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In a ca. 1798 French portrait in the collection of the National Gallery of Art (fig. 1), a woman poses in an austere neoclassical interior wearing the most radical version of fashionable neoclassical dress: a sheer white muslin overdress twisted at the bust and gathered with little tasseled cords to form short sleeves. An opaque, high-waisted white shift underneath the sheer muslin drapes loosely over the sitter’s lower torso and legs, while a rich red shawl fills the chair behind her and twines around her back and over her left knee. Her unpowdered hair is ornamented only with a braid; she wears no jewelry. Restrained in palette, detail, and texture, this fashionable sitter’s ensemble is arranged to emphasize that her beauty is “natural” and embodied in her physical form, rather than in artifice or ornamentation. Yet, paradoxically, it proclaims its wearer’s natural beauty using the language of art: in its color, drape, and shape, the dress construes her as a classical goddess or muse, a marble sculpture come to life.

This radical fashion of undress, sometimes called empire-style or *robes à la grecque*, swept the metropolitan centers of Europe and

North America in the 1790s, overturning mores of modesty and display and startling contemporary commentators. A 1790s dress in the collection of the RISD Museum (figs. 2.1–2.3) exemplifies a less extreme version of the style, featuring modest sleeves and a breast-covering flounce, but maintains the key elements: a matte, white textile; a high waist that skims the form of the body rather than decorating its surface; and a spareness of yardage that created a columnar silhouette and connoted simplicity. Scholars have often explained neoclassical dress as a revolutionary political statement exemplifying classical virtue and moral transparency; or as decadent French chic; or as a Rousseauian gesture to authentic maternity and gender essentialism. But in fact, neoclassical fashion did not emerge from the crucible of political revolution, nor was it invented in France; rather, it first arose as artistic dress, used by innovators in painting, theater, and dance in their search for a more authentic and expressive art. Between 1770 and 1830, both fashionable dress and theatrical practice underwent dramatic changes in an attempt to become more “natural.” And yet this desire was widely recognized as paradoxical, since both fashion and the theater were longstanding tropes of artifice. In this exhibition, we examine this paradox of “artful nature” through the changing conception of theatricality during these decades, as mirrored and expressed in fashionable dress. We argue that women embraced the “anti-fashion” of neoclassical dress as a way to represent their own artistic agency and to deflect traditional criticisms of women as flighty, unserious, or deceptive.

Artifice and theatricality were frequently disparaged in this period, while authenticity and naturalism were prized. In a 1795 satire, Nature. Art (fig. 3), the printmaker aligned color with “art” and fashion as a way to comment on women’s falseness and vanity. With a rake over her shoulder and a sensible hat on her head, the lovely young woman on the left appears to be a country girl of modest origins, unfashionable but naturally beautiful. By contrast,
the lady on the right sits indoors at her dressing table, staring at her reflection in a mirror in an age-old trope of vanity. Sharp-featured and homely, she applies cosmetic color to her face, and it is noteworthy the degree to which the designer has associated not only “art,” but also color itself, with deception. Not only does the lady deceptively apply color to her face in the form of cosmetics, she is also hand-colored in watercolor in vivid shades of blue, green, pink, and yellow; meanwhile the country girl is limned in the austere black and white of etching alone. Neither woman wears the white neoclassical dress that was becoming the fashionable standard, and which would purport to solve this paradox. Neoclassical fashion was not artfully deceptive, its protagonists argued, but rather artistically considered, based on classical ideals that were the closest humans could approach to ideal nature.

The impulse toward greater “naturalism” in dress exposed and unfettered the body. The new, high-waisted silhouette eliminated traditional stays, which used lacing and busks to form the torso into a long-waisted cone (fig. 4). Instead, women embraced shorter, less constraining corsets with cups for the breasts (fig. 5), or did away with corsets altogether. Neoclassical dress allowed greater bodily freedom and thus changed the way actresses moved on the stage and women walked on the street. Thomas Rowlandson’s Rural Sports (fig. 6) and James Gillray’s Modern Grace (fig. 7) showcase and lampoon the greater physicality and athleticism of women wearing the new lightweight muslin dresses, both on stage and in life. Yet some feared that this unfettered style made women not more vigorous, but more susceptible to disease. Exposure could lead to “muslin disease” (a bad cold or flu), or even consumption. Cold and dampness were the chief enemies; cloaks, muffns, and tippets might mitigate the dangers somewhat, but the bare arms and legs of the neoclassically clad woman still made tempting targets for Jack Frost, as in an 1803 satire by Charles Williams (fig. 8). The filmy gown of the central woman allows us to see her stockings, garters, and bare posterior pinched by Frost’s talons:
The shape of her frame by each gale was reveal’d, / While a slight robe of muslin her beauties conceal’d. “This woman “Paid dear for the Fashion, her Folly and Pride, / Went home to her bed and there lingering died.”

Women artists used neoclassical dress to analogize themselves to living sculptures, borrowing sculptural tropes as they posed and displayed their bodies on stages and in studios. They drew on the story of Pygmalion and Galatea, which most eighteenth-century viewers knew from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*: Pygmalion was a Cypriot king who became disgusted by real women, carved a beautiful ideal woman in ivory, fell in love with it, made offerings to it, and pleaded with Venus to bring it to life. As a potent embodiment of the aspirations to blur boundaries between art and life, and to bring the golden age of the past into the present, Pygmalion was suited
to artistic innovations aimed at conveying greater authenticity, sensuality, and embodied naturalism, and the story aggrandized the creative role of the desiring male artist. But when actresses, dancers, painters, or fashionable women posed themselves as statues come to life, they changed the gender dynamics of the tale. Acting as both Pygmalion and Galatea, such women were both subjects and objects, both the genius artist and the living artwork.

Despite women’s embrace of artfully natural neoclassical dress as a way to embody their aesthetic seriousness, satirists found plenty to ridicule. The new bodily standard of thinness could be lampooned both in women who exceeded it, as in Fat and Lean (fig. 9), and those who failed to meet it, as in Gillray’s satires of Emma Hamilton as “considerably enlarged” (fig. 10). Women’s embrace of neoclassical fashion could still be criticized as shallow and artificial, as in La Mère à la Mode. La Mère telle que Toutes Devraient Etre (fig. 11), in
11. French. La Mère à la Mode. La Mère telle que Toutes Devraient Enve, ca. 1800. Etching and engraving with hand coloring. The Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University, 800.00.00.90

which a fashionably dressed lady, abandoning her children to go out on the town, is contrasted with a good mother who stays home in their loving embraces. Both women wear neoclassical dress, but the bad mother does so in an immodest, overly ornamented, and artificial way. And women artists in particular came in for jest. Emma Hamilton’s performances of “attitudes” were one of the catalysts for the emergence of neoclassical dress from art studios and stages into streetwear, and the engravings of her poses by Frederick Rehberg and Tommaso Piroli exercised broad influence over the visual culture of the 1790s (fig. 12), yet Gillray was still able to needle her about her size. And the satirist of The Damerian Apollo (fig. 13) mocked the sculptor Anne Damer by juxtaposing the nudity and sensuality of neoclassical art with an active and desiring female creator, finding the very idea ridiculous.

And yet neoclassical dress must have offered something valuable to women because they embraced it despite such ridicule. By the early years of the nineteenth century, neoclassical dress was so ubiquitous, and so secure in its identification as modern, chic, and natural, that numerous individuals tried to take credit for inventing it. The high-waisted, white muslin dress became the orthodox style for women across Europe and North America and endured for nearly twenty years.
Mrs. Lovell: Would to Heaven I were thus at liberty to follow every dictate of my heart!—but the being to whom fate has united me, seems to have lost all idea of the attentions, of the duties of minds of a superior order. Would you believe it, he was out of patience with my sending an express after you, with my picture, the night you left me?

Lady Selina Vapour: Abominable! when he knew that I had sent to the painter’s for it every two hours of the day before I left town, and was in despair of going without it!

In this brief excerpt from Mary Berry’s play *The Fashionable Friends* (1802), written for a private theatrical performance at Strawberry Hill, the two central heroines, Mrs. Lovell and Lady Selina Vapour, are happily reunited. After “entering arm and arm,” they proceed to have a rapturous discussion about the intensity of their friendship and the depth of their connection to one another. In the original performance of the play, Berry was Mrs. Lovell, the lovely sentimental heroine trapped in what she perceives to be an ordinary and unfulfilling marriage; and the sculptor, actress, and novelist Anne

Damer played Lady Selina, a stylish, narcissistic aristocrat who cleverly plots her own freedom by convincing a doctor that because of her “nerves” she must be released from her domestic duties and travel to Naples.

Offstage, Berry and Damer were involved in a passionate relationship documented in part in Damer’s handwritten notebooks. While Berry’s play is a comedy that makes fun of all things “fashionable” at the end of the century, the drama contains a deep sense of irony. As Andrew Elfenbien has argued, audiences at Strawberry Hill would have enjoyed and understood the multiple layers of meaning attached to the friendship portrayed between Mrs. Lovell and Lady Selina, because of the offstage bond between the actresses. The moment when Mrs. Lovell admits that she has sent her picture after Selina, and Selina replies that she has “sent to the painter’s for it every two hours,” is the connection Berry makes between Mrs. Lovell’s “real” self and her portable, circulating image captured in art. The joke here relies on the audience’s understanding of the fashionable practice of exchanging portrait miniatures. These negotiations often symbolized the dynamics of friendship or personal attachment. For the actresses Berry and Damer, who are simultaneously artists and authors offstage, this reference to the self as commodity and to the practice of image making underscores the multilayered meanings of the dramatic text as well as the practice of ghosting their real-life personas on stage.

The central tensions in Fashionable Friends between theatricality and authenticity, replica and original, constructed and organic, exterior and interior, public and private highlight the main premises of our exhibition. Theater and performance practices in the late eighteenth century, including the vogue for private theatricals, reinforced the blurred lines between the theater and everyday life. Actresses, in particular, negotiated a precarious divide between the privileges of public exposure and the often debilitating necessity of always appearing to be natural and authentic. Depictions of actresses in portraits, prints, and caricatures often highlighted the sensual, natural, and dynamic qualities of late-eighteenth-century fashion as well as the connections between actresses and classical sculpture. Several images in the exhibition are drawn from Joshua Boydell’s commercial experiment “The Shakespeare Gallery” (1780–1805), which featured paintings and sculpture of scenes from Shakespeare’s plays by leading artists (including Sir Joshua Reynolds, Angelica Kauffman, and Anne Damer) that were then printed, sold, and circulated by subscription. Although the experiment ultimately failed, its limited success reflects the blurred boundaries between art, theater, fashion, and the gallery. For example, in Robert Thew’s print of William Hamilton’s portrayal of the dramatic final scene of Shakespeare’s The Winter’s Tale (figs. 14–15), Paulina draws back the curtain to reveal the statue of Queen Hermione (long presumed dead) miraculously coming back to life. The figure of Hermione, dressed in a stylish neoclassical gown, is simultaneously sculptural and theatrical. Thew’s print after John Hoppner’s scene from Cymbeline similarly depicts the princess Imogen dressed in a gown of floating white fabric, suggestively blowing off her shoulders to reveal her ivory bosom, evoking both neoclassical style and erotic theatrical presence (fig. 16). This mixture of fashion, fantasy, art, and the stage in depictions of Shakespeare’s plays underscores the relationship between the theater, actresses, and neoclassical style.

Fashionable Friends follows the intrigues of several couples. The men in the play are far less interesting than the women. They include: Mr. Lovell, the married man who thinks he wants a mistress but rediscovers his own wife at the end of the play; Sir Dudley Dorimant, the quasi-reformed rake who was once in love with Lady Selina but is now plotting to marry the dopey and hilarious heiress, Miss Racket; and Mr. Valentine, the patriarch who dabbles in exploring new technologies. Female characters Mrs. and Miss Racket enact the traditional mother/daughter plot, with the older Racket vying for the attentions of her daughter’s
suitor and, in an unlikely twist of events, almost succeeding. The play ends with a large masquerade scene where the intrigues of the plot are revealed and resolved. Throughout the play characters make reference to what is “fashionable,” particularly for women. Mrs. Racket (a self-proclaimed admirer of Congreve’s eccentric and poignant Lady Wishfort) declares: “Everybody is accomplished now:—everybody paints, and sings, and plays and is ingenious” (Act III, p. 35). Racket’s reference to “accomplished” women echoes late-eighteenth-century debates about women’s education, agency, and artistic talent. In the exhibition, we highlight the ways in which women artists depict heroines from classic literary texts. Diana Beauclerk’s large-scale watercolor of a scene from Spenser’s Faerie Queene portrays the female knight Britomart rescuing a dramatically posed Amoret dressed in a long white neoclassical gown (fig. 17). Anne Damer’s bas-relief scene from Shakespeare’s Cleopatra, commissioned for the Shakespeare Gallery, highlights a poignant moment between Cleopatra and her female attendants at the end of the play (fig. 18). In this piece Damer displays her skill in sculpting delicately crafted garments that suggest transparent fabrics. Cleopatra’s body appears through her gown, and Charmian’s dress falls nearly off her shoulders. The figures in the scene suggest sculptures that have come to life, complicating the original notion of the male artist as Pygmalion and the female subject as Galatea. Here the artist is acting as a female Pygmalion. The scene is evocative, emotional, and theatrical.

Mary Berry also acts as a female Pygmalion in her role as the author of Fashionable Friends. The backstage story of the play and

the content of the plot itself highlight the complicated relationship between women and performance. At the end of the play everyone ends up with an appropriate partner, except for Lady Selina, who is ostracized and on her own. Although it might be tempting to read this conclusion as a moral lesson about the dissipated virtues and bleak prospects for independent women, it can also be seen as a statement about the politics of female agency and fashionable style. The play asks the question, What happens when women act on their own desires?

We echo this important question in the exhibition with several satiric prints that depict the rise and fall of Mary Anne Clarke, mistress of the Duke of York, who became the subject of international scandal when she testified in 1809 before the House of

17. Diana Beauclerk. Drawing for Book III, Canto XII, 30–33, of Edmund Spenser’s Faerie Queene, ca. 1781. Watercolor. The Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University, Drawer Drawings B373 no. 10+

18. Thomas Hellyer, after Anne Seymour Damer. Antony & Cleopatra. Act 5. Scene 2, 1803. Stipple. The Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University, Drawer 724 803B no. 6
Commons that she had sold army commissions with the Duke’s consent. In these images Clarke’s story is staged through theatrical motifs and references. One print by Thomas Rowlandson features a long quote from *The Beggar’s Opera*, which begins: “Tis Woman that seduces all mankind / By her we first are taught the wheedling arts / Her very eyes can cheat when most she’s kind / She tricks us of our mon[e]y with our hearts” (fig. 19). Here Clarke is framed as a deceptive and seductive actress falling out of her empire-waist gown. In another print, Rowlandson places Clarke’s figure on a stage at the entrance to a “passage” or tunnel, creating an obscene reference to the entrance to Clarke’s own body (fig. 20). The platform is besieged by an army of men, some in military garb, rushing toward her in an effort to get her attention. Clarke dons a military jacket and hat, an image that resembles John Hoppner’s painting of the well-known actress Dorothy Jordan as Hypolita. Clarke declares theatrically: “Gentlemen it is no use to rush on in this manner___the principal places have been disposed of these three weeks and I assure you at present there is not even standing room.” Employing the language of the theater with “principal places” instead of “principal players” and “standing room” only, Rowlandson emphasizes Clarke’s connection to the figure of the sexualized actress whose business is to publicly sell her body. The details of Clarke’s costumes in these prints highlight the dueling iconography of satire and legitimacy in depictions of neoclassical dress. The criticism of Clarke is echoed in a range of caricatures of women as artistic agents, including the cruel *Damerian Apollo*, which features Damer dressed fashionably in her studio in the act of obscenely “sculpting” a classic male figure (see fig. 13).

In *Fashionable Friends* Mary Berry’s rendering of the lonely figure of Lady Selina, brought to life in performance by the
iconoclastic artist and actress Anne Damer, provides another way to consider the relationship between art and nature. After she has described her husband’s reaction to sending Lady Selina her portrait, Mrs. Lovell explains: “But, in short, we are become such totally different beings—no sympathy in our ideas—no familiarity in our tastes—no attraction in our souls” (Act II, p. 19). Reading through the space of text and performance, this particular line is perhaps an authentic declaration of Berry’s feelings about Damer, who in reality did share her ideas, tastes, and soul. In her notebooks, Damer writes to Berry, “You left your fan here last night, a sentiment of honesty once prompted me to return it, but another sentiment not so easy defined prompts me to keep it—.”6 Understanding fashion, then, provides an alternative way to access nature, which is, like performance, ephemeral and elusive. Ultimately, *Fashionable Friends* can be seen as a testament to the dynamic power of female creativity. The exhibition *Artful Nature* refers simultaneously to the ideas of theatricality and deception typically attributed to fashionable women, and to the potential survival strategies employed by women artists, authors, and actresses to craft their own parts.

### Notes


5 For more on Beauclerk and women artists connected to Strawberry Hill, see Cynthia Roman, “The Art of Lady Diana Beauclerk: Horace Walpole and Female Genius,” in *Horace Walpole’s Strawberry Hill*, ed. Michael Snodin with the assistance of Cynthia Roman (New Haven and London: The Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University, Yale Center for British Art, and Victoria and Albert Museum in association with Yale University Press, 2009), 155–59.

6 Anne Damer, *Notebooks, 1789–1797*, vol. 1. The Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University.
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