysalle, but he arrived in Australia in 1892, and exhibited at the Art Society of New South Wales from 1893 to 1894. He is not known in Australia after 1899.

Once these sculptures had been commissioned the question of style arose. Is there any consistency in the style of the busts and statues at the university? How much control did the commissioner have over the sculptor? When installed at the university how were these sculptures received? Were they merely seen as institutional monuments or were any of them classed as works of art? The choice of sculptor was to some extent linked to the stylistic preference of the commissioner. All the same, some sculptors, such as James White, produced both classical-style and naturalistic busts for the university. White’s bust Anderson Stuart (1894) is an official work in a classical style, whilst the smaller posthumous bust, Professor John Smith (1886) is a naturalistic representation, and has never been considered important enough to be placed in the Great Hall, although it was located in the adjacent anteroom for some years.

Most of the works discussed were executed in a vaguely classical style, in which the shoulders of the subject are loosely draped in imitation of the Roman toga, a convention which was supposed to invest the subject with a veneer of nobility. Only the busts John Smith, Sir William Montague Manning and the statues Wentworth and Challis show the subjects in contemporary dress. Nevertheless, each of the sculptures under discussion combines elements of realism,
idealisation and verisimilitude to a greater of lesser extent, in a complex stylistic amalgam, typical of nineteenth-century sculpture in general.

Whilst neoclassical portrait sculpture had always retained certain elements of realism it characteristically exhibits a smooth surface. There was little attempt to work the stone to represent a naturalistic illusion of the surfaces such as the texture of skin, hair etc. 54 Most of the portrait sculpture at the university has the smooth, gleaming surface associated with classical sculpture, even in statues and busts which represent the subjects in contemporary clothing, thus in these works some elements of the classical type are combined with verisimilitude. Yet the portrait sculptures also contain elements of realism in that they are 'like' the subjects, but they are in most cases idealised representations, presenting for posterity what the sculptor saw as the 'essence' of the subject, thus combining the heroic with the quotidian. 55 The exceptions are the portrait medallions by the Pre-Raphaelite sculptor Thomas Woolner, and the bust of Sir William Montague Manning by the French sculptor Emile Leysalle, who specialised in painterly effects in sculpture. But again, whilst both Woolner and Leysalle created surface effects aimed at a naturalistic representation of the texture of skin, clothing etc. they also remained faithful to the basic laws of sculptural form based on classical ideals.

As Read has pointed out the principal aim of the neoclassic portrait bust was to present a timeless image worthy of eternity. 56 Ironically the use of the drape in the neoclassical busts at the university is almost as clear an indication of date as the contemporary dress, therefore the aim of timeless immortality is somewhat diluted. Although the draped bust was still quite popular in the 1860s in England, for instance Theed's Prince Albert (1862-3), critics of the day advised the use of the unclothed herm type which does not appear in the University Collection. 57 As the draped bust appears in the collection as late at 1894, however, again a retardataire taste is indicated on the part of those associated with the university.
Plate 39 Anderson Stuart and Sir Arthur Renwick, which are versions of the classical style, although each of these works bears a distinct likeness to the sitter. Such a combination is in direct contradiction to the prototype Roman bust, which was predicated upon the ideal, and even when characterisation crept in, this had more to do with type than with truth to nature, for instance, boxers were shown with coarse features. Thus, although of 'classical derivation' there is a contradiction between the neoclassical and the naturalistic in these busts at the university, for although some aspects of the ideal are employed, they all contain elements of likeness as mentioned above. The contradiction is exacerbated by details such as the emphatic side whiskers shown in Deas Thomson and Sir Arthur Renwick.

Plate 41 That this characteristic falls into the category of 'effectism', or exaggeration of certain features to compensate for the lack of colour and described by Read, is shown by examining a photograph of Deas Thomson in which the weedy whiskers in the photograph contrast with the prominent curly side boards of the bust. The Victorian 'handle-bar' moustache shown in Benzoni's Sir Peter Nicol Russell (1877), incongruously teamed with the stylised curled beard, is a further example of 'effectism' which according to Read was practiced by foreigners such as Benzoni and Fantacchiotti. James White's

Plate 32 Anderson Stuart displays the same contradictory characteristics of realism and neoclassicism. The drape knotted on the shoulder in classical style contrasts with the realism of the head in which idiosyncratic details such as the hair cut in turn-of-the-century style of short back and sides, is parted on the right rather than the more conventional left hand side for men. The diluted classicism of the Anderson Stuart bust has more in common with Charles Abrahams' Charles Windeyer executed fifty years earlier than with styles of contemporary sculpture. Anderson Stuart's aspirations towards immortality are also indicated by the placement of this bust in the foyer of the Anderson Stuart Building, for which he was largely responsible. Placed in such a position, the bust acts as a personal signature to the building, which stylistically is a copy of the Great Hall, just as this bust is stylistically a copy of earlier sculpture. Again one sees an indication of the conservative taste in matters of art at the university in the nineteenth century.

A distinct contrast in style is provided by Leysallie's.
Sir William Montague Manning (1894) sculpted in the same year as White's Anderson Stuart. Whilst working in Australia, Leysalle remained faithful to his early training in painterly realism in sculpture under Carpeaux, producing works such as Mrs. Gerald Marr Thompson in which verisimilitude results from fine detailing of the fabric, of the clothing and the hair. His bust, Sir William Montague Manning, whilst formal in structure, not only shows the man in nineteenth-century clothing with details such as seams, buttons and creases just as carefully executed as the decorations on the breast and around the neck, but the head is also realistically and sensitively realised, without evidence of idealisation by omission or exaggeration. Executed the year before his death, here we see a portrayal of an old man, with flat hair, thin lips and lined brow, details which contrast with the exaggerated pout of Deas Thomson and the thrusting jaw of Anderson Stuart. Leysalle's official busts were praised by a contemporary critic for 'striking likeness and beautiful smoothness of marble'. This comment is, however, partly contradicted by the evidence of this particular bust, which displays careful surface detailing.

There are two representations of Sir William Montague Manning at the university. In the discussion of his painted portrait, which was executed in England, attention was drawn to the representation of a powerful individual in a portrayal which was successful in spite of the absence from the portrait of the accoutrements or symbols of office. It appears to be a realistic portrayal of the man as he was then. For his bust, Manning also chose to be represented realistically in contemporary dress. Manning also commissioned the Challis statue which again shows the subject realistically portrayed in contemporary garb. These three examples indicate Manning's consistent predilection for realism or at least verisimilitude, although realism in sculpture must always be qualified by the limitations of the medium used. Manning's preference for lack of pomp is also evidenced by the fact that his bust was 'unveiled without ceremony on 6 April, 1895', although Manning's position in colonial society warranted a public presentation for he was an outstanding chancellor of the university (1878-95) and had held the office of attorney-general and supreme court judge in New South Wales. No critical attention was registered for Leysalle's sculpture of Manning.
On the other hand, when Fantacchiotti's bust, Deas Thomson arrived in the colony, admittedly about forty years earlier, the local press referred to Fantacchiotti as 'a sculptor of great genius in Florence', the public was urged to visit the university to view the work carved from 'exquisite material' - Carrara marble for the bust and the slightly inferior spezzi for the pedestal. 'The likeness is striking and expression and pose happily given, and the drapery and general finish of the work is admirable', was one press comment, which continued, 'independently of its personal uses and association, as a work of high art (it) is a most valuable accession to the intellectual wealth of Sydney'.

Perhaps Daniel Deniehy had Deas Thomson's bust in mind when, in 1857, he wrote 'what has been done in the colony to mark our recognition of art? ... look at our public buildings, look at our public institutions' for which he claimed 'impetus given to thought, intelligence and imagination'. Although the Deas Thomson bust was said to be a contribution to the 'intellectual wealth of Sydney' it was some time before it was placed in the most prestigious location at the university. In 1859, when the Great Hall was inaugurated, the bust stood before the fireplace in the Library, even though it was considered to be 'an excellent likeness ... in the highest style of art'. It was obviously not then considered important enough for the Great Hall where it now stands. As this bust was considered such a valuable artistic contribution, the artistic scene in Sydney must have been a little poverty stricken. The enthusiastic reception of the bust was no doubt partly due to the prevailing attitude that works of art produced overseas were superior to colonial works, together with an element of deference on the part of the newspaper to the powerful colonial secretary, the subject of the bust.

To return to questions of style, the over life-size statues William Charles Wentworth (Tenerani, 1860) and John Henry Chaljis (Simonetti, 1893) will both be considered in relation to style and reception. Both works combine aspects of the classical type and the ideal, yet both the sculptors have achieved a degree of verisimilitude. The figures are presented in contemporary dress
although both sculptors defer to the classical traditions associated with portrait statues.

If Wentworth had been successful in commissioning the English sculptor John Gibson, he might have been portrayed in a toga. According to Woolner, Gibson 'is unable to do a modern statue and when obliged to do one he puts his man in a sheet or blanket, is it not odd?' 66 Gibson even portrayed Queen Victoria (1849) in classical drapery, he also tinted some of his neoclassical statues, for example his Tinted Venus (1861-66). 67 Would a tinted statue of Wentworth in a toga have been acceptable to the university senate or the members of the subscription committee? In view of Wentworth's efforts to commission a sculptor in England, Woolner's rejection remains puzzling, and could not have been on stylistic grounds for Woolner produced a number of busts and statues showing the subject in contemporary dress and conforming to the requirements of realism. Many of these were commissioned for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge from 1857 onwards. 68 The sculptor finally chosen, A. Tenerani, was imbued with neoclassical ideas by his teacher, Thorvaldsen, and followed these ideals in his monument to Pope Pius VII (1866), St. Peter's, Rome. In the Wentworth statue, however, he combined classical elements with realism. Sturgeon's description of the Wentworth statue as a 'fine neoclassical work' is not entirely correct. 69 There are some references to neoclassicism in the oratorical stance, the gesture of the right hand and in the supporting classical short pillar on which rests a stylised scroll, but the untidiness of the contemporary dress in which Wentworth is portrayed is not idealised, and gives the statue a life-like appearance.

The realistic portrayal was probably Wentworth's own choice, for he took a close interest in the production of the statue, going to great pains to have a faithful replica of himself created, even insisting on his eccentricities of dress in the words of one commentator. 70 Although Tenerani has used 'effectism' in the curled stylised hair, which is arranged to cover the ears, and in the enlarged eyes, disguising Wentworth's turned eye, the heavy-jawed face is a naturalistic representation if compared with a photograph of the subject. 71 The asymmetrical drapery resulting from the 'eccentricities of dress' has been put to telling use by
the sculptor. The deeply incised folds of the layers of clothing produce an effect of solidity and movement, which is balanced by the positioning of the arms. The result is a commanding yet relaxed figure. The convincing naturalism of this figure becomes apparent upon a comparison with Archille Simonetti's posthumous neo-classical bust of Wentworth (1893). The commission was not a source of great satisfaction for Tenerani who spoke of 'years of various delays imposed especially due to the absolute repugnance expressed by Mr. Wentworth who did not tolerate the expenditure of so much money on his portrait'. Again the general colonial attitude of stinginess in regard to art is apparent for Wentworth had £3,000 to spend, an ample sum when compared to the cost of Marochetti's Richard Coeur de Lion (1851) which was only slightly higher.

The Wentworth statue received a qualified reception in Sydney. As mentioned earlier, it was not originally intended for installation in the Great Hall. The Collection Committee, formed in 1853, had proposed that the statue should be erected before the new Parliament House, which was never built. On the statue's arrival in Sydney in November 1861, the question of a site arose. In February, 1862 the university senate received a delegation led by Mr. Terence Aubrey Murray, the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly and Wentworth's successor as President of the Legislative Council. Murray's original enthusiasm for the statue seems to have waned. The delegation requested that in view of Wentworth's connections with the university, the statue be housed in the Great Hall. The reason that the statue had become an embarrassment to the government will be discussed later. The university senate agreed to the request, with the stipulation that 'it may be removed to the new Houses of Parliament if within twelve months from the commencement of the first session held within the building the majority of the then surviving subscribers shall desire such a removal and obtain the requisite permission of both Houses of Parliament'. In spite of the qualified agreement the statue has remained in the Great Hall for the past one hundred and twenty-seven years. The statue was unveiled on 23 June, 1862 by Sir James Martin, Chief Justice of New South Wales, a member of the university senate from 1858-78. The senate had only agreed to a public unveiling ceremony on condition that
'in accordance with the previous understanding (that) there would be nothing of a party political nature in the proceedings'. 77 Wentworth, who at the time was visiting the colony for political reasons, was not present, 'it having been decided I ought not to be there' he wrote. 78

The controversial inauguration took place in the presence of the governor, a few politicians, members of the university, the armed forces and 'a large number of ladies' whilst a band played the national anthem and other patriotic tunes. Wentworth's was only the second statue to have been inaugurated in the colony, the Sir Richard Bourke statue being erected twenty years earlier in the Domain. According to the Sydney Morning Herald a third memorial was planned 'to the honour and memory of the illustrious Prince Albert'. Wentworth's statue was therefore located in vice-regal if not regal company. The unveiling ceremony for the Wentworth statue was reported by the Sydney Morning Herald in a leader and an article, which although in the same edition took differing points of view. 79 Nowhere was Wentworth's absence from the ceremony mentioned. The article contained a verbatim report of Sir James Martin's oration, which was preceded by a description of the statue as 'this magnificent work of art ... of pure white carrara marble'. It was noted that 'the thickly clustered hair (is) perhaps the only flattery which the sculptor has indulged in'. The only comment on the style of the sculpture was a reference to the 'life-like portraiture of the original'. Sir James Martin's speech concentrated on a flattering account of Wentworth's career, describing him as an heroic and noble statesman. Interspersed among the praises of Wentworth, however, were veiled references to the importance of the Cowper government's land bills, suggested by reference to Wentworth's 'genius and foresight' in relation to the land question throughout his career. Martin made only short reference to the university, but that was in terms of associationism - 'here under the magnificent roof, where gilded ornaments ... (etc.) ... we feel conscious of a link which unites us to the past and to the future'. He stressed the heroic nature of the statue which was, he said 'suggested by the graceful practice of classic times. It is a memorial which cannot be raised without the aid of art in its highest form
... which preserves the image of those whom the world would not willingly let die'. Hypocritically he concluded, the statue 'is erected in this noble hall where he himself (Wentworth) desired to see it placed'. Martin could have made more extended reference to the statue as he had some familiarity with sculpture, but this speech was designed with other ends in view, to flatter Wentworth and further the interests of the Cowper government in which Martin was vitally involved.

In contrast, the leader (which is the customary vehicle for editorial views) was critical of Wentworth's political career and scathing about the statue. It drew attention to Wentworth's disappointed hopes regarding the Constitution and his only partial responsibility for the founding of 'a university which (was) ... feeble and premature'. Maliciously, the writer then pointed out that although 'Mr. Wentworth has had the good fortune to see the statue erected to his renown ... we do not fancy that any illusion about immortality has obscured his (Wentworth's) vision in reference to the fate of all such memorials; but that which may last for centuries ought to satisfy his ambition'. However, 'the marble memorial of transitory greatness is subject to all the vicissitudes of material things', the writer warned. These vicissitudes, impossible for the writer to foresee, include featuring the Wentworth statue in television advertisements filmed in the Great Hall when traditional scenes are required.

Behind the contradictory views published by the Sydney Morning Herald on 24 June 1862 describing the unveiling of Wentworth's statue at the university lay a very complicated political situation. In March 1854, when Wentworth and Deas Thomson left for England to see the colonial constitution bills through the British parliament, Wentworth received a moving farewell from a crowded dock and an assurance from James Macarthur of the respect and gratitude of his compatriots. 80 The collection for his statue took place when he was still seen as a great Australian patriot, although liberals such as Henry Parkes were already sneering at Wentworth's hopes of receiving a baronetcy. 81

Wentworth's proposed constitution included provision for an upper house nominated by the governor, thus conferring power
on the already privileged class of society, although not creating
the bunyip aristocracy which Wentworth originally sought. During
the time the bill took to appear in the imperial parliament, the tragedy
of the Crimean war turned public opinion in England against the
aristocracy and privileged. When the bill came to Parliament,
Wentworth's old emeny Robert Lowe, now in the British House of
Commons, damned Wentworth's proposals as an 'iniquitous device
of an oligarchical clique'. Therefore a power of constitutional
amendment was included in the bill, thus providing a possible avenue
for the removal of all class privilege and defeating Wentworth's
intention of creating a colonial aristocracy.

When Wentworth returned to Sydney in April, 1861, the liberal
Sir Charles Cowper was the Premier of New South Wales. Cowper
and his colleague Sir John Robertson, the Secretary for Lands,
were trying to steer the land bills through the Legislative Council,
which was in its last days of office. The land bills were opposed
by the conservative squattocracy. Cowper's ruse of asking the
governor to appoint more Council members who would support the
bills had failed, putting the outgoing Council under a cloud. To
confer a degree of respectability upon the incoming Legislative Council,
Cowper persuaded Wentworth, who privately held the ministry and
Assembly in unmeasured contempt, to accept the position of President
of the new Legislative Council on 24 June 1861. Cowper played
on Wentworth's thwarted hopes of official honours and convinced
him that he should modify his views on the land bills, although
Wentworth and James Macarthur had supported political power based
on 'interests' and originally opposed Cowper. The inclusion
of some of Wentworth's earlier colleagues such as Manning, Merewether,
Deas Thomson (all associated with the university) and Plunkett on
the Council added weight to Cowper's persuasions. Thus Cowper
manipulated Wentworth into ensuring that the Legislative Council
endorsed the free selection clauses of Robertson's land bills. The result was that Wentworth was once again seen to change sides,
being regarded as vain and gullible by the liberals who were in
office, and as a traitor by the conservatives. It is therefore not
surprising that the siting of the statue became such a problem,
and that even the university expressed reservations about
receiving it and apprehension regarding the political outcome.

Sir James Martin, who gave the inaugural address at the unveiling of the statue, was a member of the liberal Cowper government. Martin was extremely ambitious, a man who had started his career as a journalist and rose to become Chief Justice of New South Wales, but who in his youth had been a drinking companion of Wentworth's. His speech, reproduced in the Herald, while properly praising Wentworth and his statue, was so excessively adulatory as to suggest that the objective was to gain Wentworth's continued allegiance to his (Martin's and Cowper's) liberal political party.

On the other hand, the policy of the Herald was conservative and the owner John Fairfax, described as an erstwhile liberal, had old political scores to settle with Cowper. Before the land bills were passed the Herald published an article comparing the proposed adoption of the Land Act with the passing of a 'law that the Museum should be burned down, that the University should be demolished and that Government House should be turned into a pigsty', asserting that one would naturally resist such laws. The laws did not in fact disadvantage big land holders such as Robertson himself, although the Herald feared that 'there may be revolutionary changes in the future'.

It is revealing that the university and the museum are classed with Government House as bastions of conservatism, and particularly ironic in view of Wentworth's original proposal for a university from which no-one would be barred, when in fact his own statue was only accepted on sufferance. Although Wentworth's statue received some credit as a 'work of art', it was also exploited as an object which carried the potential for political advantage, not so much to the sitter, for whom it achieved a measure of personal immortality, but for the political party which then held office. From being a liability for the government, through Martin's speech the statue was used to reinforce the respectability of the government. For the university, the statue became an impressive addition to the temple of worthies - another historical figure for the Great Hall.
Opposite the Wentworth statue in the Great Hall of the university stands Archille Simonetti's John Henry Challis (1893). Simonetti often employed a classical treatment of the subject, as seen in his busts of Sir Arthur Renwick (1892, University Collection) and William Charles Wentworth (1893, Legislative Council of N.S.W.). The Challis statue, in contrast, represents the subject in contemporary dress. The chancellor of the university, Sir William Montague Manning not only played a part in commissioning the statue, but also personally supervised all facets of its production. The fact that Manning's own portrait and busts are largely realistic indicates his personal stylistic preference which is also shown in the choice of a realistic style for the Challis statue. Although Challis is a posthumous work, the university wanted 'a statue which should fairly represent Mr. Challis'. Manning realised that this would be 'necessarily very difficult, but we hope this difficulty has been overcome by a photograph taken late in life and a portrait of an earlier date and by personal recollection', he wrote.

Manning himself inspected the clay model for the statue in Simonetti's Balmain studio on 7 February 1891 and reported that 'after a long inspection from every point of view and after some little adjustments and a material one in the pose of the head, I was satisfied with the memorial ...'. At that stage, two years before the statue was completed, Manning considered a request for a progress payment by Simonetti was 'reasonable, as the genius and artistic skill of the sculptor is chiefly employed in the model'. The Challis statue is of similar size to the Wentworth and was intended to be placed in the Great Hall, 'in a position of honour corresponding with that of Mr. Wentworth'. The stance of the Challis figure matches that of Wentworth, so that the statues placed opposite each other in the Great Hall appear to communicate. The rendering of the drapery in Wentworth is, however, not matched by the plainer effect employed by Simonetti on the outfit worn by Challis. The sculptor's inclusion of the caduceus adds an idiosyncratic element to the work, for although the Challis estate endowed a chair in the Faculty of Medicine, it also endowed seven other chairs as well as lectureships. As Challis himself was a merchant, the inclusion of the medical emblem is not entirely appropriate.
Although realistic in some aspects, such as the costume of the subject, this statue is a completely idealised version of Challis the man, as can be seen by comparison with photographs and the various painted portraits of Challis at the university. These all show Challis with sunken eyes and hollow cheeks, as a far less commanding figure than is portrayed in the statue. In spite of Manning's preference for a realistic style and his wish for a statue which 'would fairly represent Mr. Challis', here is an example of a subject ennobled in the interests of presenting an image worthy of posterity. This could be considered as a gracious gesture to the university's most generous nineteenth-century benefactor, for whatever Challis really looked like, the idealised statue now conditions our perceptions of Challis and thus influences, in a small way, our reading of history.

plate 33 The style of the Thomas Woolner medallions has been extensively discussed by Benedict Read, who places Woolner as an important figure in the Realist school and discusses his adherence to Pre-Raphaelite tenets of 'truth to nature' as well as the influence of the portrait medallion genre of the fourteenth century, for instance in the work of Pisanello. Before arriving in Melbourne, Woolner had already made portrait medallions, the most famous of which was Tennyson (1849-50), which was in demand in the colony. A comparison between the two Tennyson medallions of 1850 and 1855 illustrates the benefit to the sculptor of his 'practice' on colonial subjects. The critical response to the Australian works concentrated upon the likeness of the image and the workmanship of the sculptor. Woolner himself wrote: 'You will have seen by the newspapers I sent how highly a medallion of Wentworth I did is spoken of. There has been the greatest praise bestowed upon it, but as was the case in England, the matter seems to end there'. The Argus commented, 'The merits of the work are (so) decidedly above the level of what is met with in the Colonies ... the artist has caught by a happy inspiration the mental characteristics - the very soul of the man. We rejoice ... that such a high class of work is likely to be spread abroad to educate the eye and refine the taste'. Woolner exhibited the Wentworth medallion at the Royal Academy in 1856 and his daughter sold a copy to the National Portrait Gallery, London in 1912.
According to Woolner's daughter, the treatment of the hair in these medallions is a notable feature. Woolner often worked on the bronzes himself after their return from the foundry, giving them a quality and surface rarely seen in any other medallion. As Amy Woolner remarked, the finish on the medallions is detailed and faithful to nature in accordance with the ideals of the Pre-Raphaelites. The Wentworth, Nicholson and Martin portrait medallions in particular show a luxuriant growth of hair and eyebrows, all finely detailed and the texture of the skin is delicately worked, all these details are produced by the artist's hand after the casting.

To date no critical response has been discovered in which Woolner's Australian plaques were linked with the Pre-Raphaelites, although at least one Syndey intellectual was familiar with the movement. James Lionel Michael, a Sydney lawyer and literary man who was part of the circle of intellectuals brought together by Nicol Stenhouse, had published a pamphlet in defence of the Pre-Raphaelites before his emigration to New South Wales in 1853. In England, Michael had been a friend of Millais and Ruskin, but there is no evidence of his association with Woolner during his sojourn in the colony.

The significance of these small portraits has been overlooked by the university. Their provenance is unsure, although according to Macmillan they were commissioned by Nicholson and were found in a university basement in 1956. They were not framed or mounted until 1989 when this writer designed display cases and frames and they were shown in the 1988 University Collections Exhibition.

In summary, the portrait sculpture at the University of Sydney is largely a nineteenth-century phenomenon. As in the case of the painted portraits, there was no official university policy regarding commissioning of sculpture, but again as with the paintings, the university followed the English custom for displaying portrait busts and statues in prestigious public institutions like the Oxbridge universities. In most cases it fell to the subjects themselves to find a suitable sculptor, and surprisingly, no English sculptor was ever commissioned, although Wentworth's offer to commission Gibson was refused. Some of the sculptures were paid for by public subscription, but in other cases the university senate provided funds. The sculpture did not escape the prevailing nineteenth-
century attitude at the university of stinginess towards commissioning works of art. Images for posterity with a convincing element of artistic merit were required for the minimum cost, even when ample funds were available. These works functioned as intimations of immortality rather than as innovative examples of the sculptor's art, although some attention was given to the choice of style by the subjects or the commissioners. Stylistically, elements of classicism, realism and naturalism were employed to produce a result which combined verisimilitude with idealisation. Nineteenth-century ideas about 'the divine role of sculpture' as expressed by Baudelaire, are no longer current, yet the busts and statues remain as pale phantoms which remind us of the past, but which also condition our understanding of the past. The nineteenth-century sculpture forged another link between English and colonial taste, and allowed the University of Sydney to boast of a small collection of sculpture, just like Oxford and Cambridge.
Chapter IV

Sir Charles Nicholson: The First Patron

Of the three acknowledged founders of the university, Nicholson, Merewether and Wentworth, Sir Charles Nicholson is the only one who could be described as an aspiring connoisseur, if not as a cognoscente. He was the university's most significant nineteenth-century benefactor in terms of works of art. In the very narrow range of secondary material dealing with colonial art collections, Nicholson has been credited with importance by David Macmillan, yet has been ignored by other writers. ¹ Macmillan's article, 'The Nicholson Gift', is subtitled 'The University of Sydney's Legacy from Australia's First Great Collector'. Whilst this article makes some unsubstantiated claims regarding Nicholson, asserting that 'when he arrived in Australia from England in the 1830s he had already formed mostly by purchase an impressive collection', Macmillan provides a valuable introduction to the collection, with references to the 'Blue Lady', now thought to be by a follower of van Dyck, the Michiel Coxcie Adam and Eve which he merely called a Flemish painting, and the Woolner medallion W.C. Wentworth. Robert Holden in his 'Fine Art Exhibitions and Collections in Colonial Sydney 1847-1877' discusses the colonial collections of Thomas Barker, A.B. Spark, T.W. Smart and T.S. Mort at length, but he dismisses Nicholson as a collector because his collection was not open to the public and does not mention the University of Sydney in the context of collections. ² A large proportion of Nicholson's collection was, in fact, eventually to become public property when it was given to the university. As a result, parts of Nicholson's collection have survived intact, whilst the four collections mentioned above and dealt with by Holden, have been dispersed. In other literature, only passing references are made to Nicholson's collection, but no analysis or evaluation of it is made. ³ There is considerable difficulty in writing about Nicholson's collection due to lack of provenance of the works. Research to date has revealed little positive information. That many of Nicholson's papers were burnt in a fire at his home, Totteridge Grange, Hertfordshire, England in 1899 is confirmed by family documents left to the university by his only surviving descendant, Sir John Nicholson, who died in 1987.
Nicholson's benefactions to the university reveal a remarkable catholicity of taste. It would appear that his collections were assembled on a random basis, although he did show some preference for portraits and had a strong interest in classical antiquity. His collection can be related to his wide-ranging interest in history, religion, architecture, archaeology and aesthetics, as revealed in his 'Recollections of Italy', an address delivered at the University of Sydney in 1862. There he recounted details of works of art and antiquities seen on his journey 'from one of the extreme southern points of the Roman Empire, Syene on the Nile, to what formed one of the headquarters of its northern frontier, York, taking in Italy'.

In evaluating Nicholson as a benefactor, the generosity of his gifts to the university must be acknowledged. Nicholson made much of his benefactions, however, ensuring that the 'value' of his gifts was appreciated by drawing attention, in his letters of donation, to the financial considerations relating to his gifts. There is no doubt of the expense he incurred in relation to the stained glass for the Oxford window in the Great Hall, for instance, and little doubt regarding the antiquities, but the situation regarding donations of the paintings and some of the tapestries suggests a mixture of motives; his generosity was tempered with opportunism. Before undertaking a detailed analysis of Nicholson's various benefactions to the university, it is relevant to draw attention to two matters regarding his picture collection not taken into account in any previous literature.

First, Nicholson's picture collection was not assembled for donation to the university - it was a private collection, for the enjoyment of Nicholson himself and his friends, and as Holden rightly says, never opened to the general public. Although Nicholson felt himself to be quite well-informed in matters of art, his motives for assembling a collection seem to have been, on the whole, similar to those of other well-to-do middle-class Englishmen, which were (as John Ruskin pointed out in 1858) 'for mixed reasons, sometimes to fill a corner of a passage - sometimes to help the drawing room talk before dinner - sometimes because a painter is fashionable -
occasionally because he is poor - not infrequently we may have a collection of specimens of painting, as we have specimens of minerals or butterflies ...' 5

Such was the character of Nicholson's collection of works of art in 1862 when he resigned as chancellor of the university and returned to England where he remained for the rest of his life. By 1865 he had determined to wind up his affairs in Sydney as he had married and decided to live in England. After business arrangements had been made by Nicholson regarding the disposal of his establishment in Sydney in 1865, he wrote to Alexander MacDonald at the university grandly indicating that he had resolved 'upon making a final disposition of the various articles consisting chiefly of bookcases, tapestry, paintings and a few other works of art belonging to me which are at present deposited at the university'. 6 The list of paintings from this letter is quoted below. Nicholson also expressed the wish that his former colleagues Sir William Manning, Sir Alfred Stephen, Mr. (later Sir) E. Deas Thomson, Dr. Woolley (all leading figures in colonial society) and Alexander MacDonald himself, should 'select any one picture you may fancy from the remainder of the collection'. Another letter appears in the university Benefactions Book, obviously wrongly dated 22 February 1860, from the same address in London as the above letter, although Nicholson was living in Sydney in 1860. In that letter also Nicholson gave his pictures to the university, but he also remarked that 'in the absence of any better works of art they (his pictures) may serve to cover the otherwise bare walls ... in the university buildings'. 7 Such a comment indicates that not only did Nicholson not value these works highly, but also that he no longer wanted to keep them, or in other words, he wanted to get rid of them.

This leads to the second point, for in fact, the gift of Nicholson's pictures to the university and his former colleagues was hardly the gracious benefaction that it appeared to be from his letter of 1865. In 1862, three years before his letter of donation in which specific works are listed, an auction notice had appeared in the Sydney Morning Herald, advertising 'A highly important sale' of the entire contents of Nicholson's house, Lindesay, at Darling Point.
The sale was also advertised in the Empire under the heading in large type 'Magnificent oil paintings by Eminent Masters'. Separately listed in both advertisements are no less than ninety-two paintings, ten statues and a quantity of tapestry. Included in the list is every article subsequently given to the university in 1865, except the Gobelin tapestry Joseph, the items given to the Nicholson Museum and Nicholson's works of art made in the colony, including the Marshall Claxton portrait of an unknown lady, and six Woolner portrait medallions. (It must be assumed that Nicholson took them to England with him.) From the auction list, thirty-three items have been or are now at the university. As these thirty-three paintings include some of the most impressive-sounding items from the auction list it is obvious that the sale was a failure.

The fact that so many of the paintings did not sell at the auction remains a problem. Nicholson himself took little apparent interest in the auction. He left Sydney for England via India the previous month. It was not only the paintings subsequently donated to the university which failed to sell, for other works from the auction list were given to friends and business associates. For instance, Nicholson gave the Ceres, which he attributed to Paul Veronese when he exhibited it at the Society for the Promotion of Fine Arts in Australia exhibition in 1847, to one of his partners in a landholding in southern New South Wales. The St. Jerome, attributed by Nicholson to Josepe de Ribera, but probably a copy of the painting in the Prado, Madrid, was hanging at the de Laurent family house 'Wynella' in 1945 but was subsequently given to Sancta Sophia College at the University of Sydney, where the display of flesh in the painting was not appreciated. When last heard of this painting was at St. Patrick's Seminary, Manly. Apart from these paintings and those given to the university, the fate of the other paintings listed for Nicholson's auction is not known.

Initially it may seem surprising that Nicholson's paintings did not sell, for in 1861 and 1862 the art scene in Sydney was quite lively. There were three private collections similar to Nicholson's, which were open to the public. These collections, owned by T.S. Mort (specializing in watercolours), T.W. Smart (oil paintings) and J.F. Josephson (sculpture) were, like Nicholson's collection, acquired
in England or the continent, not in Australia. All the big collectors bought overseas, not at local auctions. It may be thought that these collections pointed to some degree of colonial expertise in the fine arts: indeed Smart's collection of one hundred and fifty paintings was 'calculated to produce the best possible effects in the elevation of the intellectual taste of a large and important class in the community'. Nevertheless, comparison of the purchase prices of Smart's paintings, acquired largely from Lord Northwick's sale, with prices for authentic works by the same artists sold about the same time, indicates that most of Smart's paintings must have been fakes or copies. 12 By 1879 it was common knowledge that Australia was a dumping ground for the inferior works of art which glutted the English art market. 13 The fate of Smart's and Mort's collections was similar to Nicholson's. Interest in the collections faded. Smart's collection was auctioned after his death and of the works which sold, most realised under half the original purchase price. 14 Mort's collection was also auctioned, but most of the paintings were dispersed among his widow's friends. The difficulty of selling this type of painting in the colony may be explained by the following comment:

The average moneyed man in Australia is not much of a judge of painting. If he wants a picture to adorn his new house he goes and pays big prices to eminent artists in England or on the Continent. The statuettes in the Hall he will buy in Italy - must be right if they come from Italy, you know - he trusts the taste of others ...

Therefore, it seems that not only the major collectors, but also the casual purchaser of paintings did not buy on the local market. Whatever the reason that Nicholson's paintings failed to sell, he himself obviously did not value them enough to ship them to England.

The revelation of Nicholson's attempt to sell his pictures complicates the situation and puts a less than illustrious complexion on his image as a benefactor. When describing his benefactions to the university in a letter to F.L.S. Merewether in 1898, Nicholson failed to mention the pictures at all. Indeed, Nicholson considered his art collection 'comparatively insignificant' though good enough for colonial consumption. 16 This rather cynical attitude does not tally with his later reputation as a great benefactor. It was only in an endeavour to sell that he began to inflate the importance of
the paintings. After the failure of the auction he decided to gain at least some value from the works by setting himself up as a benefactor and donating the works to the university, an expeditious action which would give him social status in England, where he had decided to live, as well as enhancing his reputation in the colony. Nevertheless, whatever Nicholson's original intentions for his collection, he eventually gave a large number of his pictures, together with other items yet to be discussed, to the university. Much of this collection survives and provides valuable insights into nineteenth-century taste and society.

The scope of Nicholson's collection at the university will now be examined. Apart from the presentation of archaeological specimens in 1860, Nicholson's gifts to the university began with the donation of the Gobelin tapestry *Joseph and his Brethren* (1772). Other tapestries followed as did a number of pictures. In his letter of donation of 1865, Sir Charles listed what he thought to be the most important, as follows: the description but not necessarily the attributions are accurate.

1. Full size portrait of a naval officer from Stowe Sir P. Lely
2. Portrait of a lady 17th century supposed to be Countess Clifford
3. Original portrait of Catherine Cornaro, Queen of Cyprus
4. Very valuable portrait of James I of England by Janssens
5. Portrait of Anne of Denmark wife of James I
6. Head of a Roman Cardinal from the Sciarra Collection, Rome
7. Head of a Venetian Nobleman
8. Portrait of Nicolo (sic) Politiano Venetian school
9. Portrait of Charles I School of van Dyck
10. Head of a Venetian Nobleman
11. Copy of Chandos Shakespeare
12. Original portrait of Machiavelli by Bronzino
13. Adam and Eve, 15th cent. school of Van Eyck

Additional paintings given by Nicholson include Angelica Kauffmann's

- *Cupid distressed by Three Graces*, several versions of St. Sebastian,
- two crucifixions and other religious pictures including a madonna
- after Carlo Dolci, several picturesque landscapes, allegorical pictures,
- Marshall Claxton's *Portrait of an unknown lady* and the portrait medallions by Thomas Woolner. Works of art retained by the descendants of Sir Charles have been given or left to the university in the twentieth century. These include a portrait drawing

- *Sir Charles Nicholson* by Koberwein, and a watercolour by
plate 3 Edward Blore Interior of the Great Hall. Recently acquired on the death of Nicholson's one remaining descendant, Sir John Nicholson, are a watercolour by Sir Thomas Lawrence of his mistress and their son, two albums of watercolour drawings which include two brush and wash numbered drawings by John Constable, a study by Wilkie for the portrait of George IV at Holyrood, a landscape by Reinangle, studies by Richard Westall and Thomas Stothard, and a number of drawings of buildings by the architect Edward Blore, plus a fragment of a Rembrandt etching. 18 Nicholson himself left his enormous

plate 28 statue Captain Cook by W.G. Nicholl, c. 1854, at the university, and the Hermes statue which belonged to Sir Charles was given by the Nicholson family in 1934.

In addition Nicholson gave the university the imposing silver epergne which he received in 1856 in recognition of his position as speaker in the Legislative Council of New South Wales. The epergne, of monumental proportions, includes in its ornate decoration the Australian coat of arms and an engraved outline of the Australian continent. Amongst other decorations there are three male figures, representing 'religious learning' with the university motto at its feet (sidere mens eadem mutato), 'justice' which holds a sheet engraved 'sic fortis eturia crevit' and 'monarchy' which bears a crown on a cushion and a caduceus. Above all is a draped female figure holding a wreath with a tri-star coronet. 19 The overloaded decoration and sentimental iconography is typical of silver testimonials of the Victorian era. The inclusion of the coronet, a reference to the English peerage, is a little surprising, for although Nicholson received a knighthood in 1852 he was not elevated to the baronetcy until 1859. Another strange element is the juxtaposition of the caduceus which undoubtedly refers to Nicholson's profession of medicine, with the crown. The piece was made in England by the London silversmiths Smith and Nicholson in 1856, although the Sydney firm of silversmiths Brush and McDonnell were producing work of high craftsmanship for example the university mace, at the same time. As will be shown later, Nicholson did not usually patronise colonial artists or craftsmen, although in this case the choice may not have been his.
Nevertheless it was through Nicholson's efforts that the university acquired the silver and myall wood ceremonial mace. Correspondence between Sir Charles, Deas Thomson and the Governor, Sir Charles Fitzroy, led to presentation of the mace on behalf of Queen Victoria in 1854. The mace was made in New South Wales by Brush and McDonnell to a design by E.T. Blacket. ²⁰ It was included in the Natural and Industrial Products of New South Wales Exhibition at the Australian Museum, Sydney in 1854. As the university coat of arms was not formally granted until 1857 (also an initiative of Nicholson's) three years after the mace was presented to the university, these must have been inscribed later in the space left, to accompany the coats of arms of royalty and New South Wales which were included in the original design. The acquisition of the mace indicates the intention to follow English ceremonial traditions at the university, and corresponds with the ideas of associationism related to the Great Hall.

Whilst in London on university business, Nicholson took the responsibility of procuring the stained glass for the windows of the Great Hall as well as the windows of the Caesars (not extant) and the windows showing his own coat of arms. The two latter sets were installed in the rooms which originally housed the Nicholson Museum and which were finished at the same time as the Great Hall. This is a case in which the gift was specifically designed for the university. Nicholson, himself, donated the Oxford window.

A number of medieval and renaissance documents and a Hebrew twelfth-century manuscript, an early copy of Magna Carta, important illustrated manuscripts (thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth-century), an ikon (probably) as well as collections of wax impressions of English historical seals and some original historical seals were all given by Sir Charles. Of the thirty-three medieval and renaissance documents received, six were given by Sir Charles Nicholson in his lifetime, these are all in Latin, three dated from the thirteenth century and three from the fifteenth century. They include land grants, letters patent and theological treatises. The balance of twenty-seven manuscripts was received by the university from Sir Charles Nicholson's estate in 1924 and 1937. Amongst a group received in 1924 is
twelfth-century florilegium in Latin, a fifteenth-century Italian translation of La Prima Guerra Punicain and educational tracts by renaissance scholars including Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini who was to become Pope Pius II in 1458. 21

Nicholson also donated various gifts unrelated to any of the above, such as the collection of bones from a midden in the Channel Islands and a Pacific Islander's skirt made of strips of leather and shells. These assorted items do not, of course, concern this writer, except as an indication of the taste displayed in Nicholson's collection.

Nicholson's best known, and in his own eyes the most significant and valuable benefaction was the gift of archaeological artifacts including Etruscan, Egyptian and Greek antiquities, which formed the foundation of the Nicholson Museum. These items were given in 1860 with certain conditions. The antiquities will be discussed from the viewpoint of taste in collecting. A detailed study from an archaeological viewpoint of Nicholson's donations to the Nicholson Museum has already been written but is not published to date. 22 Nicholson's important Hermes statue, given by his sons for the Nicholson Museum, has also been discussed elsewhere. 23 In summary, then, Nicholson's benefactions to the university include tapestry, paintings, medieval documents, seals, medallions, sculpture, archaeological artifacts and stained glass.

Nicholson's gifts to the university have been briefly outlined above, and it may now be asked what was the taste and style of Nicholson as a collector? This must be considered first in the context of his own interest in the arts and of other colonial collections, because it appears that Nicholson's works of art were acquired whilst he was living in New South Wales. 24 Nicholson is acknowledged as 'the most erudite collector in the colonies in the first half of the nineteenth century' by Holden, but as stated earlier he does not discuss Nicholson's collection, taste or contribution to the art scene. Although there were other individuals in the colony who collected paintings, and some who had more paintings than Nicholson, and although some collectors of paintings also had various other items, there was no-one in the colony whose collection as a whole had such a wide range as Nicholson's.
Nicholson's interest in the fine arts was made apparent early in his sojourn in the colony, when, in 1842, he delivered two lectures to the School of Arts, Sydney on 'The Application of the Principle of Taste to the Arts', but his incipient interest in collections is also illustrated even earlier in his years in the colony, by the fact that he was the first curator of the museum attached to the Mechanics Institute and held that office from 1835-1838, and from 1838 to 1840 was joint curator. When the Society for the Promotion of the Fine Arts in Australia was formed in May 1847, Nicholson was elected as the first president and held continuous office during the 1847 and 1849 exhibitions. The object of the society was 'to foster and encourage art in this country and to afford instructive amusement to the community by establishing periodical exhibitions and by the gradual formation of an academy and gallery of painting and sculpture in Sydney'. The first exhibition of the society, held in 1847, showed three hundred and eighty works and the committee was 'obliged to reject many pictures for want of space', although the 'assigned authorship of paintings' was accepted without comment. Paintings from Nicholson's private collection were included in this exhibition. That the exhibition was well supported by influential people can be seen from the fact that six hundred season tickets at a guinea each were purchased, and other individuals attended at one shilling entrance fee, whilst artists were admitted free of charge.

Although Nicholson did not continue to exhibit his paintings in later exhibitions arranged by the Society for the Promotion of the Fine Arts in Australia, his interest in the arts continued. Before he left the colony in 1862 he delivered a lecture at the University of Sydney on his travels in Italy, in which he described his impressions of the art he had seen. To a colonial audience this lecture may have sounded most erudite. 'Painting and sculpture', Nicholson said:

may be said to owe their revival to Italy. As early as the twelfth century we find the stiff and barbaric forms of Byzantine art giving place to efforts inspired with an intuitive sense of natural grace and beauty. In Cimabue, Orcagna, Beato Angelico and Giotto we have a rapid and wonderful progression from old conventional forms to styles which though not free from traditional influences are full of life and vigorous nature...
He indicated his preference for the work of Andrea del Sarto to that of Titian and found the Sistine chapel 'sublime' and 'terrible'. The tone and content of this lecture is conventional and does not depart from standard art histories of the day, for example, Mrs. Jameson’s *Memoirs of Early Italian Painters* of 1846. Giotto, mentioned by Nicholson, was first praised by William Young Ottley in 1808 and in 1833 Lady Calcott published the monograph on the Arena Chapel, but theirs were advanced views. In January, 1842 the *Art Union* reported on Paul Delaroche’s *Hemicycle*, which included all the artists referred to by Nicholson. Haskell argues that in Delaroche’s choice of artists for the *Hemicycle* he ‘satisfied the consensus of informed opinion’.

Therefore it is evident that Nicholson was ‘up-to-date’ with one of the more recent re-instatements in the arts – painters before Raphael. Yet although Nicholson shows awareness of these recent developments he did not fully understand them (as can be seen from the following analysis of his collection), however it seems that he was better informed than others in the colony. He played a prominent part in the development of a considerable and growing interest in the fine arts in the colony over the thirty-odd years of his stay in the country.

As far as Nicholson’s paintings go and the taste shown in his collection, a survey of the paintings loaned for the 1847 exhibition organised by the Society for the Promotion of the Fine Arts in Australia will give some indication of the taste of the exhibitors and should also show whether Nicholson followed the prevailing fashion. Holden dismisses Nicholson’s contribution to the exhibition in favour of a discussion of A.B. Spark’s exhibits which are described as ‘old masters’. Indeed, Spark was one of the main contributors with his loan of fourteen canvasses, but Nicholson loaned eleven paintings, three casts from the antique and a model of a Greek temple, a contribution which cannot be ignored. At the date of this exhibition Nicholson’s taste does not seem markedly different to that of other exhibitors. Nicholson did not lend any works by colonial artists and Spark included only one – a pencil drawing by Samuel Elyard. The paintings lent by Nicholson included works attributed to Paul Veronese, Watteau, Zuccarelli and Salvator Rosa plus another by an unknown Dutch artist, whilst Spark’s loans
included works attributed to Hondeloot, Pat Nasmyth, J.P. Gillemans, des Palierie, Jacques Jordens, Stroehling, Claude, and Brueghel. The great majority of the works exhibited in this exhibition were by English, Flemish or Italian painters and most were labelled either 'artist unknown' or 'after' another master or engraver. Only a few collectors gave definite attributions to their paintings, these lenders included Nicholson, A.B. Spark, W.C. Wentworth, A. McLeay and Dr. McRae. The writer of Bell's Life in Sydney of 14 April, 1847 in retrospect rejected many of the attributions of 'old master' works in the exhibition. It is also worth noting that of the twenty-eight paintings by colonial artists shown, most were exhibited by the artists themselves. In these early days in the colony it seems that a similar taste prevailed amongst all who were interested in paintings. In fact, paintings were sometimes passed from owner to owner, for instance in 1843 Nicholson gave Sir Thomas Mitchell a 'picture of Charles I ... a present intrinsically valuable' as Sir Thomas noted in his diary. It is not known whether this was the same picture exhibited at the 1847 Society for the Promotion of the Fine Arts in Australia exhibition by Alexander McLeay and entitled Portrait of Charles I, 1641 Lely. In any case, the composition of the 1847 exhibition indicates that Nicholson's taste in pictures at this time was virtually the same as that of the other exhibitors.

Nevertheless, although Nicholson's selection of paintings for that exhibition was quite similar to that of other exhibitors, there were collectors in New South Wales such as Smart and Mort, whose collections of paintings became more extensive and who eventually owned a greater number of pictures than Sir Charles did. The composition of the collections of these three men changed and more definite preferences emerged. Some individuals collected objects other than paintings, and some combined paintings and other objects. T.S. Mort, for instance, added armour and weapons of war to his collection of fashionable water colour paintings. The Macleay family collected 'rare and unique specimens' of natural history including a world famous collection of insects with a considerable number of type specimens, as well as birds and fish. Sir James Martin collected garden statuary and commissioned sculptors working in Australia to produce decorative pieces such as the Flora by
William Lorando Jones and a copy of the Choragic Monument of Lysicrates from Walter McGill. He also owned two sphinxes among other garden decorations which were placed in a landscape designed to resemble the garden of an archon of ancient Greece. Another eclectic collector about whom little has been written was Joshua Frey Josephson (1815-1892) who became Lord Mayor of Sydney in 1848. Although he loaned only one work to each of the 1847 and 1849 exhibitions of the Society for the Promotion of the Fine Arts in Australia, in 1861 on a journey to Italy, he purchased some thousands of pounds worth of statues and pictures as well as examples of Wedgwood and Minton china and porcelain. He opened his collection to the public in 1862. Whilst the question of patronage in relation to artists working in the colony has been addressed in the Artist and Patron exhibition of 1888, it appears that European and English pictures were far more popular than colonial works amongst collectors in New South Wales in the mid-nineteenth century. The question of a taste for European as opposed to colonial works has not been addressed to date.

Although Nicholson patronised local art activities whilst he was in the colony, research to date reveals that his interest in colonial artists was limited. Only two received his patronage - both were Englishmen who each spent a short time in the colony before moving on, namely Thomas Woolner and Marshall Claxton. Although Nicholson carried on an active correspondence with Adelaide Ironside before his marriage, and offered to raise money for her journey to Italy, he did not buy her paintings nor did he encourage her in her ambition to 'fresco the university'. Nor did Nicholson commission any work from Conrad Martens although his friends the Macarthurs did and Martens painted (in collaboration with E.T. Blacket) the View of the Proposed Building for the University which is in the University Collection, but was paid for by Blacket. The other colonial collectors mentioned above developed associations with colonial artists, for instance Spark and Mort patronised Conrad Martens and Maurice Felton.

At the same time, however, the collections of these men, like Nicholson's, were comprised mainly of European and English art.
Mort's collection concentrated on English watercolourists, with a few genre paintings in oils, one or two animal paintings and a copy of Reynold's Lady Hamilton. The 1861 catalogue of Smart's collection of one hundred and fifty-four oil paintings lists a mixture of genre, landscape, religious and allegorical works, with one portrait, a so-called van Dyck, Ann of Austria. Neither of these collectors showed any interest in portraits, and whilst Nicholson's preference in 1847 was for landscape, by the 1860s when he deposited his paintings at the university, his preference had changed to historical portraits and his collection contained only a few landscapes, religious and allegorical paintings. This interest in historical portraits was not seen in any other known private collections in the colony. Nevertheless, even although Smart, Mort and Nicholson each preferred different subjects in their paintings, it is impossible to assert that by the 1860s there was a distinctive colonial taste in paintings, or that Nicholson's taste in paintings varied significantly from that of other colonial collectors.

What can be asserted from the foregoing brief survey of the few documented colonial collections is that whilst there were other collections in New South Wales which contained a greater number of paintings than Nicholson owned and although some of these collections were eclectic in some degree, there is no known collector whose interests ranged over the diversity of objects (tapestry, paintings, medieval documents, seals and illustrated manuscripts, portrait medallions, sculpture, archaeological artifacts and stained glass) which engaged the attention of Nicholson. Thus it must be agreed that although there was no distinctive colonial taste, Nicholson's collection, in its range and scope, was indeed significantly different from other colonial collections.

In what ways can Nicholson's taste - that of an English expatriate - be compared to the taste of nineteenth-century English collectors? The collection of George Salting (1836-1909), the greatest benefactor of the National Gallery, London, the British Museum and the Victoria and Albert Museum would be an appropriate example for comparison, as he and Nicholson were well acquainted. George Salting was one of the first graduates of the University of Sydney, although he spent only a few years in the colony. As a young
student he attended Eton College, but emigrated to Sydney with his father. Upon graduation from the University of Sydney, he returned to live permanently in England where he formed his collection. When in Sydney, Lindesay at Darling Point was the home of the Salting family, who occupied it after Sir Charles Nicholson moved out. Further evidence of a close association between the families is revealed by the fact that Nicholson interrupted his wedding trip to return to London for the funeral of George Salting's father. George Salting and Sir Charles became friends for more than one commentator has remarked that 'Mr. Salting, the great collector, was a visitor to Nicholson's house', Hadleigh House, Devonshire Place, London, which was built in the style of a French chateau. The assembling of a collection was an interest common to both men. In spite of the fact that Salting was both a graduate of the University of Sydney and a friend of Sir Charles, however, the university was not, unfortunately, included among Salting's benefactions. George Salting's personal reputation was one of wealthy squalor, yet items in his collection were of the highest quality. His collection, which revealed a sophisticated taste, included carpets, bronzes, seventeenth and eighteenth-century Chinese porcelain, English miniatures, ivories, lacquer, illustrated manuscripts, bronze medals by Pisanello and others, Italian tapestry and paintings, amongst which are works by Vermeer, Jan Steen, Fragonard and Constable. Salting was interested in the objects themselves and 'their particular degree of perfection'. The enormous range of Salting's collection encompassed and exceeded all the categories of objects (except antiquities) which were included in Nicholson's collection - that is, illustrated manuscripts, tapestry, medallions and paintings - although Nicholson's paintings were nowhere near the quality of Salting's and were often of doubtful attribution. The question of the authenticity of Nicholson's pictures will be discussed below, but in my assessment of the taste displayed by Nicholson, his collection will initially be taken at its face value. So, with the exception of the Roman, Greek, Egyptian and Etruscan antiquities, the range of Nicholson's collection was less expansive than Salting's, in fact, it could only be described as pale and less sophisticated by comparison. Nevertheless Nicholson's collection was not unusual in its eclecticism when seen in the English context. Lady Eastlake, the influential writer on Victorian taste, referred
to 'catholicity of taste' as a true test of a real lover of art for art's sake. 50

While it has been demonstrated that Nicholson's collection resembled Salting's in some ways, it lacked the items in Salting's collection which pointed to a sophisticated taste - that is, paintings by artists such as Fragonard, Vermeer and Constable, although Nicholson did own two Constable drawings. But in the 1850s when Nicholson was collecting, works by Vermeer and Fragonard would have been within the price range of other items in Nicholson's collection. For instance, Vermeer's Lace Maker was set at £68/5s in 1848, but it must be added that the work of Vermeer was seldom recognised until Thoré took it up in the 1860s. In the 1850s there was no market at all for Fragonard who was still regarded as a decadent painter. 51 On the other hand, while Constable drawings were plentiful when Nicholson was assembling his collection, from the 1840s the paintings were fetching prices out of Nicholson's range. Therefore, it seems that Nicholson's choice was not wholly determined by financial considerations, for he could have purchased similar paintings to those in Salting's collection. While Nicholson's taste in paintings was more conservative than that of one of the leading English collectors of the day, George Salting, there was one uncommon acquisition in Nicholson's collection which cannot be labelled conventional or conservative.

This Flemish painting, attributed by Nicholson to 'school of van Eyck' is an Adam and Eve which is part of an altar-piece by Michiel Coxie (1497-1532). It must have been acquired by Nicholson at least fifteen years before the purchase of Salting's first Netherlandish painting, Robert Campin's Child Before a Fire Screen, acquired by Salting after 1875. 53 Nicholson's purchase of this painting by Coxie is of interest for a number of reasons. In several different contexts Nicholson referred to this painting as an 'early painting, fifteenth century, school of van Eyck'. 54 He therefore obviously thought that was what he had bought, but in fact it wasn't. The Coxie painting bears no resemblance at all to any of van Eyck's works. Michiel van Coxie was a Flemish artist of high Renaissance period, who was influenced by Michelangelo
and Raphael. His only connection with van Eyck was that he executed a copy of the Ghent Altarpiece for King Phillip II of Spain. The reason Nicholson was interested in a painting which he thought to be 'school of van Eyck' is probably that van Eyck is attributed by Vasari with the invention of oil painting and therefore is seen as an important figure in the progress of art. Vasari's Lives, although translated into English in part in 1685 were published in an almost complete translation by Mrs. Jonathon Foster in 1850. This translation would thus have placed Vasari's views before the Victorian reading public. Yet, Nicholson's misattribution of the Coxcie painting shows his complete ignorance of Renaissance art. He obviously had not seen the two van Eycks owned by the National Gallery of London, the Arnolfini Wedding acquired in 1842 and A Man in a Turban acquired in 1851, although he spent several years in London in the 1850s. The Coxcie painting, which was probably sold to him as 'school of van Eyck' was undoubtedly very cheap, for instance, at the Ralph Bernal sale of 1855 a painting attributed to 'school of van Eyck', A Female Saint, was sold by Christies for three guineas. A real van Eyck, the Arnolfini Wedding, cost the National Gallery £630 in 1842. Nicholson's Coxcie is cropped below the knees of the figures, which would not have increased its value. Notwithstanding the misattribution of the painting, the Coxcie is the most interesting and probably the best of Nicholson's painting collection.

When Nicholson returned to the colony in 1859 no other colonial collections contained Flemish works such as Nicholson's Coxcie. However, T.W. Smart was in England in 1859 where he purchased two Netherlandish paintings from the Earl of Northwick's sale. According to Holden, Smart was the best informed colonial on matters of European art, but it appears that Nicholson's interest in what he thought was an early Netherlandish painting preceded that of Smart, whose Mabuse was undoubtedly a fake or a copy. Although Nicholson exhibited an interest in 'Netherlandish' painting his attribution of the robust Adam and Eve to the school of van Eyck leave considerable doubt about his expertise. On the whole, in both English and colonial contexts, Nicholson's taste was conventional, certainly not adventurous but rather conservative.
As already noted the university did not receive all the paintings in Nicholson's collection which contained a range of Italian, Flemish, English and Spanish paintings with subjects varying from religion to landscape, but concentrating on portraiture. A number of unspecified works which can be identified by comparison to the auction list were given, but in his letter of donation, already quoted, Nicholson specifically listed thirteen works which were to be given to the university. They were all historical portraits, except for the 'van Eyck' Adam and Eve; these portraits relate principally to influential figures in British and Italian history.

We should consider why Nicholson specifically chose portraits for the university. Nicholson desired to make the best of his collection, and having failed to sell it, saw that it could be of value to the university, if not as an art collection of some aesthetic value, then at least of historical interest. By selecting the portraits particularly the emphasis upon the works would be changed from the perspective of the work of art to that of an historical document. In common with many Englishmen of the day, Nicholson was interested in the past and curious about individual historical figures, as can also be inferred from his enthusiasm for the novels of Sir Walter Scott which he read aloud to the end of his life. 58 The foundation of the National Portrait Gallery, London in 1856 may also have contributed to Nicholson's interest in historical portraits, for he was in London from 1857-9. It cannot be a coincidence that Nicholson's gift to the university included a copy of the Chandos Shakespeare (now lost). The original of this portrait (c.1610) was the first acquisition by the National Portrait Gallery. It was acquired from the Buckingham collection, the same source which Nicholson claimed for some of his paintings. 59 The aims of the National Portrait Gallery were expressed by Lord Palmerston, who believed that portraits were intended to be didactic, a means of reassurance regarding man's place in the cosmos and of England's economic position in the world of commerce. 60 Nicholson may have seen his collection in these terms. In a small way, his collection of historical portraits would transfer such sentiments to the unruly colony of New South Wales via their placement in that great new cultural institution, the University of Sydney. Moreover, a collection of portraits would
emulate the picture collections of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The 'new' University Galleries for the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford had been opened in 1845. When the first exhibition of 'University and College Portraits' was held at the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge in May and June, 1884, the writer of the catalogue essay expressed a desire to publish a catalogue of all the Cambridge pictures. These were all portraits and all oil paintings. 61

**plate 52** The portrait of the Italian Renaissance poet and humanist, Angelo Poliziano, included in Nicholson's list, is of relevance in the context of the emulation of university collections. As early as 1711, Sir Thomas Hearne listed 133 of 200 portraits in a seventeenth-century frieze in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. Poliziano appeared in the frieze, which was covered by a false ceiling in 1831. 62 There was also a frieze of portraits of famous people at Durham University in the ancient library of Bishop Bosin, painted in 1668 by Gian Battista van Erssell. Poliziano did not appear amongst the thirty-three heads, although according to Juliana Hill, the space from which one portrait is missing was probably for Poliziano. It is most unlikely, however, that the missing portrait is the one now at the University of Sydney, because the Durham works are on wood supports, whilst the Sydney portrait is on canvas. Other series of heads of famous men of the Medici were not unknown in England. William Roscoe, the English biographer of Lorenzo de' Medici (1795) had a group of forty in his study in 1833. 63

The many representations of Poliziano all originate in the two heads of Poliziano with two other humanists portrayed in the Ghirlandalo frescoes in the Santa Maria Novella in Florence. Many existing versions of Poliziano are copies of copies of the original frescoes, made from the first copy painted for Paolo Giovio, Bishop of Nocera (1483–1552). Giovio was one of the first of the princes and scholars of renaissance Italy to decorate their palaces with series of portraits of famous people, often humanists. His collection at Como has now been dispersed. 64 The Giovio version of Poliziano, however, established a pattern for all subsequent depictions of his features. Nicholson's head of the humanist closely resembles a portrait of Poliziano bought by Sir William Somerville (1860–1932) for a few
shillings in Northumberland at the end of the nineteenth century. The composition is the same but there are variations in the colour. 65

As there is no provenance attached to the university portrait Poliziano, it is impossible to know whether Nicholson purchased it on his tour of Italy, or in England. Nevertheless its existence at Sydney indicates a desire by Nicholson to emulate - probably in the first instance - collections of portraits of famous figures and types - later to transfer this to an historical portrait collection at the University of Sydney. The other Italian portraits listed in Nicholson's letter of donation, Roman Cardinal, Machiavelli (now lost) and two heads of Venetian noblemen also fit the pattern of collections of portraits of notable Italians.

plate 47

Nicholson's list includes one more Italian portrait, Caterina Cornaro. She was a Venetian patrician (c.1450–1510) who in 1472 married Giacomo il Lusignano, King of Cyprus. After his death in 1473 she assumed power, but in 1489 abdicated in favour of the Venetian state, which in recompense bestowed upon her the city of Asolo. Her court there was eulogised by Pietro Bembo in his Gli Asolani (1505). The portrait is a well-known type of Caterina Cornaro, portrayed as a widow and showing the pallid flesh set off by the dark mourning habit. Harold Wetley in his catalogue raisonné of Titian portraits postulates an original of this type by Titian. 66 He notes several versions, similar to Nicholson's, which may reflect the lost Titian. 67 Another version, not referred to by Wetley, is the slightly smaller portrait in the Niedersachsisches Landesmuseum, Hanover, in which the pose and dress are identical to the university version, although the pearls of the necklace are larger. The facial features in the Hanover portrait appear from photographic evidence to be more sensitively portrayed. The Hanover version lacks the sea view and column of the Sydney and Nicosia portraits, but the Hanover is the only version which, in common with the Sydney portrait bears an inscription. The Hanover portrait was purchased in Rome from August Kestner in 1836. 68

One must assume that the portrait was purchased by Nicholson because of his interest in the Italian Renaissance, and perhaps as a souvenir of his 'grand tour' of Italy, rather than from knowledge.
of a connection with Titian, for although the Lindesay auction list describes the work as an 'original portrait of Caterina Cornaro' the artist is not named, as is the case for the other paintings listed. 69 No other versions of the portrait of Caterina Cornaro apart from Nicholson's now at the University of Sydney are known in Australia, either in the 1850s or at present.

It is obvious that to create a cohesive group appropriate for presentation to the university, Nicholson selected a group of historical portraits from his existing collection to provide an instant heritage for the colonial university, modelled on the Oxbridge tradition. None of these related to Australian history, the only such reference connected with Nicholson is the Captain Cook stained glass window. As well as the Italian portraits, the group includes a number of English figures. Among these is a full-length portrait of a naval officer, dressed in seventeenth-century costume similar to that of Henry Rich Earl Holland (1590–1649) from the studio of Daniel Mytens. 70 In both these portraits the ribbon (probably the Order of the Garter) is worn over the right, not the more usual left, shoulder, suggesting that both works may be copies of engravings showing a mirror image of the original. Another common element is the sailing ship beneath a cloudy sky. The globe in the university portrait shows the two Americas. Presumably this work was acquired as an example referring to English exploration and colonial conquest. Other portraits show famous historical figures such as James I and his wife Anne of Denmark, which reveal Nicholson's interest in Scottish history. The portraits Charles I - a head and shoulders portrait in armour said by Nicholson to be school of van Dyck - and Countess (sic) Clifford by a follower of van Dyck, continue the interest in British history and in particular the nineteenth-century revival of popularity of van Dyck. Lady Clifford is reputed to be 'Elizabeth Martin (born 1637) of Lindridge, Devon who married Sir Thomas Clifford, later Lord Clifford, one of the ministers of Charles II's cabal'. 71 The similarity of the Clifford portrait to one of Henrietta Maria, wife of Charles I, which is discussed in the following section on the authenticity of these paintings, must have been known in the nineteenth century, as in the album of photographs at the university in which the portrait appears, the label reads 'Portrait of Henrietta Maria (Countess Clifford?)'. 72 Portraits of Charles I and Henrietta Maria said to
be by van Dyck were held in many English collections in the nineteenth century. Anne of Denmark and James I are the subjects of portraits in the Royal Collection, and that of the Dulwich Picture Gallery, and are also found in many of the grand houses of England. The aristocracy also tended to have portraits of themselves, for instance the Clifford family have portraits of all their forebears except for the one at the university. Nicholson may have seen at least one of these aristocratic collections as a child, for his father was the agent for the Earl of Egremont who had an extensive picture collection. In the acquisition of these portraits Nicholson was probably motivated by an interest in history and influenced by the formation of the National Portrait Gallery, and in giving them away his aim appears to have been didactic. Instead of acting like other middle class nouveau riche collectors, who may have satisfied their interest in history by reading Edmund Lodge's Portraits of Illustrious Personages of Great Britain (1849-50) and who bought nineteenth-century English paintings depicting historical themes by William Powell Frith and others, Nicholson concentrated on collecting historical portraits.

What of the other works of art given by Nicholson, but not listed in his letter of donation, and which have been identified from the Lindesay auction list? For a man described by Bishop Broughton as a sybarite who was not a friend of the church, Nicholson owned a large number of religious pictures. They are all Italian works, plate 58 and are either copies, such as that of Mary Magdalene by Titian, plate 54 or 'school of' for instance St. Sebastian by Gennari, school of Guercino. Nicholson may have seen these works as examples of great masters rather than as religious pictures. The Dutch Gentleman, school of Rembrandt, a panel painting of an unknown man holding a glove is certainly an example of skilful painting, and is one of the best paintings in Nicholson's collection.

A leaning towards 'sybaritic' taste is revealed by the Venus Repelling Cupid, a provocative full-length reclining nude based on a copy by Pontormo after Michelangelo's Venus and Cupid. A version of this painting was acquired for the British royal collection in 1734 and another exists in the Uffizi. Nicholson's Venus is probably a nineteenth-century copy for the overt and robust sexuality of
the Fontormo copy is, in the university version, watered down to a coy Victorian prettiness, yet is still calculated to titillate. The other work in this category is Angelica Kauffmann's The Disarming of Cupid, also a coquettish work, but here with neo-classical references. It is one of Kauffmann's most popular compositions, and was produced as a stipple engraving by William Wynn Ryland in 1777, used as a pattern for a Derby biscuit porcelain group modelled by J. Spangler and was also used as a plate decoration. There are a number of known versions of this work, and an identical painting is held in the Iveagh Bequest at Kenwood House, London in an identical frame.

There was a profusion of Kauffmann paintings in the great houses of London, for instance thirteen were let into the walls of the dining room of Sir Culling Eardley's mansion Belevedere, and fifteen paintings were in the Marquis of Exeter's collection at Burleigh House. There was also one at the National Gallery, but according to Waagen, although Kauffmann's was an 'effeminate but agreeable talent ... this generally feeble and studied style of art no longer satisfies the taste of our day', that is 1854. Again we see an indication of the conservative taste noted previously. Not included in the auction list, but thought to have been given by Nicholson, Marshall Claxton's Portrait of an Unknown Lady is also a rather 'pretty' painting. If this painting was acquired by Nicholson, it was probably for friendship's sake, as Claxton occupied rooms at Sydney College when the university commenced operations there, and he won the competition for the design of the first university seal, therefore would have been well known to Nicholson.

The provenance and authenticity of these paintings is a difficult question to address in view of the already-mentioned lack of archival material on Sir Charles Nicholson. Although various claims regarding authenticity and provenance were made by Nicholson in his letter of donation of 1865 and the same claims had previously appeared in the Lindesay auction notices, the above discussion of some of the paintings has indicated that many of them were copies, 'after' or 'school of'.

The one painting from Nicholson's donation list which has been the subject of some intermittent investigation is number two on the list, Portrait of an Unknown Lady of the Seventeenth Century.
Supposed to Be Countess Clifford. As previously mentioned this painting is represented in a nineteenth-century photograph album, where it is labelled 'by Lely', and other attributions written on the same page read 'van Dyck' and 'Cornelius Johnson (1593-1664). The 'Johnson' note was probably made in 1926 as another note in the same hand bears that date. In 1954 the painting underwent extensive restoration by D.J. Setelik, a graduate in painting and conservation from the Prague Academy of Fine Arts, who was employed by the university to carry out conservation work on the picture collection. 81 The painting was in poor condition but because of the 'Royal visit to the university, the painting was required to be given an acceptable appearance' and therefore the treatment was rather rushed. Chemical analysis revealed that the support (flax fibre) was identical with seventeenth-century canvases and that media used included lapis lazuli usually not used after the seventeenth century without admixtures. 82 Therefore Nicholson's claim that the work was of seventeenth-century origin was probably correct.

This technical evidence is supported by the former Keeper of the Queen's Pictures, Sir Oliver Millar, but he rejects Setelik's assertion that the picture is almost certainly from the hand of Sir Peter Lely, commenting that 'this appears (though the photograph is imprecise) to be a portrait of the 1630s, perhaps by a pupil of van Dyck and certainly using one of his best-known patterns. It cannot be the famous Lady Anne Clifford who was much older at that date. It is certainly not by Lely'. 83 The Lady Anne Clifford referred to is from a different family but is mentioned because there are some well-known portraits of her. Although Macmillan gives no references to authenticate his identification of the sitter of this painting as Elizabeth Martyn, wife of the first Lord Clifford, support for the identification is given by Sir Edward Benthall, once owner of Lindridge (home of Elizabeth Martyn) and by Lord Clifford of Ugbrooke, who asserts that this is the missing portrait of the first Lady Clifford which was probably sold during the long and impeccable widowhood of the third Lady Clifford. 84 The first Lady Clifford, thought to be the portrait at the university, is the only portrait missing from the historical portraits of all the Lords and Ladies Clifford at Ugbrooke Park.
The Clifford portrait is painted to a van Dyck pattern, the original design for which is van Dyck's Elizabeth Howard, Countess of Peterborough in which the dress and particularly the skirt, sleeves and left hand are very similar. The gesture of the right hand in the Clifford portrait relates to a well-known van Dyck portrait Queen Henrietta Maria in the British royal collection. Of peripheral interest is the fact that Thomas, First Baron Clifford of Chudleigh (1630-73), married to Elizabeth Martyn, who was a member of Charles II's cabinet was painted by Sir Peter Lely and the portrait remains with the family at Ugbrooke. 85

Other works from Nicholson's donation letter on which Sir Oliver Millar gave an opinion are:

- plate 46 (1) Full size portrait of a Naval Officer ... Sir Peter Lely
- plate 48 (4) Very valuable portrait of James I of England by Janssens
- plate 49 (5) Portrait of Queen Anne of Denmark wife of James I

The University Collection photograph album attributes the Naval Officer to Dobson, others are attributed as Nicholson listed them. The Naval Officer, according to Sir Oliver is 'probably not English - certainly not by Dobson and perhaps painted by a provincial Dutch artist c.1640. James I not James I, I am afraid and certainly not by "Janssens", i.e. Johnson, and Anne of Denmark is a reduced version of van Somer's full-length signed and dated 1617 in the royal collection'. 86

The Adam and Eve discussed earlier, although not 'fifteenth-century school of van Eyck' as Nicholson asserted, is by a known painter though of a slightly later era, Michiel Coxcie. The portraits of Caterina Cornaro and the male portrait heads, also already discussed, are obviously either copies or part of repeated series. Nicholson's donation list number 12, the 'original portrait of Machiavelli by Bronzino' is lost and no photograph remains. It is possible that this may have been authentic if the single criteria of the current prices being paid for works similar to Nicholson's is taken as a basis for argument. There was no demand for Bronzino's works before 1882 and in 1855 four Bronzinos were sold at auction for under £10 each. 87 Of the other pictures given by Nicholson on his departure for England and already discussed, all are copies except the Angelica Kauffmann which
exists in many versions none of which are signed, but nevertheless thought to be authentic. Works acquired from Nicholson or his family after the 1860s are genuine (i.e. the Woolner portrait medallions, Marshall Claxton, portrait of Nicholson by Koberwein etc.).

Although Nicholson claimed to have some expertise in the area of 'Taste and the Visual Arts', his knowledge appears to have been superficial as has been pointed out. It is now impossible to know if he was duped by the 'more than six and a half thousand forgeries which entered England in 1838' and in other years, as reported by the Art Journal, or whether he subscribed to the sentiments expressed by Waagen in 1857, when on inspecting Northumberland House he discovered

in the gallery, a magnificent and splendidly decorated apartment the following copies of well-known works ... Raphael's School of Athens copies by Mengs in 1755 ... etc. The idea of making this admirable selection of the most celebrated works and having them copied by able artists, affords me a new proof that the English nobility possesses not only money but knowledge and taste to employ it in the most worthy manner.

The first suggestion is most believable, in view of the doubtful claims regarding provenance of the works, which will now be discussed.

In Nicholson's donation letter, the Naval Officer is said to have come from Stowe and the Head of a Roman Cardinal from the Sciara collection in Rome. Among the pictures in the Lindesay auction list which came to the university, the Naval Officer, Countess Clifford, James I. and Anne of Denmark are listed as from the Buckingham Collection at Stowe, and A Landscape and view of a Seaport, Italian Landscape and Head of a Roman Cardinal from the Sciara collection. To date only one mention of the Sciara collection has been found, which does, at least, establish that there was such a collection.

Extensive searches have been conducted amongst Stowe material for references to the above works which Nicholson claimed came from that collection. A list of works of art at Stowe was published by the English Connoisseur in 1767, but there is no mention of
pictures similar to Nicholson's in that inventory. The Stowe papers reveal very little of relevance. The Seeley guide of 1820 mentions one seventeenth-century naval figure, Admiral Russell, Earl of Orford and 'a curious picture' of James I, but no mention of 'Countess Clifford' amongst the gallery of family portraits. The Stowe Catalogue of 1848 notes that the 'odd picture of James I has the name of "Sir Robert Rich" painted on the canvas'. There is no visible inscription on the university portrait. Nor is there any similarity to any of the Nicholson paintings in the inventory of Avington House (the second Grenville residence). An enquiry to the foremost expert on Stowe House was passed on to Mr. Colin Anson an expert on pictures from the Stowe sale, who supported the advice received from the Huntington Library, adding that the Admiral Russell Earl of Orford is now lost. Inventories of the 1839 Christie's sale of 30 November and 6 December, following the death of the first Duke, did not show any works corresponding to Nicholson's, although after the 1839 sale it was said (according to Anson) that there were a number of dark old pictures to be seen at the London dealers of the day. Sales of these pictures were anonymous and it was not widely known whence the pictures came. Anson's advice on the four individual works was similar to that received from Sir Oliver Millar. He also suggested that unscrupulous dealers might have added a Stowe provenance to paintings whose origins were doubtful. This may explain Nicholson's claims, although if so, it would be further evidence of his lack of practical knowledge in the area of paintings. As far as is known, however, Nicholson was not in England in 1848 when the Stowe sale took place. The suggestion by Sir Oliver Millar that Nicholson's collection was 'perhaps put together with a certain Scots frugality' seems likely. All the same, even if the paintings had come from Stowe, their authenticity would not have been guaranteed, as a number of the works in the Stowe sale were copies.

It may be that the Stowe provenance seems unlikely, but there is a remote possibility that some of the pictures were in the Stowe catalogue as unnamed items, particularly the Lady Clifford as there was an indirect Clifford connection in the ancestry of the first Duke of Buckingham's wife, Eliza Brydges, but in the sixteenth rather than the seventeenth century. On the unlikely speculation
that some of Nicholson's works of art had belonged to his father who could have acquired them whilst he was the agent for the Earl of Egremont, an enquiry was made at Petworth, but searches in their archives revealed nothing. Numbers inscribed on the verso of some of Nicholson's paintings have been checked with Christie's auction numbers, but this endeavour was also unsuccessful.

In summary, evidence assembled through an examination of Nicholson's picture collection indicates that his taste was closely related to that of conservative English collectors and that his intentions in giving his paintings to the university - in spite of his earlier unsuccessful auction - were both didactic and designed to imitate the Oxbridge tradition. Sadly it seems that the authenticity of the paintings is in most cases questionable and that the claim that some of the works came from Stowe cannot be substantiated at all. Thus it seems that Nicholson was not particularly interested in the paintings themselves as works of art, but that he saw them as instruments which could initiate a tradition which would further reinforce ties between England, the mother country, and her colony of New South Wales so that it would be in fact Sidere Mens Eadem Mutato.

Plate 15 Nicholson gave the university a number of tapestries, but only two survive. Little is known of their provenance, but details of Nicholson's attitude towards them and their probable market value when he acquired them contribute to the overall impression of Nicholson's taste and the effect it had on the university. The only gift by Nicholson which has been on continuous display since it was received by the university is the Gobelin tapestry, Joseph and his Brethren (1773). It was loaned for the adornment of the Great Hall on the occasion of the first Commemoration and inauguration of the Hall, held on 18 July, 1859. The loan was converted to a gift in 1862 when Nicholson had delivered to the university 'a large piece of Gobelin tapestry which I have occasionally permitted to be hung on the walls of the Great Hall, I leave this in your charge and enclose the key of the case in which it is contained'. The tapestry was presented before the Lindesay auction of Nicholson's pictures and other possessions, including other tapestries, and thus cannot be seen as a gift of questionable or dubious value like the pictures,
and it may have been acquired specifically for the Great Hall. Nicholson obviously regarded it as an important piece because he gave specific instructions for its hanging:

If the Authorities of the University will undertake to have an appropriate frame work for the hanging and due presentation of this beautiful work of art in a suitable position in the Hall, with a curtain to protect it and a lining of wood at the back I shall be ready to cement the loan into a gift and am willing that it should be so deemed. In the meantime I place the Tapestry in your hands and trust that it will be carefully preserved.

The university senate accepted the 'valuable work of art' and undertook to send a description of the hanging, but the 'wood at the back' has not yet been installed, one hundred and twenty-six years later.

In the same way that Nicholson stressed the 'munificence' of his gift of paintings and publicly inflated their importance whilst privately not valuing them himself, he also made clear that the Joseph tapestry was a gift of significant value. His letter continues:

I have no desire to enhance the value of an immediate or prospective gift but I believe that a similar piece of Gobelin could not be produced at the present day from the Imperial manufacture for less than fifteen hundred pounds.

Nicholson's estimate of the cost of the manufacture of this tapestry may have been correct, but it was most unlikely that a similar tapestry would have been woven in the 1860s in view of the decreased activity at the Gobelin factory after the French Revolution. If Nicholson bought the tapestry at auction, which he probably did, he would have paid much less than £1500. In 1852 a late eighteenth-century Gobelin panel (16'6" x 9'6") with a similar religious subject to the Joseph (The Death of Ananias) sold at Christie's for £108/18/-, but this was a very high price and was the first tapestry panel sold by Christie's at over £100. The sale price for the same panel two years later, in 1854, was a mere £6. The low price for tapestry was due to changes in society largely resulting from the French Revolution. European aristocrats who retained large mansions no longer had money to commission tapestries and the houses of the nouveau riche were not suitable for wall hangings and in France particularly tapestries were unpopular because they were regarded as the taste of kings. There was some fashion for tapestry in England,
however, where they were hung in the Gothic revival baronial halls which were fashionable additions to English country houses for the wealthy who had antiquarian interests. Examples of tapestry are not found in other colonial collections as far as is known, but Nicholson had 'a quantity of very beautiful Flemish tapestry' at Lindesay although none of his residences were large enough to house the Joseph tapestry. The Great Hall at the university offered the perfect location, however, and at its inauguration it was reported that:

**plate 14**

The walls were hung with exquisite specimens of Gobelin Tapestry brought from England by Sir Charles Nicholson. One easily distinguished by the peculiar shading of its colours is an original bearing the date 1772 (sic). The subject represents 'Joseph and his Brethren'.

To date details of Nicholson's purchase of this tapestry are not known. Sales of series from which the Joseph comes are known in Paris in 1907 and 1912. Nicholson was travelling in Italy in the 1850s and purchased works of art from dealers there. It is possible that he also acquired the Joseph tapestry there as it once belonged to the Papal Chamberlain, Count Onesti. It has always been common knowledge that Nicholson was the donor of the Joseph tapestry which has always been valued by the university (several conservation treatments have been carried out). Nicholson's inference that he paid a high price for it is written into the university archives and has never been questioned although it seems probable that he acquired it rather cheaply, nevertheless the gift, supposedly at a high price, has contributed to Nicholson's reputation as a benefactor.

**plate 61**

The only other remaining tapestry is a Flemish piece entitled Triumph of Diana from a well-documented series entitled Triumphs of the Gods and Goddesses. The entire set of the original weaving can be seen in the Museum voor Schone Kunst, Ghent, Belgium, where a tapestry room was constructed specially for their display. The original series of five pieces was woven in the atelier of Urbanus Leniers (b. Brussels 1674, d. 1747), and Kendrick Reydams II (b. Brussels 1650, d. 1719). They held the monopoly on the cartoons which were specifically ordered by them in 1717 from Jan van Orley (1665-1735) and Augustin Coppens (1668-1740), the former specialised
in figures and the latter in landscapes. Weaving from the Diana cartoon continued until 1734 and because of the monopoly restriction on the cartoons there is no doubt that the university example is authentic. The university Diana is smaller than the first weaving and there are some variations on the right side, but the figure of Diana, one attendant nymph, dog and game are identical in size and design to the Ghent version. The landscape background and sections of the tree trunk of the university Diana are taken from another cartoon in the series The Triumph of Apollo. The nuances of colour in the drapery of the goddess's garments are meant to simulate the variations of colour possible in a painting but the lack of knowledge of technicalities of the dyes used to produce new colours in the eighteenth century led to uneven fading of tapestries in this series. The university tapestry is less faded than those at Ghent, probably because it has only recently been hung after being in storage for many decades. It has a narrower border than the Ghent version which includes the coat of arms of the Old Town of Ghent in the centre of the upper galloon. The entire upper galloon is missing from the university Diana but the galloon on the other three sides is similar to the example of the Diana tapestry at the Hermitage Museum, Leningrad. Eleven editions of the series are known. Extant examples include a version in the Hermitage which has variations in the design. In 1926 the complete series hung at the home of Sacherverel Sitwell, Renishaw Hall, Derbyshire, England. His family purchased the tapestries in London from the collection of Phillipe Egalité, Duc d'Orleans. Sitwell, who considered these tapestries one of the marvels of the eighteenth century, remarked also on another edition of the series 'mois grand que les notres' at Lord Leicester's house Holkham Hall, Norfolk.

In view of Nicholson's claims that some of his paintings came from the Buckingham collection at Stowe, it is worth noting that Thomas Martyn, writing in 1767, mentions that at Stowe in the State apartments 'the walls are adorned with curious (i.e. skilful O.E.D. 1771 meaning) pieces of Tapestry viz. The Triumph of Diana, ditto Mars, ditto of Venus, ditto of Bacchus, ditto of Ceres.' It is much more likely that Nicholson bought the tapestry sold by John Matthew Gutch esq. F.S.A. of Common Hill, Worcester on 26 March 1858. It was described for the auction, which Nicholson attended,
as 'Gobelin' but represented Diana, her dogs and attendant nymphs and was of approximately the same dimensions as the university Diana. 116

If, as argued above, Nicholson, in his collection, aspired to an erudite and conservative taste and was in some aspects didactic, and if through it he aimed to establish at the university a moral and political climate which would further strengthen the bonds with England, how does the subject matter and content of these tapestries support this assumption? It has already been shown that Nicholson attached some importance to the Joseph tapestry. The subject is a religious one, yet at no time was the Great Hall where the tapestry was hung, intended for religious ceremonies, nor was Nicholson himself, in his early years, particularly religious, although he had a scholarly interest in the Bible. 117 But there are several aspects of the scene depicted which would have attracted Nicholson and the content could be read in a way which supports the above suggestion. The tapestry shows Joseph as a wise ruler not only loving his dependent relations but prudently providing for them. In the eyes of a nineteenth-century viewer this scene would have had a didactic significance pointing to a moral. Could it be that Joseph was seen as a metaphor for England, caring for her dependent colonies, providing for them and receiving grateful gestures in return? Although this interpretation is pure hypothesis, the message of reconciliation and family ties would have been welcomed by many of the elite of the colony at a time when debate about introduction of a new system of government for the colony and the discovery of gold were just two unsettling facets of colonial society. There is no doubt, however, that the setting in Egypt would have appealed to Nicholson's passion for Egyptian antiquity, although the only iconographical indication of Egypt is a single palm tree in the left background.

The Diana tapestry does not support the above argument, it is not didactic, and should be seen as purely decorative. It has never been hung in an official room at the university (although at the time of writing it is hung in a private room at the university) but it is noted as hanging in the Warden's room early in the twentieth century. 118 As noted earlier the collection of tapestry was
practically extinct in European countries in the nineteenth century, although as I have shown there were some examples in England but only amongst the wealthy. Thus again, a conservative taste is revealed and to some extent an individual preference.

The question of Nicholson's collection of antiquities must now be examined. Does this collection also reveal conservative taste, and if not, how does it relate to other nineteenth-century collections? It has already been claimed that Nicholson's taste differed from Salting's in relation to the collection of antiquities and also from that of colonial collectors, for Nicholson's was the only collection of antiquities in the colony. In 1860 he gave the university four hundred and eight Egyptian objects and one hundred Greek vases as well as other pre-historic Etruscan and Roman objects. While such a collection was unique in New South Wales, the situation amongst European collectors, however, was quite the opposite in spite of the example of Salting quoted above.

In England the widespread enthusiasm for antiquities was shared by William Long (b. Sydney 1839), the Cambridge student and son of an ex-convict turned publican. William Long established an interest in antiquities at the University of Sydney one year before Nicholson made his grand gift. The university Calendar for 1860 lists amongst the donors for 1859:

William Long Esq. (Trinity College, Cambridge)
Two casts from the METOPES of the Parthenon in the Elgin Collection in the British Museum
Four casts from the PANATHENAIC FRIEZE of the Parthenon in the Elgin Collection in the British Museum
Cast of the statue of THESEUS in the Elgin Collection
Cast of ILISSUS or RIVER GOD in the Elgin Collection.

The casts of Theseus and Ilissus are not now known, but the other six were built into the walls of the southern vestibule of the main building of the university quadrangle. They provide an appropriate setting for the entrance to the original Nicholson museum which Nicholson himself ensured was built to receive his 1860 gift of antiquities, but Long was not acknowledged by Nicholson as the donor of the casts. No doubt his convict father was an embarrassment although he had become rich and lived at Tusculum, adjacent to Sir James Martin.
To return to Nicholson, in discussing his Egyptian collection it should be remembered that Egypt has been the victim of tomb robbers and collectors of curios since the days of the Pharaoh, but by the 1830s the acquisition of Egyptian objects by European collectors had reached outrageous proportions. Egyptian artifacts were so commonplace by 1832 that William Hazlitt remarked that 'any eighteenth-century squire had collections of Egyptian hieroglyphics and mummies'. It is not appropriate here to analyse all the causes of this phenomenon, but its impact was widespread.

Architecture, furniture design and fashion in England were affected by the craze. The Duke of Buckingham built an Egyptian Hall at Stowe in 1805 and Bullock's Museum in Piccadilly, which opened in 1812, had an extraordinary pseudo-Egyptian facade. The new Crystal Palace, opened in 1854, had an Egyptian Court in which the Colossi of Abu Simbel were reproduced. There were countless other examples. Many museums also had Egyptian collections. The British Museum's Egyptian collection had been founded by Sir Hans Soane in 1756 and later in 1802 received the Rosetta Stone while Vivant-Denon had assembled the enormous Egyptian collection at the Louvre to mention only two examples. The eighteenth-century antiquarian interest in Egyptian curios gave way, in the nineteenth century, to a more scholarly interest in the scientific recording of these artifacts, but tomb robbery was still rife.

By the 1840s Egypt had become easily accessible to travellers through the opening of the overland route from England to India. A journey from Australia could be undertaken via India and the Red Sea overland from Suez or Kosier then across the desert to Thebes and the Nile. The journey continued via the new P. and O. steamers from Cairo to London. The new route facilitated heavy traffic and catered for wealthy tourists who flocked to Egypt. This route would have been available to Nicholson when he visited Egypt in 1856-57. Egyptology became both a scholarly and fashionable pursuit. One scholar remarked that 'it would be hardly respectable, on one's return from Egypt, to present oneself in Europe without a mummy in one hand and a crocodile in the other'. Although it was customary to acquire Egyptian artifacts from hawkers and curio dealers in situ, some Egyptian objects were sold at auction
and brought relatively high prices. In 1859 Sotheby's sold a sixth-century BC Saitic bronze hawk (17¼" high) for £20/10/- and a similar cat (16" high) for £10. 123

An examination of the taste displayed in Nicholson's collection of Greek vases must be seen in the context of the history of the collection of Greek pottery, which by contrast to Egyptian collecting, began in the eighteenth century. The earliest scholarly work on Greek pottery did not appear until Sir William Hamilton published a catalogue on his first collection in 1766-67. 124 Huge numbers of Greek pots have come to light, and for technical reasons, almost all are authentic. 125 By the middle of the nineteenth century large numbers of them were in circulation. The director of the Rome Monte di Pieta from 1830-57, the Marchese Campana, had a collection of 3,800 Greek vases. 126 In common with French mirrors, Persian rugs and gothic candlesticks, Greek vases were familiar items in the English household. 127 Between 1785, when Sir William Hamilton sold 180 Greek vases for £4,724 or approximately 25 guineas per vase, and 1848 when the Duke of Buckingham sold a red-figure vase for £24/3/- through Christie's at the great Stowe sale, the commercial value of Greek pottery remained almost static. But by 1856, however, prices for good quality vases had risen steadily to occasionally reach over £100: the Earl of Orford sold a fine truncated sphere vase for £129/2/- in 1856. 128

Etruscan bronzes came on the market from time to time and could be purchased for around £100. Roman bronzes were not so expensive, the Duke of Buckingham sold two at the Stowe sale for much less than he had paid for them (for instance a bronze figure of Theseus which was purchased for £200 sold for £53/11/-). A high relief sarcophagus sold for £39/18/- in 1842. 129 Of course it was not bronze, but it was Roman and there was a sarcophagus included in Nicholson's gift to the university.

Although it appears that Nicholson did not acquire his objects at auction, the prices quoted indicate the demand for the articles. Nicholson stated that he acquired the Egyptian, Greek, Etruscan and Roman artifacts during his visit to Italy and journey down the Nile which began at 'Syene' or Aswan in 1856. 130 Nicholson
assembled this collection at a time when the craze for Egyptian artifacts was at its height and when Greek vases - which had been included in many eighteenth-century collections such as the Buckingham - were nevertheless bringing an increasing price at auction, which indicates a new wave of enthusiasm for them.

The importance Nicholson attached to his collection of 'Etruscan, Greek, Roman and Egyptian antiquities' is indicated by his employment of Joseph Bonomi to compile a 'Catalogue of Egyptian and other Antiquities collected by Sir Charles Nicholson', published in London in 1858. Bonomi (1796-1878) was well-known in England as a specialist in Egyptology who worked as a draughtsman, illustrator, cataloguer and producer of casts in situ from Egyptian statues. He was employed by J.G. Wilkinson to illustrate his famous Ancient Egyptians and by the British Museum, Hartwell House and the organisers of the Crystal Palace's Egyptian Hall. Nicholson thus placed his collection of antiquities in illustrious company, and no doubt Bonomi's agreement to undertake the catalogue indicates that in his view it had considerable merit. Today, Nicholson's original collection is regarded as uneven, but it does contain a number of first-class pieces such as the Eighteenth-Dynasty portrait of Horemheb and the black figure cups painted by Sakonides and the Brygos painter. Other items such as Roman sepulchral inscriptions and inscribed blocks from the Nineteenth-Dynasty tomb-chapel of Mose are of value for their archaeological interest. There are a few fakes but not sufficient to conclude that Nicholson lacked discernment in this area of his collection.

It is very doubtful if the significance of Nicholson's generous gift of antiquities was understood by more than a handful of individuals in the colony in 1860 when he made the donation. Nicholson himself however, in offering his collection of 'Etruscan, Greek, Roman and Egyptian antiquities' to the university coyly pointed out (as usual) that he had 'no desire to enhance the value of the donation in saying what is nevertheless the fact, that the formation of the collection which I now offer to the university has been attended with much personal labour and no inconsiderable pecuniary outlay'.
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Nicholson's collection of Egyptian, Etruscan and Roman antiquities, whilst it was unique in the colony, accords with fashionable European taste. Of course, neither Nicholson nor any other nineteenth-century collectors regarded objects such as these as works of art, but like the portraits they were didactic material. Nicholson saw them as supplying materials interesting in themselves and most important in the illustrations of various branches of historical, philological and classical enquiry. 134

The various aspects of Nicholson's benefactions which have been addressed in the preceding discussions, lead to an assessment of his overall taste and its effect upon the university. Taken as a whole the preferences revealed in Nicholson's benefactions manifest the breadth of his cultural interests. But he was a complex personality whose tastes varied with each section of his collection. The preferences expressed in the picture collection were conservative with one exception. His interest in classical (Greek and Roman) antiquities follows a well-established eighteenth-century fashion, the Egyptian collection reveals a scholarly interest in classification and history which was at a high point of popularity in England when Nicholson was collecting. On the other hand his tapestries revealed an idiosyncratic taste. Although he is regarded by some writers as Australia's first great collector his taste was English, yet in the English context his collection was relatively insignificant. In the colonies there was only a handful of people trying to assemble collections and in the 1850s and 1860s there does not appear to have been an identifiable Australian taste. In his early years in the colony Nicholson saw himself as an arbiter of taste and felt himself to be well enough informed on the subject to deliver lectures on 'the Application of the Principle of Taste to the Arts' in 1842 as already mentioned. 135

Unfortunately there is no record of these lectures, however, it was reported that 'Dr. Nicholson' who was Vice-President of the School of Arts in 1842, and other officials of the institution, were bringing together the higher classes of society to gratify their polished taste, rather than to impart useful instruction to that body for whose exclusive benefit the Institution was formed'. 136 This assessment of Nicholson's lectures from the popular and somewhat
radical press, may have had some credibility. 'Taste' was an eighteenth-century concept, which according to David Hume involved moral and cultural values and a 'sensibility' to beauty. Sir Joshua Reynolds linked it with 'genius', but it was also related to rules and manners in polite society. But by the nineteenth century, on the other hand, Wordsworth was questioning the concept of 'taste' as shallow and opposed to ideas of 'truth', 'passion' and 'dignity' which he found in nature's common man. It could be said that Nicholson was catering for an audience which had aspirations to gentility, even though Sydney's main reason for existence less than two years previously had been as a penal colony, the bulk of whose citizens had less status even than Wordsworth's 'common man'.

Throughout his days in the colony Nicholson retained his didactic attitude which appears to have been the strongest motive for his donation of what he regarded as the best of his collection. His primary incentive, which must be related to his taste, can be expressed in his own words - 'In a country like Australia where all is new, objects comparatively insignificant in themselves yet illustrative of the manners, religion and thoughts of those who lived during earlier periods of the world's history possess a value and interest far beyond that which would belong to them in European states'. As Diane Sachko Macleod points out, in the Victorian context, donations of private art collections to the public should be regarded as similar to other socially ameliorating activities like the setting up of Mechanics Institutes. In regard to one such donation the Art Union commented that 'the salutary influence of ART on the universal mind requires no argument: it is impossible that a people can be coarse or vicious whose sources of enjoyment are refined and intellectual'. Nicholson expressed such sentiments when he donated a collection of casts from the antique to the Australian Museum:

In presenting them to the public of New South Wales, I have been influenced by the hope that they may be instrumental in exciting a taste - especially amongst the native youth of the colony for that branch of the fine arts of which the originals of these casts are the most cultivated examples. Therefore, Nicholson's overall taste can be identified with aspects of English attitudes towards collecting, which, as in Nicholson's case, had strong didactic tendencies.
In what ways have Nicholson's benefactions affected the university and the wider community? One could ask also whether Nicholson's benefactions had any effect upon his own image either in England or in Australia? In relation to the university it has been suggested that Nicholson's aims regarding his donations were didactic: he sought to reinforce ties between colonial and English institutions and to provide an instant heritage for the university. Have these aspirations been fulfilled? Before attempting to assess the overall effects of Nicholson's benefactions the effects of various categories of gifts will be discussed.

The first to be considered are the Joseph tapestry, the stained glass windows and the mace, which are all associated with the Great Hall, the architectural style of which owes much to Nicholson's influence as pointed out in Chapter I. Since it was donated, the Joseph tapestry has hung in the Great Hall and together with the stained glass windows, contributes markedly to the atmosphere of history, English tradition, formality, richness and dignity which strikes one immediately upon entry. The acquisition of the silver mace, which significantly appears in the H.W. Phillips portrait of Nicholson, obliged the university to follow a tradition taken directly from English universities: that of the Esquire Bedell, who bears the mace, a symbol of the authority of the university senate, when preceding the academic procession. The creation of an instant heritage was certainly the intention of Sir Charles, and it cannot be denied that with the help of these benefactions, he succeeded brilliantly. Nevertheless, whilst many commentators, in writing on Sydney generally, praised the Great Hall and its contents, its effect on the community was principally to provide a visible link with England. The effect of the Great Hall and its contents upon the taste of the community was commented upon by Nicholson's daughter-in-law when she visited Sydney in 1897. She wondered at the 'bad taste of the present Sydneysites with such an example (as the Great Hall) before them'.

Although Nicholson's pictures and tapestries were hanging at the university, it must be admitted that, apart from the Joseph tapestry, they aroused very little interest, either at the university or in the wider community. Indeed, when Professor Badham, the principal of the university, delivered the inaugural address at the
opening conversazione and art exhibition of the New South Wales Academy of Art, he did not refer either to Nicholson or his pictures, nor were any paintings from the university included in the exhibition. Although there was a committee of senate convened in 1880 to 'ascertain the safe custody of the antiquities and pictures given by him (Nicholson) to the university', the committee's only report omitted any reference to the pictures or tapestries. The community must have been aware that there was a collection of paintings at the university, for it is recorded that the offer of a 'Mr. Fielding' to clean and restore the pictures at a cost of £59 was declined by the university senate in 1880. Later, in 1888 when the New South Wales Commission for the Centennial International Exhibition invited the university to lend works of art for the exhibition, the university declined. Evidence suggests that it was not only the works of art which lacked attention at this time, for in 1883 Richard Twopenny commented on the failure of the university to attract 'any considerable number of students', and noted that 'there is an indolence and laissez faire about the Sydney University ... (and) not until there is a thorough reformation of the whole style, tone and management will there be any real progress'.

There are no records to indicate that Nicholson's pictures were ever shown publicly in the nineteenth century, although from photographic evidence, they were hung in the university senate room and the registrar's office, not areas frequented by students or the general public. Thus the effect of the paintings in the nineteenth century was minimal because they were not seen. In the early twentieth century H.E. Barff, the registrar, arranged for conservation (some of it disastrous by today's standards) and he attempted some research on some of the paintings between 1903 and 1912. Such activity indicated some interest, but again no marked influence on the immediate or wider community.

After some years of languishing unacknowledged, the paintings achieved some measure of public and international recognition through an article which was written by Professor David MacMillan, then archivist, and published in the Connoisseur Year Book 1957, referred to earlier. The article included two reproductions of the 'Lady in Blue', the Coxcie and the Woolner portrait medallion of Wentworth,
and asserted that Sydney University was richly endowed with items of interest, all presented by Nicholson. At this time little had been written on individual art collections or benefactors in Australia, although several articles by the conservator employed by MacMillan, D.J. Setelik, appeared a couple of years earlier. MacMillan's interest in the paintings was not pursued or taken up by others. Both Setelik's and MacMillans articles deal with the style and possible provenance of the paintings. Neither refer to Nicholson's donation as a group of historical portraits, which it has been suggested here was intended by him to be didactic. Nicholson's paintings have, therefore, only been a source of interest from time to time. Except for Lady Clifford which seems to have been on constant view, they have been in storage for at least thirty years, but the current revival of interest in colonial history has aroused some interest in the collection some items of which have been restored and rehung.

In contrast, Nicholson's donation of four hundred odd articles of antiquity with which the Nicholson Museum was founded has been of great significance, although the original collection now forms a very small part of the Museum collection. The Nicholson Museum is known as Australia's foremost museum of antiquities, lending the university great prestige in this area. In fact there is no other collection in Australia which is comparable in significance. The reason that such a distinguished collection grew out of Nicholson's original benefaction is doubtless due to the fact that Nicholson gave express instructions that a curator should be employed from the start and he ensured that the original main building included a space for the Museum (at the expense of the clock tower which was added later). Nicholson designed the collection 'to enable the Professors to avail themselves of their aid (objects in the collection) in the illustration of classical lectures'. Sydney was the first university to use a collection of antiquities for teaching purposes, although there were at the time collections of antiquities at both the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford and the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. The introduction of archaeology to the curriculum of the university was undoubtedly a result of the Nicholson donation of antiquities, although no research has been carried out to support this assertion. In the nineteenth century the university also gained some international recognition through the association between the Nicholson Museum
and the Egypt Exploration Society, through whose auspices the Nicholson antiquities were listed at the Egyptian National Museum at Gizeh. On the local scene the Nicholson antiquities and the Museum have had no perceptible effect on the art world. Nicholson himself never envisaged this, but the idea was postulated by Professor Joseph Burke. He suggested that the antiquities had possibilities as a resource for Australian artists who could use them in the same way as European artists such as Paul Klee, Brancusi and Picasso used similar European collections.

There is no question that Nicholson's personal reputation was enhanced as a result of his benefactions to the university. In the nineteenth century one anonymous English writer praised him for his 'taste, ability and munificence' with which he so richly endowed the university, and suggested further that 'he will prove in the future of Australia what Sir Hans Sloane is to us in reference to the British Museum'. The colonials certainly did not see Nicholson in this light when he finally departed from the colony in 1862. Then it was to his political and mercantile activities that the local media referred and in so doing made some sour remarks about his baronetcy, social tastes and ambition. The leader writer of the Empire pointed out that:

On returning to Sydney after his elevation to a baronetcy, he soon became disgusted with the democratic tendencies of its government and people and on the separation of Qld. declared his intention of becoming a denizen of that very pretentious and would-be aristocratic colony ... things did not run smoothly there ... and we are informed that he had conceived of getting (Rockhampton where he had invested somewhat lavishly in land) erected into a separate colony. It is said he confidently anticipates getting the appointment of Governor if he is successful in his separation project ... The people of that rising settlement will probably be surprised to learn that they are to have greatness thrust upon them.

The Empire was not a conservative paper and despite Nicholson's great involvement in colonial life and his contribution in setting up the university, he did not win over the currency lads such as Charles Harper, who farewelled him with a biting epigram:
So Sir Charles goeth home, with his coals to Newcastle,
That is, with his Title, since with him it goes:
And there it may suit, as a personal tassel,
Though here it appears just as silly to those
Who dare think, as the reed in a Blackfellow's nose,
Whereby he would hint the sublime estimation
In which he is held (by himself) in his nation. 158

Although the media had praised Sir Charles for his benefactions
when the Great Hall was opened in 1859 and noted his contributions
to the windows and of the tapestries, to date no references have
been found to Nicholson in the role of benefactor and art lover upon
his final departure from the colony.

Nevertheless his reputation as a collector was again posited
almost a century after the anonymous English writer had compared
him to Sir Hans Sloane, when Rachael Roxburgh remarked that had
Nicholson's collection, 'Australia's first great art collection chanced
to remain at Lindesay, Sydney might have had a museum analogous
to London's Wallace Collection'. 159 It is obvious, however, that
this writer was not familiar with the pictures.

Upon the centenary of Nicholson's arrival in the colony (1934)
his sons gave the famous Hermes statue to the university, and on
that occasion the reputation and influence of Sir Charles, as it was
then perceived, was outlined by Professor Todd, as follows:

But in respect of his ... services to the University of
Sydney and through it, to the culture of a whole continent
Sir Charles Nicholson stands alone ... To him we owe the
priceless treasures of the Museum of Antiquities which bears
his name, a collection which is now, and must always remain
unique in Australia; to him, whether as giver or prompter
of the gift, we owe all the splendid windows of stained glass
which adorn this Hall: to him all the tapestries and almost
all the pictures which delight our eyes and refresh our
spirits; to him the enrichment of our Library with valuable
printed books and manuscripts ...
His especial care was the aesthetic culture of the University
the necessity, in a new and materially minded country, of
cultivating good taste in literature and art. He was the
first and greatest of our spiritual benefactors, the man who
ensured that this ... University founded in British lands
beyond the seas, should become and remain worthy of its
name and heritage. 160

By 1934 Nicholson's reputation as a great benefactor was firmly
established and had subsumed his personal reputation as a snob,
at least in the estimation of the currency lads and lasses and their descendants.

Todd's summary of Nicholson's influence is just in many ways and indicated that Nicholson's benefactions were well-known in 1934, but it also reflects the attitudes of the time, when Australia still saw itself as an 'outpost of the British Empire' and a place which should reflect English standards, values and interests. Therefore, if Nicholson's aim had been to cement British and colonial relationships, the above address indicated that he succeeded and that the bond remained until at least 1934 when the address was first delivered and possibly until 1947 when it was reprinted upon the death of Sir Sydney Nicholson.

In summary, Nicholson's own reputation was significantly enhanced by his benefactions, not only in Sydney but also amongst his friends in England, but the university also gained in many ways as outlined above. Nicholson's didactic intentions only succeeded in direct relationship to the Nicholson Museum. If he had ideas of imparting moral standards and exemplars to live by through his collection of works of art, it cannot be said that any evidence survives to suggest that this idea was ever comprehended by the university community. It could, however, be confidently asserted that the foregoing analysis shows that Nicholson's benefactions established links between the colonial university and the British tradition and thus reinforced ties between the colony and England, although it could never, in fact, be 'the same under southern skies'. 
Conclusion

In 1989, as the writing of this thesis is reaching its conclusion, the University of Sydney is on the threshold of a dramatic expansion in relation to art and art collections. The University Collection, from which nineteenth-century examples have been taken to illustrate this thesis, has now been recognised as an important and cohesive collection within the ambit of public art collections in this country; the university's Museum of Contemporary Art, which contains the Power collection has been established at Circular Quay in Sydney and a programme of international exhibitions is planned; the Nicholson Museum retains its leading and prestigious position within the archaeological discipline in this country; the university Art Workshop, formerly housed in the famous Tin Sheds is now located in a permanent building which contains an exhibition area; the Sydney College of the Arts is to become a College of the university; and collections of material relating to the cultural heritage of the university have been identified. No other university in Australia will be as richly endowed with such a wide variety of collections and activities in the field of art as the University of Sydney. It could even be said that the University of Sydney now finds itself in a position where it has a responsibility to take a leading role in shaping the cultural life not only of its own institution, but also of the community at large.

It is therefore timely that the genesis of the collections formed and the architectural style related to the foundation of the university should be examined as it has been in this thesis. Neither the art collections, nor the result of the choice of architectural style have previously received anything but scant attention either in connection with the history of the university or analysis of the University Collection and its relationship to other colonial collections. This study set out to redress these omissions for the period 1850 - 1900.

Broadly it has been claimed that the architectural style of the main buildings and the original collections formed at the university played a major role in shaping public perception of the fledgling institution as a bastion of English tradition, as a symbol of law and
order and as a visible re-inforcement of the dependent relationship between the colony and the mother country. Other issues which arise are, first the undoubted enhancement of the private reputations of the founders of the university through their identification with the grandiose buildings, the portrait collection and private donations. The second issue relates to reasons for commissioning European and English portrait painters as opposed to relying on local artists.

In a colonial population composed largely of 'the redundant poor' of Great Britain, who had neither the skill nor taste to transfer the 'English tradition' to the colony, the leadership in opinion and taste fell to the free settlers who were largely middleclass Englishmen, such as Sir Charles Nicholson. This study has argued that Nicholson and his colleagues who founded the university consciously chose the Gothic style of architecture for the Great Hall in preference to any other with the specific intention of constructing an image for the university. The imposing Gothic 'noble pile' was calculated to operate on the principles of associationism, which were well-known to the educated elite of the colony, but which were also practised, perhaps unconsciously, by the less educated members of society. It has also been shown in this study how the Gothic style imposed upon the new institution of higher learning an instant but pseudo history which insisted upon the strength of the links between the colony and the mother country, an important issue in the 1850s when the discovery of gold increased the wealth and potential independence of the colony. The imposing building was advertised throughout Great Britain and the colony of New South Wales by popular journals and in spite of the fact that there were distressingly few students enrolled the importance of the university was asserted by its huge Gothic Revival building, which was at once tradition-laden and fashionable. The international reputations of both the colony and the founders were promoted and elevated as a result of the erection of the Gothic Revival style Great Hall of the university.

While there was no articulated policy in regard to the acquisition of portraits for the university, the genesis of the portrait collection was largely due to the same individuals who chose the Gothic style of architecture for the Great Hall. Nevertheless, they commissioned
portraits as private individuals, not on behalf of the university, although in some cases the portraits were paid for by public subscription. In others the sitters, themselves, provided the funds. It will bear repeating that in spite of the random commissioning of portraits, a coherent pattern emerged; the style of patronage was conservative in the extreme, with an emphasis upon recognisable representation of the individual which entailed an image of respectability and power in all but a few cases. Lip service only was directed towards a desire for some standard of artistic integrity in the portraits, but this was rarely achieved due to the parsimonious attitude which prevailed. A majority of the portraits and certainly those acquired first (with one exception) were not painted in the colony, largely for reasons of social prestige. In contrast, most of the sculpture was produced in Sydney, and in some cases was funded by the university. The portraits were seen as contributing to an historical tradition, linked to Oxford and Cambridge and incidentally (or by design) placed the sitters within the historical tradition of founders of 'great universities'. Establishment of a portrait collection further entrenched English tradition associated with the university.

Nevertheless, the portrait collection at the University of Sydney has been shown to be the pre-eminent collection to have remained within the institution directly associated with the sitters. The aesthetic quality of the works was in some cases pedestrian, but they are of immense value as social and cultural documents.

As the first great benefactor in terms of works of art, Sir Charles Nicholson has always been regarded with due deference, to which in the case of the antiquities and stained glass he is entitled. Yet this study has revealed that such deference was not in all cases merited, although recognition of his generosity was constantly insisted upon in his own correspondence. Across the whole range of Nicholson's benefactions, including paintings, tapestries, antiquities, manuscripts and stained glass, his approach was didactic rather than directed to aesthetic considerations. His desire appears to have been to manufacture a standard of civilization, not only for the university but also for the wider community. Such an attitude was typical of the day and was also expressed by J. Sheridan Moore in his lecture of 1857, entitled 'Art Education in Australia'. This study reveals Nicholson as a complex character, in whom philanthropic
predilections and didactic intentions were tempered by personal ambition for public recognition and the desire for an elevated and honoured position in both colonial and English society.

His gift of the historical portraits points to his passing interest in the Italian Renaissance, probably fostered by a visit to Italy, and his choice of artists, often in copies, indicates a retardataire taste. His acquisition and gift of tapestries point to an antiquarian taste, while his interest in antiquities, particularly Egyptian, places him in a class of fashionable collectors of his day. In his collection of antiquities, which he himself regarded as his most important benefaction to the university, he made available to students and for scholarly purposes, to the wider community, a collection of a high standard, which he intended should be used for teaching purposes and in this respect he showed considerable foresight. Nevertheless, in forming a collection of antiquities, particularly Egyptian, Nicholson conformed to ideas relating to imperial expansion and in ignoring aboriginal historical artifacts of equal antiquity he was also following the accepted dogma that so-called 'primitive' people in colonial situations had nothing to offer in terms of art. Nicholson's benefactions continued the pattern of first, imposing an instant history and secondly, reinforcing the English tradition and strengthening the imperial domination of the colony.

While the art collections and style of the university did not produce an institution which was noted for its interest in art in the nineteenth century, they did make a significant contribution towards establishing a stable (if rather inactive in the nineteenth century) tertiary institution, conducted in conformity with the Oxbridge tradition. The aim stated by the founders, although not publicly admitted until after the university was established, of educating young men for administrative positions in the colony was fulfilled in the graduation of the student who became the first Prime Minister of the country, the Hon. Sir Edmund Barton, P.C., G.C.M.G.

It could not be argued that the original collections and style are directly responsible for the current expansion of interest in art at the university. Nevertheless, there may be an indirect link. The institution was established as one which would endure, as
'Futurity' Merewether asserted, and as a place where benefactions and bequests would be appropriately received. Although there was very little activity in relation to art in the first years of the twentieth century, due no doubt to two world wars and the economic depression of the early thirties, two major collections of art were loaned to the University of Sydney Union during those years, the A.J.L. McDonnell collection and the collection of Dr. Oscar Paul. These collections remained at the university until after 1958. The university received significant gifts of groups of works of art, including the gift of Miss Lucy Swanton in 1953, acknowledged as 'a small group of Australian paintings', but which proved to contain a number of important works by leading Australian painters including Sir Russell Drysdale, Sir William Dobell, Donald Friend, Ian Fairweather and others. A.R. Renshaw also made a major bequest of another important group of paintings by Jeffrey Smart, as well as works by Donald Friend, Justin O'Brien, James Gleeson to name a few; and a corporate donor, Aquila Steel, gave a number of Lloyd Rees paintings from the Cathedrals of France series. There are numerous donors of individual works of art and sculpture. The major twentieth-century donor in the field of art is, of course, Dr. John Wardell Power who bequeathed shares valued at £2,000,000 to the university 'to make available to the people of Australia the latest ideas in the plastic arts by means of lecturing and teaching and by the purchase of the most recent contemporary art of the world'. The Power collection is now housed in the Museum of Contemporary Art. In the twentieth century the portrait collection has been expanded. Australian artists are favoured, and many of the country's leading artists are represented. The history of these twentieth-century collections is yet to be written, although a brief outline has already been published.

This thesis has touched on a number of areas which present prospects for further investigation. There is a lack of any comprehensive study of all the museum collections at the University of Sydney, encompassing all the art and antiquities collections, the scientific collections, such as the Macleay Museum collections and some scientific teaching collections, the Rare Books collection and others. The research carried out for this thesis has revealed the need for a detailed and all embracing study of art collections in
in Australia in the nineteenth century as well as a study of institutional portrait collections in the nineteenth century, including works by both local and European artists. In looking at the work of Thomas Woolner in the University Collection and through brief research on Adelaide Ironside and the Stenhouse circle it appears that there is scope for a study of the Pre-Raphaelites in the Australian context.

In conclusion, this study has endeavoured to show that the intention of the founders of the University of Sydney to create an institution in which 'although the stars differ, the mind remains the same' was initially successful to some degree. I have shown that the style of building and the type of collections formed played a significant role in shaping the image of the institution and enhancing the reputations of the founders, both in the colony and in the mother country, as well as supporting imperial domination of the colony and providing a symbol of civilization. It has also been shown that an analysis of the visual environment can contribute to our knowledge of history as well as adding to art historical knowledge.
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Appendix I

Portraits in Government House, Sydney. (Nineteenth Century)

1st Governor, 1788-1792
Captain Arthur Phillip, R.N.
After F. Wheatley, R.A. 1786 (National Portrait Gallery)
Presented by the Royal Empire Society on the 150th anniversary of the
foundation of New South Wales.

2nd Governor, 1795-1800
Captain John Hunter, R.N.
From the original in the Nan Kivell Collection, National Library, Canberra.

3rd Governor, 1800-1806
Captain Philip Gidley King, R.N. 1890
Artist unknown. From a pastel portrait at the Australasian Pioneers
Club, Sydney.

4th Governor, 1806-1808
Captain William Bligh, R.N.

5th Governor, 1810-1821
Colonel Lachlan Macquarie
F. Leist after R. Read. (May not be Macquarie, possibly Colonel Erskine).

6th Governor, 1821-1825
Major-General Sir Thomas Brisbane, K.C.B.
Augustus Earle.

7th Governor, 1825-1831
Lieutenant-General Sir Ralph Darling, G.C.H.
Artist unknown, possibly Augustus Earle.

8th Governor, 1831-1837
Major-General Sir Richard Bourke, K.C.B., 1841
Andrew Morton.

9th Governor, 1837-1846
Lieutenant-Colonel Sir George Gipps
E.U. Eddis.

10th Governor, 1846-1855
Sir Charles Augustus RitzRoy, K.C.H, K.C.B.
R. Buckner.

11 Governor, 1855-1861
Sir William Denison, K.C.B.
R. Buckner.

12th Governor, 1861-1867
Sir John Young, G.C.B., G.C.M.G.
R. Buckner.
13th Governor, 1868-1872
Richard (Lowry-Corry) 4th Earl of Belmore, K.C.M.G.
Artist unknown.

14th Governor, 1872-1879
Sir Hercules Robinson, P.C., G.C.M.G.
George Follingsby.

15th Governor, 1879-1885
Lord Augustus Loftus, P.C., G.C.B.
Photograph. Unknown photographer.

16th Governor, 1885-1890
Lord Carrington, P.C., G.C.M.G.
Julian Ashton.

17th Governor, 1891-1893
The Earl of Jersey, P.C., G.C.B., G.C.M.G.
Photograph. Unknown photographer.

18th Governor, 1893-1895
Sir Robert Duff, P.C., G.C.M.G.
Photograph. Unknown photographer.

19th Governor, 1895-1899
Viscount Hampden, G.C.M.G.
Tom Roberts. Collection, Art Gallery of N.S.W.

20th Governor, 1899-1901
Earl Beauchamp, K.C.M.G.
Tom Roberts. Collection, Art Gallery of N.S.W.

His Majesty King George III, 1800
After Sir Joshua Reynolds. Presented by the widow of Governor King.

Her Majesty Queen Charlotte, 1800
After Sir Joshua Reynolds. Presented by the widow of Governor King.

Princess Royal of England
Attrib. Winterhalter. From the collection of the 15th Governor.

Her Royal Highness The Princess of Wales Graves. Presented by the 16th Governor.

Lady Santry
Angelica Kauffmann after portrait in the Santry Collection.
Presented by the 16th Governor.

Her Majesty Queen Victoria
Unknown artist. Official portrait.

Information as supplied by the Official Secretary to His Excellency the Governor of New South Wales. 1986.
Appendix II

Society for the Promotion of the Fine Arts in Australia Exhibition, 1847

Works of art exhibited by Dr. (Sir) Charles Nicholson.

Paul Veronese, Ceres, 1532.
Watteau, Fête Champêtre.
Unknown artist, Interior with figures: A Dutch painting.
Zuccarelli, A Landscape with Cattle and Figures, 1710.
Unknown artist, A landscape.
Salvator Rosa, Head, 1614.
Unknown artist, Boy's Head.
Unknown artist, Girl's Head.
Unknown artist, Landscape with cattle.
Unknown artist, Landscape.
Unknown artist, Landscape.
Bacchus and Ariadne, cast from Canova.
The Laocoön, cast from the antique.
Cupid and Psyche, cast from the antique.
Ruins of the Temple at Paestrum, model.

Works of art exhibited by A.B. Spark.

Hondekooer, Poultry.
Pat Nasmyth, Landscape, Cottage and Figures.
Unknown artist, Flemish Interior: Intrigue.
Unknown artist, The Idle Boy.
J.P. Gillenmans, Children and Fruit.
des Palliere, Landscape: Ruins, Morning.
Jacques Jordaens, Judgement of Solomon: An Imitation of Rubens.
Unknown artist, Woman Asleep.
Stroehling, The Gladiators.
Unknown artist, Abbey Ruins and Figures by Moonlight.
Claude, Dawn.
Breughel, Landscape: Water Mill and Castle.
Samuel Elyard, Pencil drawing.
Unknown artist, A River Scene.

From exhibition catalogue, Society for the Promotion of the Fine Arts in Australia Exhibition, 22 June 1847, Australian Library, Bent Street, Sydney. (Mitchell Library, Society for the Promotions of the Fine Arts in Australia catalogues, [ML 7065]).
Appendix III

Charles Nicholson's auction
sale at Lindsay. Sydney Morning Herald 15 February, 1862.
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Plate 15. Gobelins factory, Joseph and his Brethren, 1773, wool and silk, 530.0 x 275.0.
Plate 16. Maurice Felton, (attrib.), Deas Thomson as a young man. n.d., 76.5 x 64.0.
Plate 17. Unknown, Francis Lewis Shaw Merswether, n.d., 145.0 x 102.0.
Plate 18. Giulio Anivitti, Charles Badham, 1875, 224.0 x 133.0.
Plate 20. Arthur J. Foster, Mr. Justice Sir William Charles Windeyer, n.d., 127.0 x 103.0.
Plate 22. Percy Spence, Sir Philip Sydney Jones, 1895, 180.0 x 130.0.
Plate 23. Ethel Stephens, Sir Henry Normand MacLaurin, n.d., 91.0 x 76.0.
Plate 24. Unknown, Mrs. Blacket, n.d., 80.5 x 48.0.
Plate 25. Unknown, Mrs. Woolley, n.d., pastel on paper, 71.0 cm 60.0 cm.
Plate 26. Charles Abrahams, Charles Windeyer, 1844, plaster, 76.0 x 47.0 x 23.0.
Plate 27. William Beynes, Helenus Scott, 1828, marble, 65.0 x 48.0 x 28.0.
Plate 28. Unknown, The Great Hall, University of Sydney, c.1870, photograph. (Only known photograph of Captain Cook statue in the Great Hall).
Plate 29. Unknown. Library, University of Sydney, c.1870. photograph.
(Now the Senate Room, showing busts of Deas Thomson, Helenus Scott, Shakespeare, Queen Elizabeth, portrait of Thomas Barker and bookcase donated by Charles Nicholson.)
Plate 30. Odoardo Fantacchiotti, Edward Deas Thomson, 1855, marble, 80.0 x 59.0 x 31.0.
Plate 31. Pietro Tenerani, W.C. Wentworth. 1861, marble, 208.0 x 124.0 x 74.0.
Plate 32. Jean B. Benzoni, Peter Nicol Russell, 1877, marble, 75.0 x 52.0 x 28.0
Plate 33. Thomas Woolner, Charles Nicholson, 1854, bronze, 21.5 diameter.
Plate 36. Thomas Woolner, W.C. Wentworth, 1854, bronze, 22.0 diameter.
Plate 37. Thomas Woolner, Governor Fitzroy, 1854, bronze, 21.5 diameter.
Plate 38. James White, John Smith, 1886, plaster painted black, 59.0 x 36.0 x 23.0.
Plate 39. James White, Anderson Stuart, 1894, marble, 70.0 x 52.0 x 30.0.
Plate 40. Achille Simonetti, John Henry Challis, 1893, marble, 230.0 x 92.0 x 66.0.
Plate 41. Achille Simonetti, Arthur Renwick, 1892, marble, 83.0 x 56.0 x 23.0.
Plate 42. Emile Leysalle, Sir William Montague Manning, 1894, marble.
72.0 x 57.0 x 22.0.
Plate 44. Follower of van Dyck, Lady Clifford, c.1660, 190.0 x 125.0.
Plate 45. Michiel Coxie, Adam and Eve, c.1540, tempera on wood panel, 142.0 x 112.0.
Plate 46. Unknown. Sea Captain. c.1640, 183.0 x 125.0.
Plate 47. Unknown, Caterina Cornaro, n.d., 113.0 x 92.0.
Plate 49. Unknown, *Anne of Denmark*, n.d., 110.0 x 88.0.
Plate 50. Unknown, Head of a Roman Cardinal, n.d., 28.0 x 35.0.
Plate 51. Unknown, Venetian nobleman, n.d., 68.0 x 52.0.
Plate 52. Unknown, Angelo Poliziano, n.d., 69.0 x 52.5.
Plate 53. Angelica Kauffmann, Cupid Distressed by Three Graces, n.d., 68.0 diameter.
Plate 54. Unknown, St. Sebastian, n.d., 180.0 x 116.0.
Plate 56. Marshall Claxton, Portrait of an unknown lady, c.1850,
142.0 x 112.0.
Plate 57. George Koberwein, Sir Charles Nicholson, 1867, conte crayon on paper, 59.0 x 46.0.
Plate 58. Unknown, after Titian. Mary Magdelene, n.d., 48.0 x 38.0.
Plate 59. Unknown, Dutch gentleman holding a glove. 1629, oil on panel, 90.0 x 70.0.
Plate 60. Unknown, after Pontormo, *Venus and Cupid*, n.d., 105.0 x 118.0.
Plate 62. Unknown, Registrar's Office. University of Sydney, c.1900, photograph. (Showing works of art donated by Sir Charles Nicholson).
Sir Charles Nicholson and one of his bookcases.

Photograph: Showing works of art donated by
University of Sydney, C. 1900.

Plate 63. Unknown. Senate Room, University of Sydney, C. 1900.