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Abstract

This thesis reconsiders the perception and status of pets in eighteenth-century Britain through an analysis of the unconventional modes of representation in Thomas Gainsborough’s portrait of Henry Scott, Third Duke of Buccleuch. By examining the social attitudes towards pets in eighteenth-century Britain, this thesis discusses the elevated status of dogs in Britain’s early modern visual culture, which offers new possibilities for understanding the complex and sympathetic relationship between owners and their pets.

By reconstructing the identity of the Dandie Dinmont dog in Gainsborough’s portrait of Henry Scott, this thesis provides an alternative narrative for the painting in which the dog is acknowledged for its near-equal role of importance in relation to the human subject. Contemporary discourses on animal ethics and posthumanist theory, as well as early modern philosophies, will be applied to the analysis of the portrait, with a primary focus on the influential writings of the eighteenth-century philosopher, David Hume. Gainsborough’s rejection of iconographic convention, which complicates the categorization of the portrait within a specific subgenre of portraiture, will also be discussed.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

At the time that Thomas Gainsborough's portrait of Henry Scott was painted (c. 1770), a significant shift was occurring regarding the status of animals in British culture.¹ With the domestication of animals, which was one of the responses to urbanization in this period, people developed strong attachments and established meaningful relationships with non-human pets,² who no longer served only practical working purposes.³ Additionally, pets were not only perceived as cherished companions, but also as valued family members with distinct identities, which gave rise to new interspecies relations. Enlightenment ideas regarding the nature of “reason” and the emphasis on the notion of “freedom of thought” enabled different ways to think about animals.⁴ A social rhetoric of sensibility further complicated ways of thinking. Through the aspect of “sympathy,” which was one of the main ideals of sensibility, some progressive Britons who cared about animals began to extend the notion of reason to

---

¹ See Adrian Franklin, *Animals and Modern Cultures: A Sociology of Human-Animal Relations in Modernity* (Los Angeles: Sage, 1999), particularly chapters 2 and 5.
non-humans. The visual arts offered a space where such new ideas regarding human and animal relations could be explored, as well as a place to contemplate controversial views on the mental capabilities of animals. By examining the conventions of portraiture, and specifically animal representation, this thesis explores the human perception of and relationship with animals in eighteenth-century Britain.

Prominent eighteenth-century English painters, including William Hogarth (1697–1764), Thomas Gainsborough (1727–1788), and Joshua Reynolds (1723–1792), frequently depicted humans and animals interacting with each other. These artists not only illustrated the companionship between humans and their pets in portraits, but also exhibited how the identities and narratives of the sitters could be constructed through cross-species relationships. Both Hogarth and Reynolds painted portraits of owners and canine pets that will be analyzed in comparison with the portrait of Henry Scott, Third Duke of Buccleuch (c. 1770, Figure 1) by Thomas Gainsborough, the main object of study in this thesis. However, neither Hogarth nor Reynolds fully embraced the representation of the animal as a near-equal subject beyond representing the intimate

---


7 In Ruth Yeazell’s book, Picture Titles, the author discusses how Western paintings acquired their titles. Yeazell writes that most Western paintings from the eighteenth-century were provided with titles for inventory purposes, while the “true” title of a work, or that given by the artist, was a rare occurrence; see Ruth Yeazell, Picture Titles: How and Why Western Paintings Acquired Their Names (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), 4-7. For brevity, I will refer to Gainsborough’s painting of Henry Scott, Third Duke of Buccleuch, simply as Henry Scott throughout this thesis.
bond between owner and pet in the manner Gainsborough was able to accomplish in *Henry Scott*. What I mean by the term “near-equal” throughout this thesis is not the perception of the dog as having the identical social status as an adult male human or having anthropomorphized features. Instead, I use the term to address a recognition of the animal’s sentience, agency, identity, and capacity for reason. I argue that this recognition elevates the dog’s role to that of a near-equal conscious individual in the painting. By breaking with iconographic convention that marginalized the role of pets in portraits, Gainsborough provided the spectator with greater character insights to both the human and non-human subjects in *Henry Scott*. In doing so, Gainsborough offered commentary on the evolving perspectives towards animals and suggested a destabilization of anthropocentric ideals. While many scholars recognize the unusual representation of the subjects as near-equals in *Henry Scott*, no one has endeavoured to pursue a closer analysis of the painting. Through a thorough analysis of the portrait of *Henry Scott* and utilizing a posthumanist perspective, this thesis will offer new insight on the unconventional representation of the dog in the painting, arguing that the artist presented the dog as a rational, individual subject.

Thomas Gainsborough’s portrait of Henry Scott (1748-1812), Third Duke of Buccleuch and Fifth Duke of Queensberry, serves as a remarkable example of how art was able to capture changing social attitudes towards animals in eighteenth-century Britain. In Gainsborough’s portrait of *Henry Scott*, the artist depicted the noble Third Duke of Buccleuch intimately embracing his pet dog, a medium-sized Dandie Dinmont

---

terrier. Gainsborough painted both subjects in the foreground of the work, against an outdoor autumn setting. The young Duke is portrayed respectably, dressed in a dark coat with the Order of the Thistle pinned on his left breast and his hat tucked under his arm. Gainsborough positioned the Duke in a relaxed pose with a smiling expression and a slight tilt of the head. In the painting, the charcoal-coloured, shaggy furred dog is portrayed in a state of alert focus and is placed on a raised patch of dirt. Gainsborough added complexity to the painting by positioning the dog’s paw overtop of the Duke’s arms and ensured that both subjects gaze back at the viewer.

The non-marginalized and engaged role of the dog in Henry Scott conveys the dog as a significant actor in the painting. As Shearer West writes, “‘Identity’ can encompass the character, personality, social standing, relationships, profession, age, and gender of the portrait subject.” Based on this premise and an analysis of the canine subject in Henry Scott, this thesis examines how the dog is represented with several of such attributes that inform its identity. Therefore, I argue that the notion of “identity” in Gainsborough’s portrait of Henry Scott is evident in both the human and non-human subjects. By breaking with the iconographic expectations of early modern portraiture, Henry Scott expresses both Gainsborough’s and his patron’s liberal attitudes towards non-humans, thus illustrating the progressive social changes that were beginning to take shape in eighteenth-century British society.

9 Shearer West, Portraiture (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 11.
1.1 Theoretical Framework and Methodology

This study is informed by the work of numerous scholars who have explored the intricate relationship between humans and non-humans within historical, philosophical, literary and visual arts contexts. The evolving discourses and popular interests in the field of animal-rights, largely influenced by contemporary writers Jim Mason, Peter Singer, and Tom Regan, have highlighted the importance of human attitudes towards the treatment of animals.10

In The Cry Of Nature: Art and The Making of Animal Rights, Stephen Eisenman provides valuable insight into the role the visual arts has played in the animal-rights movement, highlighting the origins of the movement in eighteenth-century Europe. Eisenman combines both the fields of animal-rights and art history in The Cry of Nature to discuss how early modern thinkers and artists expressed sympathetic attitudes towards animals, perceiving them as sentient and conscious beings. Eisenman argues that the constructed prejudices of humans towards animals has stemmed from a humanist tradition based on economic and social influence. As Eisenman traces the cultural construct of species, he argues that non-human animals deserve to be considered with moral rights.11 Additionally, Eisenman combines new scientific findings on the issue of animal rationality, including modern research on the concept of animal consciousness and language, with the theories of early modern thinkers (including René Descartes and David Hume).


In his book *The Animal Therefore I Am (More to Follow)*, Jacques Derrida examines the role of the animal in philosophy, questioning logic and ethics to challenge species boundaries and the ontology of non-humans, as well as criticizing Descartes’s judgment of animals as unconscious automata. In *The Animal Therefore I Am (More to Follow)*, Derrida contemplates the consciousness of his cat that the philosopher embarrassingly undresses in front of, addressing the idea of the real animal that looks back. However, I agree with Donna Haraway’s criticism of Derrida in *When Species Meet*, where she praises Derrida for beginning a dialogue about the animal that is present and conscious, but is disappointed in his failure to pursue a philosophical argument for companion animals, choosing instead to focus on the frailty of human anxieties that are influenced by Western ideals. Where Derrida abandons the argument for animals, this study endeavours to pursue it through a posthumanist lens within an art historical context. Derrida’s theory of the animal gaze thus influences the analysis of the Dandie Dinmont dog in *Henry Scott*, who I argue is presented as looking back at the spectator not as an unconscious symbol, but as a real individual with its own identity, thoughts, and agency.

Posthumanist views on the topic of human and animal relations have also influenced the scope of this study, most notably the works of Pramod K Nayar and Donna Haraway. In his book *Posthumanism*, Nayar examines various terms associated

---

14 While Haraway’s work relates to posthumanist theory, the author claims that she is not a posthumanist; see Ibid, 19.
with the philosophies of humanism and posthumanism, revealing anthropocentric and speciesist politics through literary examples.\textsuperscript{15} Nayar focuses on “critical posthumanism,” which critiques traditional humanist theories that are exclusive to non-humans. Critical posthumanism thus frames the lens through which the subjects in Gainsborough’s \textit{Henry Scott} will be analyzed.

In her book \textit{When Species Meet}, Haraway stresses the concept of “response” as central to the human and animal relationship and discusses human social anxieties towards animals. By reflecting on personal experiences with dogs (as well as many other kinds of inter-species relations), Haraway discusses how “companion species” impact each other’s lives and can be used to think with theoretically, but are also beings that we live with.\textsuperscript{16} While Nayar and Haraway apply posthumanist theory to modern cultural contexts, less consideration has been given to posthumanist ways of thinking about historical non-human subjects and in other mediums besides literature, with the notable exception of Erica Fudge’s article, “The Animal Face of Early Modern England.” In the article, Fudge reconsiders historical relationships between humans and livestock in seventeenth-century England through a posthumanist perspective, challenging the idea that only humanist ways of thinking existed in the past.\textsuperscript{17} As Fudge writes,

\begin{quote}
If we want to contemplate alternative – better – ways of being in the world with animals, recovering and acknowledging the existence of another past might be a useful strategy.\textsuperscript{18}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{15} See Pramod K. Nayar, \textit{Posthumanism: Themes in 20\textsuperscript{th} and 21\textsuperscript{st} Century Literature and Culture} (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2014).

\textsuperscript{16} See Haraway, \textit{When Species Meet}, 5.


\textsuperscript{18} Ibid, 2.
While Fudge’s work re-examines alternative ways of understanding the relationship between humans and livestock in the early modern period, the author does not apply this thinking to the even more complex relationship that emerged between owners and pets a century later.

Historians Fudge and Ingrid Tague have been prominent writers in the field of human and animal relations in eighteenth-century Britain. Tague’s central argument in *Animal Companions: Pets and Social Change in Eighteenth-Century Britain* is that the hybridity of pets as both human-like and part of the natural world helped explain what it meant to be human and how society should operate in the early modern period.\(^{19}\) As Fudge and Tague would agree, because we do not have access to an animal’s experiences, scholars cannot study non-humans as isolated subjects in the same way a human subject can be studied. Both Fudge and Tague analyze the appropriation of animals as a means to understanding early modern British society, exploring the animal only through its impact on human life. History, as Tague argues, is thus a study of the human and animals provide insight into the ideologies of human society.\(^ {20}\) However, Fudge implies the possibility for new ways of studying historical non-humans through the human who provides access to the animal: “Reading about animals is always about reading through humans.”\(^ {21}\) As Nayar writes,

> This means critical posthumanism does not see the human as the centre of all things: it sees the human as an instantiation of a network of connections, exchanges, linkages and crossings with all forms of life.\(^ {22}\)

\(^{19}\) Tague, *Animal Companions*, 11.  
\(^{21}\) Fudge, *Perceiving Animals*, 3.  
\(^{22}\) Nayar, *Posthumanism*, 5.
Therefore, I suggest a critical posthumanist lens enables a connection to the non-human through the familiar “link” that is the human subject and to form a narrative for the non-human because of shared resemblances and a relatable interspecies relationship that is portrayed in works such as Gainsborough’s *Henry Scott*.

Many British artists responded to changing social attitudes towards non-humans in the early modern period, yet a Western tradition of art history has continued to focus on humanist ideals in paintings, systematically marginalizing non-humans. Scholars have focused on the representation of animals in art, investigating how the image of animals has contributed to the construction of human narratives. Yet, few scholars have considered the alternative: how humans have also informed the narrative of non-humans or examined historical non-human subjects as individuals. There are two notable exceptions: Joy Kenseth’s article, “A Dog and His Man: Anthony Van Dyck’s James Stuart, Duke of Richmond and Lennox” and Diana Donald’s book, *Picturing Animals in Britain: 1750-1850*. Kenseth’s article examines the role of the Greyhound dog that poses elegantly beside the young Duke in Anthony Van Dyck’s *James Stuart, Duke of Richmond and Lennox* (c.1633, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 89.15.16), discussing the way the dog serves as an extension of the human subject’s identity. Although Kenseth’s article focuses on how the dog contributes to the human subject’s narrative, the author implies that the human also influences the dog’s identity; 


however, Kenseth does not pursue the idea further. Whereas a portrait can serve as a historical account of the human subject depicted, little consideration has been given to the individuality of a non-human within the same frame, except in Donald’s book, *Picturing Animals in Britain*. Donald examines the representation of animals in early modern British visual culture, offering insight about the attitudes towards animals and debates about shared resemblances between humans and animals, such as capacities for reason and emotion. Donald’s writing has been instrumental in contextualizing the sympathetic eighteenth-century British attitudes towards animals within the visual arts in correspondence with early modern philosophical insights, which has greatly influenced this study. Specifically in chapter three, “The Elephant in the Bookseller’s Shop: Imagining the Animal Mind,” Donald addresses the representation of pets as individuals with inner thoughts, briefly mentioning the unconventional modes of representation in Gainsborough’s *Henry Scott*. Donald notes the representation of the subjects in *Henry Scott* as “pretended near-equals,” but does not elaborate on this pretence. However, the author seems to suggest that the dog is comically portrayed as the Duke’s near-equal in terms of consciousness and elevated social status. Natalie Hansen writes in her dissertation “Horse Stories: Rethinking the Human-Animal Divide” that Animal Studies is a way of “imaging being other-than-human, of thinking outside the boundaries of species identity.” Attempting to imagine the animal mind by perceiving it as a “near-

---

26 Donald, *Picturing Animals in Britain*, 112.
equal” thus contributes to the analysis of the dog in *Henry Scott*, which I suggest is necessary for creating a narrative for the canine subject.

In *Henry Scott*, Gainsborough captured something beyond the likeness of his sitters. He depicted a timeless friendship between man and man’s best friend – a friendship that remains relatable centuries later. In the portrait of *Henry Scott*, the Duke affectionately embraces his dog, demonstrating a striking inter-species relationship that begs for further exploration and exemplifies the progressive change in attitudes towards non-humans that was emerging in eighteenth-century Britain. *Henry Scott* is a significant portrait because of its unconventional display of intimacy between the human and canine subjects that is unlike any portrait of an earlier era. Around the time *Henry Scott* was commissioned, animals were emerging in new ways, which started to affect what it meant to be human. To propose a sense of near-equality would therefore have been an unconventional concept. The portrait of *Henry Scott* comments on the changing symbiotic relationship between animals and humans that British culture was grappling with, especially in combination with other discourses of the period. In Fudge’s book *Perceiving Animals*, the author looks at how humans understood themselves in relation to animals. Fudge writes that British society projected social anxieties on animals, using them to construct and define human identity.28 Fudge also discusses how early modern British society debated whether humanity was distinctly separate and superior from the natural world (especially from animals), while others argued the opposite.29 However, rather than succeeding in creating a succinct divide between humans and nonhumans, a

series of discourses around human and animal relationships transformed definitions of human identity. Furthermore, Fudge suggests that such attempts to define humanity blurred the lines between anthropocentrism and anthropomorphism, raising ethical concerns that have carried over into contemporary issues concerning human and animal relations. In *Picturing Animals in Britain*, Donald also discusses contradictory issues of anthropocentricism and anthropomorphism, highlighting the construct of species boundaries. As a result, animals became inaugural factors that have shaped – and continue to – human society. Animals were objectifying in one sense, yet, as in the case of pets, the new role of animals in British society enabled entirely new ways of interacting and perceiving domesticated animals, which, at times, elevated the animal’s status. By representing the dog as a near-equal subject in *Henry Scott*, Gainsborough draws attention to the construct of the non-human subject’s status and place within society, suggesting to the viewer that how the non-human is perceived is a malleable social concept – a topic that remains relevant in contemporary fields of animal studies.

This thesis also discusses how the notion of identity correlates with the concept of consciousness through the analysis of the subjects in *Henry Scott*. For instance, in Hogarth’s *Self-Portrait with Pug* (c.1745, Figure 2), the portrait is as much about the artist’s beloved Pug, Trump, as it is a self-portrait of the artist.\(^30\) The distinguishable identity of Trump establishes the dog as *someone* in the painting and not just a visual accessory. If the spectator can determine Hogarth’s identity and attribute the artist with consciousness (despite the ambiguous title of the painting that does not specifically

\(^30\) As I will elaborate, Hogarth had a significant influence on Gainsborough and the unconventional representation of the Pug in *Self-Portrait with Pug* (Fig.2) offers valuable insight on how non-humans were perceived in the early modern period as well.
identify Hogarth), why is consciousness not attributed to the dog if his distinct identity can also be determined? I apply this logic to the analysis of *Henry Scott* and argue that if the Dandie Dinmont is represented with a distinguishable identity, why is the dog not attributed with inherent consciousness as well? The Dandie Dinmont in *Henry Scott* was likely named either Ginger or Pepper, but its name is unknown due to a lack of record keeping. However, earlier spectators may have been familiar with the dog and thus, known its name. Therefore, this study examines how Gainsborough depicted the Dandie Dinmont in *Henry Scott* with qualities that contributed to creating a distinguishable canine identity and unique character traits through the use of visual clues such as facial expressions and body gestures. I argue that these visual clues also present the animal as a rational being, a view that challenged the beliefs of some early modern thinkers like René Descartes (1596-1650).

Finally, the challenges of categorizing the portrait of *Henry Scott* within a distinct subgenre of portraiture will be discussed and I propose that the painting should be considered an “animal conversation piece.” And in conclusion, this thesis puts forth evidence that, contrary to some scholarly thought, Gainsborough did indeed consider moral subject matters, such as animal ethics, made evident in the analysis of the artist’s

31 Regarding the titling of artworks, see footnote 7.
32 During my tour of the Bowhill House in November 2017, Scott Macdonald (Head of Collections and Conservation, Buccleuch Living Heritage Trust) recalled the possibility of the dog’s name in the portrait to have been either Ginger or Pepper, although he was unable to confirm this. For this reason, I will refer to the dog by its breed throughout this thesis.
33 Descartes denied the possibilities of animals being capable of rational or conscious thought, and saw them as emotionless machine-like organisms; see René Descartes, *Discourse on Method and Meditations*, (New York: Philosophical Library/Open Road Integrated Media, Inc. 2015), ebook, 45-47.
fancy pictures (a genre that commonly portrayed everyday scenes with imaginative and narrative aspects)\textsuperscript{34} and other life influences, such as music and religion.

Chapter 2: The Art of Unconventionality

This chapter discusses the unconventional elements in Gainsborough’s portrait of Henry Scott, demonstrating how the painting reflected Gainsborough’s push against the boundaries of artistic and social expectations of eighteenth-century England. Based on the methodological premises of Marcia Pointon’s work on eighteenth-century portraiture, my analysis of Henry Scott will compare and contrast iconographical aspects of this painting with the work of Gainsborough’s contemporaries – notably those of his competitor Joshua Reynolds – in order to uncover the deeper “ideological mechanism” that Gainsborough embedded within the portrait. This ideological mechanism, I propose, is the progressive view of canine companions as rational near-equals and inimitable extensions of human identity.

In their work on Gainsborough, scholars Hamilton and Whitley portray the artist as only profit-driven, arguing that he did not make personal commentaries on social or political issues in his art. Although Gainsborough’s commentaries were less provocative than those of Hogarth, his mentor, they are nonetheless present. The unsurpassed rendition of the intimate bond of companionship expressed between the subjects in Henry Scott distinguishes the painting from any of Gainsborough’s other works and from

---

1 See especially Pointon, Hanging the Head, 4 on the iconographical approach.
2 Ibid.
any other portrait involving human and non-human subjects of the era or earlier. I contend that Gainsborough’s keen aptitude for observation and ingenious skill for depicting the likeness and inner character of his sitters in *Henry Scott*, as well as the opportunity to collaborate with an open-minded patron with similar progressive views on canine companions, led the artist to paint a truly different understanding of his sitter’s identities. This chapter will discuss how constructs of human and canine identity in the portrait of *Henry Scott* rely on social modes such as hierarchy and nationalism, as well as gender and species roles. Through an analysis of the painting, this chapter will also discuss how the artwork presents challenges in terms of defining which subgenre of portraiture it belongs to, since to define the portrait by its subgenre affects the interpretation of it. Although certain iconographical aspects in *Henry Scott* define the painting as a grand portrait, fancy picture, conversation piece, and even a pet-portrait – it is none of these entirely, but a hybrid containing aspects of many subgenres. I conclude that the painting most closely resembles the iconographic standards of conversation pieces and should be considered an animal conversation piece.

2.1 Henry Scott - The Portrait

*Henry Scott* is a magnificent portrait in its unconventional display of intimacy between a human and canine subject. While other portraits of Henry Scott, Third Duke of Buccleuch exist, portraying him in various stages of life, Gainsborough’s portrait

---

remains significant in its representation of the young nobleman during a pivotal moment in his life: the Duke’s coming of age and the full inheritance of all his estates. However, there is an interesting compositional parallel between Gainsborough’s *Henry Scott* and Martin Ferdinand Quadal’s (1736-1811) portrait of the Duke as an equestrian military hero in *Henry, 3rd Duke of Buccleuch, On Horseback in the Uniform of the South Fencibles* (c.1780, Figure 3). Like the gazes of the Duke and dog in *Henry Scott*, in Quadal’s portrait, the Duke and horse gaze at the viewer similarly. The exaggerated white of the horse’s visible eye emphasizes the animal’s effort to glance sideways at the spectator in the same direction as the Duke who is seated on its back. In Gainsborough’s *Henry Scott*, the Duke and his dog also gaze at the viewer – the white specks in the dog’s eyes illuminating the direction of its stare. This consistent articulation of the animal gaze suggests the possibility of an intentional stylistic insistence on the patron’s behalf to emphasize the animal as a self-aware and conscious subject.

Gainsborough’s portrait of *Henry Scott* was presented to the Duke in 1770. Although it is possible that Gainsborough painted the portrait earlier, between 1768-1770 when the artist was at the peak of his success in Bath, it was only in 1770 that Gainsborough was paid for the commission. The use of pictorial metaphors such as the

---

7 Gainsborough was a well-established artist in Bath (and beyond) by the end of the 1760’s; see Vaughan, *Gainsborough*, 80. As Sloman also observes, Gainsborough was able to raise his price for full-length portraits from sixty to one hundred guineas between 1766-1774, which indicates the artist’s growing success; see Susan Sloman, *Gainsborough in Bath* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 62.
8 Crispin Powell, “Further Henry Scott Portrait Questions,” email, December 07, 2017. “The only documentation we have about the commissioning of the portrait is the receipt from Gainsborough dated 21 November 1770 and a matching payment in his Coutts bank account. It cost 100 pounds;” Crispin Powell, “Gainsborough,” email, August 30, 2017. Hamilton also notes that it would not have been unusual for Gainsborough to work on a portrait for some time before completing it and delivering it to its commissioners. For instance, even though Gainsborough began to paint *Mr. and Mrs. Andrews* (Fig.8) in
Order of the Thistle and fashionable attire contributes a formal element to the portrait and articulates the Duke’s dignified social standing. These aspects suggest the work to be a Grand Manner portrait – a popular style in eighteenth-century Britain that Reynolds was instrumental in introducing to the genre of portraiture.⁹ Although the Duke is portrayed as a noble and powerful individual in Henry Scott, the inclusion of the dog in such a prominent and intimate pose is a peculiar aspect that complicates the Duke’s image, posing challenges in defining which subgenre the portrait belongs to.

2.2 Fashion and Status

Adhering to the conventions of fashion in Henry Scott demonstrates Gainsborough’s recognition of iconographic standards in portraiture and social expectations of representation.¹⁰ In Henry Scott, the Duke comes across as a highly confident young man, acknowledging the spectator politely with a smile, enhanced by a slight tilt of the head. Brian Bonnyman recounts, “the one thing the teachers did instill in the young Duke was an acute awareness of his aristocratic standing.”¹¹ I suggest that stemming from this awareness, Gainsborough was able to represent the Duke casually, conveying the Duke’s confidence in his social status. Perhaps it is precisely the Duke’s confidence in his reputation that allowed the portrait to focus on another subject without

---


¹⁰ See Rosenthal and Myrone, Gainsborough, 180.

¹¹ For more about Henry Scott’s educational experiences at Eton college, see Bonnyman, “Education (1764-66)” in The Third Duke of Buccleuch and Adam Smith, 34-52.
the need to over-emphasize the sitter’s social status. However, considering that Gainsborough valued fashion as an important aspect in portraiture,\textsuperscript{12} the artist uses fashion to provide the spectator with clues as to the social identity of the Duke nonetheless. In one of Gainsborough’s letters, the artist stated that fashion was essential to capturing the likeness of his sitter, despite the risk that “modern dresses” would go out of fashion and look “awkward.”\textsuperscript{13} Gainsborough was renowned for his ability to paint exquisite textiles in portraits, adorning female sitters in luminous silky dresses and dressing male sitters in richly texturized attires.\textsuperscript{14} As Matthew Rogan asserts, fashion contributed to the formation of social identity in early modern Britain and was a “visible emblem of social standing.”\textsuperscript{15} Rogan notes that eighteenth-century British fashion was particularly distinct in its simple design and practical choice of materials in comparison to other European countries.\textsuperscript{16} A concept that is still relevant today, fashion enabled a person to display their status through material wealth, serving as a distinguishing factor for the Duke’s upper class spectators between the rich and poor.\textsuperscript{17}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{13}Hayes, \textit{The Letters of Thomas Gainsborough}, 90.
  \item \textsuperscript{14}For examples of lavish costumes in the artist’s other works, see Thomas Gainsborough, \textit{The Hon. Mrs Graham} (c.1775-7, Edinburgh, The National Gallery of Scotland, NG 332); Thomas Gainsborough, \textit{Mrs Henry William Berkeley Portman} (c.1764-5); Thomas Gainsborough, \textit{The Blue Boy} (c.1770, San Marino, Huntington Library, 21.1); Thomas Gainsborough, \textit{John Campbell, Fourth Duke of Argyll} (c.1767, Edinburgh, Scottish National Portrait Gallery, PG 1596); and Thomas Gainsborough, \textit{Portrait of William Wollaston} (Fig.11). For more on portrait and fashion and Gainsborough’s costumes, see Aileen Ribeiro, \textit{The Art of Dress: Fashion in England ad France 1750 to 1820} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).
  \item \textsuperscript{16}Rogan, \textit{Fashion and Identity in Georgian Britain}, 16.
\end{itemize}
In *Henry Scott*, the young Duke is presented “in the relaxed pose and dress of a country gentleman.”\(^\text{18}\) Wearing a somber navy waistcoat, the Duke politely acknowledges the spectator with his hat tucked under his arm. In Gainsborough’s portrait of *Robert Craggs* (c.1760-1, Figure 4), the artist depicted the politician Robert Craggs (Nugent) (1702-788) also wearing a similar navy coat with hat held at his side like the Duke in *Henry Scott*. However, when comparing the seemingly similar attire between *Robert Craggs* and *Henry Scott*, the effect of lighting in both portraits affects the representation of the sitters. The Duke’s coat in *Henry Scott* appears dim and simplistic in comparison with the coat in *Robert Craggs*. In *Robert Craggs*, Gainsborough’s meticulous attention to the effects of lighting can be noticed in the illuminated creases and folds in Craggs’s coat, which draw attention to the detailed costume. The boldness of Craggs’s red under-vest and pearly satin stockings create a strong contrast against his cobalt coloured coat. In *Robert Craggs*, Gainsborough also exemplifies his detailed attention to the effects of light by emphasizing how the bright sunlight from the window appears to washout the intensity of the coat’s pigmented colour as it shines on the sitter’s left shoulder. Meanwhile, the dull dark tone of the Duke’s coat in *Henry Scott* is a strange phenomenon in the works of Gainsborough, considering the artist’s particular interest in lighting.\(^\text{19}\) Furthermore, Gainsborough was careful about the control of natural light in his studio, even modifying the windows in his Bath houses –

---

where *Henry Scott* may have been painted – for such purposes.\(^{20}\) Considering Gainsborough’s great admiration for textiles, the lack of brightness and detail in the Duke’s coat in *Henry Scott* is peculiar. Sloman observes that Gainsborough’s earlier Bath portraits were actually characterized by their “flatness and plainness,”\(^{21}\) before Gainsborough had established enough professional standing to dictate the dress of his sitters. However, *Henry Scott* was painted many years later. A return to a simplistic type of costume at the time *Henry Scott* was painted would have been an unusual choice for Gainsborough, unless, as Sloman suggests, it was upon the sitter’s request.\(^{22}\) In a letter dated July 1770 to his friend James Unwin, Gainsborough complained about the pressures of society portrait painting, calling it a “curs’d Face business.”\(^{23}\) Considering the unusual representation of textile in the painting, perhaps *Henry Scott* provided Gainsborough with an opportunity to shift the focus away from materialistic distractions to a more conceptually challenging and engaging topic that provided him temporary relief from the pressures of society portrait painting. While it is possible that the Duke may have insisted that Gainsborough portray him in simple clothing as a way to emphasize a representation of his modest character, I argue that the more apparent reason for keeping the focus off lavishly detailed costumes in the painting was to redirect the spectator’s attention to a more important matter instead: the relationship between the Duke and his cherished canine companion.

\(^{20}\) For more on the effect of different lighting, see Sloman, *Gainsborough in Bath*, 57-8. Postle writes that Gainsborough used a tripartite window with elongated central light to allow control over lighting conditions; Postle, *Thomas Gainsborough*, 26.

\(^{21}\) Sloman, *Gainsborough in Bath*, 46.

\(^{22}\) Ibid.

\(^{23}\) Hayes, *The Letters of Thomas Gainsborough*, 78.
Although the Duke wears a simple coat in Gainsborough’s portrait, the brilliant white frilled cuffs and a pristine ruffled neckcloth enlivens his attire. The intense white of the fabric reinforces the Duke’s social prestige and implies a virtue of cleanliness.  

Although the spectator cannot see how the Duke’s hair is gathered in the back, the front is fashionably styled with tight curls above the Duke’s ears and smoothed-back hair atop, resembling a popular style of wigs worn in the period. If the Duke was indeed wearing a wig, the wig was understood as symbol of masculine authority and an “embodiment of [the] historical exercise of power.” Furthermore, a wig was “customary for gentlemen to wear...[and] to appear without one was to expose oneself as eccentric, exceptional or deviant.” Thus, the Duke is perceived as a proper gentleman in the painting because of the wig and not as an eccentric individual with an abnormal attachment to his dog, as may have been the case if he were portrayed without a wig. The wig creates a sense of dignity and commands the spectator’s respect for the Duke as a noble individual, therefore suggesting that the painting be regarded as a formal commission.

The dog in *Henry Scott* is understood as a fashionable accessory because of the eighteenth-century perception in Britain of pets as luxury consumer goods. Small or lap dogs in particular were perceived as fashionable accessories for women in British society, whereas men were expected to be seen with larger hunting dogs that conveyed a

24 On bodily cleanliness in this period, see Styles, *The Dress of the People*, 79.  
25 For more on the different styles of wigs, see Pointon, *Hanging the Head*, 117.  
26 Ibid.  
27 Ibid.  
28 For a discussion about the vulgarity associated with displaced wigs in male conversation pieces versus the perception of men in wigs engaged in similar activities, see David Solkin, *Painting for Money. The Visual Arts and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 79-83.  
sense of masculinity. However, by the end of the century, the rhetoric of sensibility had made it socially acceptable for men to form emotional bonds and be seen with small pets, disrupting the gender stereotypes of lap dogs. While earlier social views perceived pets as useless luxuries, changing attitudes enabled pets to be perceived paradoxically as both luxuries and family members. Early modern thinkers like Adam Smith and David Hume aided in diminishing the negative connotations associated with pet keeping by arguing that luxuries were economic benefits that promoted commerce. The Duke is therefore presented as a fashionable subject in Henry Scott because he is conventionally portrayed with his pet dog, which adheres to an iconographic standard that implies the Duke’s landed class status.

Although the dog can be perceived as an objectified fashionable accessory in the portrait, the dog is also a consumer of fashion. Similar in purpose to human clothing, animal fashion indicated status. In the painting, the Dandie Dimont dog is accessorized with a leather collar, detailed with a glistening gold buckle made intentionally visible and not covered by the dog’s hair. Just as fashion serves to mark the Duke’s social identity, the dog’s collar contributes to inform the dog’s identity. The collar symbolizes ownership, which associates the dog with the Duke. But rather than perceiving ownership as an oppressive notion, the collar indicates that the dog’s status is elevated from that of a stray to a pet of a nobleman. As in contemporary society, collars in the

30 Tague, Animal Companions, 112-113 and 151-152.
31 Ibid, 229.
32 Ibid, 11 and 30.
33 Ibid, 29.
34 Ibid, 56.
35 For more on the personalization and luxury of pet commodities in the eighteenth-century, see Ibid, 53-58.
eighteenth century also conveyed an owner’s concern for the safe return of their lost pet.\textsuperscript{36} In *Henry Scott*, beyond its fashionable purpose, the collar thus further symbolizes the Duke’s doting care and concern for his beloved companion. This intimate relationship between the Duke and Dandie Dinmont challenges the perception of the dog as merely a fashionable accessory in the painting. For example, in Johann Joseph Zoffany’s (1733-1810) *Mary and John Wilkes* (c.1782, Figure 5), the artist lent his pet dog, a white German Spitz named Poma, as a prop. In comparison, the Dandie Dinmont in *Henry Scott*, which was owned by the sitter, is understood as a treasured family member and not a lent accessory for symbolic or fashionable purposes.\textsuperscript{37}

2.3 Nationalism and Identity

In his book, *Art Writing, Nation, and Cosmopolitanism in Britain*, Mark Cheetham discusses the aesthetics of nationality and the concept of “national identity” in British art from the eighteenth-century onward. Regarding Hogarth’s *Analysis of Beauty* (1753), Cheetham writes about how the artist remarked on the aesthetic of “Englishness” in British art.\textsuperscript{38} In *Self-Portrait with Pug* (Fig.2) for instance, the dog embodies the concept of English nationality.\textsuperscript{39} As Cheetham writes,

> Artists’ self-portraits and their characterization in art treatises often included animals, if not usually pets…The Pug was an identifiably English breed very likely kept by Hogarth for this reason.\textsuperscript{40}

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid, 54.
\textsuperscript{37} Gibson, *Pets in Portraits*, 32.
\textsuperscript{38} Mark A. Cheetham, *Artwriting, Nation, and Cosmopolitanism in Britain: The Englishness of English Art Theory since the Eighteenth Century* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), 23.
\textsuperscript{40} Cheetham, *Artwriting, Nation, and Cosmopolitanism in Britain*, 41.
Despite the disagreement among scholars regarding the meaning of the Pug in *Self-Portrait with Pug*, all agree that the dog is an emblem of Englishness and therefore a symbol of nationalism.\(^4\)

I argue that nationality was also a concept that Gainsborough incorporated in *Henry Scott* through the canine subject, possibly inspired by Hogarth’s representation of his dog in *Self-Portrait with Pug* (Fig. 2). The Dandie Dinmont in *Henry Scott* can be understood as a visual representation of merged national identities. Although the subjects in *Henry Scott* are from different species, I suggest that the Dandie Dinmont’s breed implies a sense of shared nationalistic identity that crosses inter-species boundaries and attributes the dog with the human construct of a nationality as well. Miranda Green writes that there were many different types of Celtic hunting dogs, including terrier and lap dogs, which further emphasizes the Dandie Dinmont as a symbol of Scottish identity that the Duke (literally) embraces.\(^4\) Bred from a mix of terriers, including the Bedlington, Scottish, English, and Otter Hound,\(^4\) the Dandie Dinmont breed also embodies the merging of both Scottish and English cultural identities. The dog thus serves as an extension of the Duke’s national identity in the portrait by portraying the merging of cultural identities, which the Duke was experiencing between the familiarity of his English identity and an emphasis on his new Scottish identity after moving to Scotland to take the Buccleuch family seat. However, as Michael Rosenthal and Martin Myrone write,

---

The dog is an individual character in its own right, emphasized by it being an unusual breed, possibly a Dandie Dinmont Terrier…

Therefore, the distinct Dandie Dinmont breed also informs the uniqueness of the dog’s own identity.

In the Victorian era, popular Scottish dog breeds such as the Deerhound (popularized by Sir Walter Scott (1771-1832) and his beloved dog, Maida) and Dandie Dinmont, were reminiscent of a romanticised Scottish history and legendary chivalry. Donald writes that these particular breeds “were likewise expressions of an aristocratic spirit or mementoes of gallant royalism, to set against the political and industrial turmoil of the 1840s.” Although Donald suggests the romanticized understanding of Scottish dog breeds to be a nineteenth-century perception, the Dandie Dinmont’s noble association with Scottish history and aristocracy was likely already established in the late eighteenth-century.

---

46 Ibid.
47 Secord notes that the Dandie Dinmont breed was relatively unknown outside of the Border area until 1815, but the official Dandie Dinmont Terrier Club website claims that the dogs were known about long before then and often owned by gypsies and poachers; see Secord, *Dog Painting: A History of the Dog in Art*, 227 and Simon Rishton, “Welcome to the Dandie Dinmont Terrier Club,” *The Dandie Dinmont Terrier Club*, accessed January 10, 2019, http://www.ddtc.co.uk/. Because the breed developed discreetly in the Border area, the mysterious origin of the Dandie Dinmont terriers allowed for a romanticized connection to Scottish history. Furthermore, in the seventeenth-century, the Duke of Northumberland expressed great interest in purchasing a Dandie Dinmont from a farmer who refused the offer, which confirms that the dog was a desirable breed for aristocratic classes and therefore linked to aristocracy in the following centuries; Secord, *Dog Painting: A History of the Dog in Art*, 227.
2.4 Insignia

One of the first unusual details in *Henry Scott* is that the Duke’s coat lapel covers approximately one-third of the honourable “Star of the Thistle” pinned to his breast. The Order of the Thistle was bestowed on the Duke in December 1767. The Order of the Thistle is a great honour of Scottish chivalry, presented to persons of high distinction in nobility or government service. Just below the Duke’s waistline, a small ambiguous metal object illuminates the bottom left section of his costume, presumably a decorative hilt that would further articulate the Duke’s noble status. Although Gainsborough painted the insignia brightly to make it noticeable, the Duke’s lapel covers the upper part of the order, which diminishes its predominant presence. This compositional decision implies that the order was not intended to be the main focus in the painting, but rather “seems distinctly out of key, except as a pictorial accent.” It can also be argued that this compositional decision was expressive of the patron’s modesty – a custom of politeness that was expected of the upper class.

---

The inclusion of the Order of the Thistle as an accessory that represents the Duke’s noble social identity was likely included at the request of the patron. As Douglas Hay and Nicholas Rogers explain, the royal and aristocratic classes comprised a very small percent of eighteenth-century British society; therefore, it is understandable the Duke would have wanted to recognize his status as a member of the landed classes. However, the imposition of the dog as such a prominent figure in the portrait, a genre of art that Hamilton defines as “status-defining art” and in which the human sitter’s social achievements are expected to be showcased, challenges the focus of the subject matter. For instance, when comparing the different representation of insignias in *Henry Scott* and the work of Gainsborough’s contemporary, Joshua Reynolds’s portrait of *Lord Heathfield of Gibraltar* (c.1787, Figure 6), we can observe how the orders affect the topic of the paintings. In *Lord Heathfield of Gibraltar*, General George Augustus Elliot (1717-1790) is portrayed holding a symbolic key to the British fortress in Gibraltar, which he defended during the siege of 1779-83. The General is displayed with the Order of the Bath on his left breast, similar in position to the Order of the Thistle on the Duke’s breast in *Henry Scott*. In *Lord Heathfield of Gibraltar*, the insignia is also partially concealed – one-third of it lost into the shadowed crease of the General’s upper

---

54 “For the Dukes of Sussex and Kent, (one-hundredth of 1 percent of the population, fewer than 300 families) was the knowable social world;” see Douglas Hay and Nicholas Rogers, *Eighteenth Century English Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 18.
56 Also known as Lord Heathfield.
58 For more on orders and insignia, see Peter Galloway, *The Order of the Bath* (Chichester: Phillimore, 2006).
arm—but it dominates the subject of the portrait, emphasizing the General’s military achievements and forming the basis of the sitter’s identity. In comparison to the rigid formality of Lord Heathfield of Gibraltar, the casual pose of the Duke and emphasis on emotion by embracing the dog in Henry Scott rather than military achievement conveys an informal tone. Despite the relaxed atmosphere created in the portrait, the Duke remains identifiable as a dignified nobleman because of the order on his breast, demonstrating Gainsborough’s recognition of social hierarchy.

In a portrait of Henry Scott’s father-in-law by Sir William Beechey (1753-1839), George, Duke of Montagu (c. 1789, Figure 7), the artist portrayed George Brudenell, Third Duke of Montagu (1712-1790) brazenly displaying the Order of the Garter on his chest, which he was awarded in 1752. Much like Lord Heathfield of Gibraltar (Fig.6), the insignia dictates the subject of the painting. In George, Duke of Montagu, the turned body position of the Duke pushes the sitter’s chest with insignia forward into the foreground of the painting, immediately confronting the spectator. Furthermore, the insignia is brightly painted against the Duke of Montagu’s dark navy coat, illuminating the lower part of the work. The insignia is the most prominent pictorial prop in Beechey’s portrait of George, Duke of Montagu that informs the narrative of the painting and contributes the most information about the sitter’s identity. In Henry Scott, however, the Order of the Thistle is perceived more as an accessory rather than the subject of the work. The dog complicates the question of subject matter in the painting because of its dominant role, seeming to contribute more insight into the Duke’s character and identity.

59 Also see Joshua Reynolds, William Cavendish, 3rd Duke of Devonshire (c.1754, Bakewell, Chatsworth House Trust) and Joshua Reynolds, Henry Howard, 12th Earl of Suffolk and 5th Earl of Berkshire (c.1770s, unknown), in which the sitter’s insignias are the most prominent and identifying factors in the portraits.
than the insignia. It is important to note that in *Henry Scott*, the order also occupies the same plane of space with the dog, dividing the spectator’s attention. In other words, it is impossible to see the insignia without acknowledging the dog. Gainsborough’s compositional decision to share the focus between the order and dog implies the dog’s significant value. By emphasizing the insignia as the more obvious pictorial accessory, Gainsborough elevated the dog’s role to that of an important subject in the painting, thus de-objectifying the animal.

**2.5 Landscape, Or Lack Thereof**

In *Henry Scott*, the Duke and his dog are positioned against a very simple – almost barren and spatially flat – landscape. The lack of pictorial depth within the landscape of the portrait is unusual, considering that Gainsborough enjoyed painting landscapes and painted many around Bath. Other portraits by Gainsborough demonstrate the artist’s mastery in creating pictorial depth and willingness to conform to the convention of portraying a sitter’s property wealth through landscapes.

In 1767, three years prior to the painting of *Henry Scott*, the twenty-year-old Third Duke of Buccleuch arrived in Scotland for the first time with his new wife, Lady

---

60 For a similar analysis of the insignia in Anthony Van Dyck’s portrait of James Stuart, Duke of Richmond and Lennox (c. 1633, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 89.15.16), see Kenseth, "A Dog and his Man," 223-232.


Elizabeth Montagu (1743-1829). The Duke was celebrating his coming of age and the full inheritance of all the Buccleuch estates. As Bonnyman recounts, after crossing the border into Scotland, the Duke traveled for miles through his inherited lands.\textsuperscript{63} The sudden inheritance of such vast property wealth surely would have made an impact on the young Duke. Therefore, it is peculiar that in *Henry Scott* there is no pictorial reference to the Duke’s new acquisition of wealth. However, referring to a sitter’s property wealth is a convention that Gainsborough adhered to in other works, such as in the well-known outdoor conversation piece *Mr. and Mrs. Andrews* (c.1750, Figure 8).

In *Mr. And Mrs. Andrews* (Fig. 8), Gainsborough painted a young aristocratic couple with dog, emphasizing the agricultural prosperity of the sitters in the background of the painting.\textsuperscript{64} In the painting, the male figure stands with a rifle tucked under his right arm to the left of the canvas and an obedient hunting dog by his side – an accoutrement to his masculine representation. The rifle and dog symbolize the male subject’s privileged participation in the aristocratic blood sport of hunting and are “…motifs that make his landed status immediately obvious.”\textsuperscript{65} Some acceptable British hunting dogs were indeed small and rough-haired,\textsuperscript{66} like the Dandie Dinmont in *Henry Scott*, which complicates the perception of the dog as either a hunting or lap dog. Although, in

\textsuperscript{63} See Bonnyman, *The Third Duke of Buccleuch and Adam Smith*, 1.

\textsuperscript{64} Postle suggests that even the relationship between the newlywed couple was intended to further articulate the organization and succession of farmland; see Postle, *Thomas Gainsborough*, 16.

\textsuperscript{65} David Solkin, *Art in Britain: 1660-1815* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015), 114. For examples of the convention for portraying male sitters in an outdoor landscape with their dogs, see Thomas Gainsborough, *George, Lord Vernon* (c.1767, Southampton, Southampton City Art Gallery, SOTAG: 1494); Thomas Gainsborough, *William Powlet* (c.1762, Althorp, Private Collection); and Thomas Gainsborough, *An Officer of the 4\textsuperscript{th} Regiment of Foot* (c.1776-80, Melbourne, National Gallery of Victoria). For more on dogs and hunting in eighteenth-century Britain, refer to Donald, *Picturing Animals in Britain*, 268.

\textsuperscript{66} Green, *Animals in Celtic Life and Myth*, 56.
comparison to the painting of *Mr. and Mrs. Andrews*, the Duke’s landed class status in *Henry Scott* is not defined by the notion of hunting, despite the hunting capabilities of the Dandie Dinmont breed, and is a popular convention that Gainsborough breaks with.

In *Mr. and Mrs. Andrews* (Fig. 8), the dog is perceived as both a working animal and a pet.\(^{67}\) However, the dog’s closer proximity to the male subject and rifle in the painting suggests that the dog is more valued as a working animal rather than a pampered pet. Although the dog’s static pose reflects a mastery of immobility, necessary for a pet to learn in order to be obedient,\(^{68}\) Gainsborough further conveyed the hunting dog’s obedience in the painting by depicted the dog in an idealized state of behaviour, fixated on its master’s hand in anticipation of a command. The dog’s overemphasized obedience can be interpreted as representing the dog with a lack of agency over its own interests and in sub-servitude to its master’s demands. Alternatively, the dog’s loyal and obedient behaviour may also suggest its capacity for rational thought, as Hume argued was a result of an animal’s learnt experiences.\(^{69}\) Fudge writes, “The animal can be dominated or represent human power, it has no power or potential of its own,”\(^{70}\) but I argue that the dog does possess power over its behaviour. For instance, the dog could choose to be disobedient in order to assert dominance or pursue its own interests, but represses these instincts because of its ability to reason. In the painting, the dog is represented as having chosen to repress its instinctual desires, replacing them with a

---

\(^{67}\) For more on the different attitudes between pets and working dogs, see Tague, *Animal Companions*, 175-176.


\(^{70}\) Fudge, *Perceiving Animals*, 40.
desire for its master’s affection and other gratifications because of a rational decision to act obediently. The human subjects in Mr. and Mrs. Andrews may also be understood as repressing their desires to engage with their pet in order to demonstrate social expectations of proper etiquette. In Henry Scott, however, the Duke blatantly abandons social expectations and intimately interacts with his dog, which challenges social etiquettes and constructed hierarchies of power.

2.6 Body Language

Prior to the painting of Henry Scott, Gainsborough painted the Duke’s parents-in-law, the Third Duke and Duchess of Montagu (1711-1775).\(^71\) In the portraits of George, Duke of Montagu (c.1768, Figure 9) and Mary, Duchess of Montagu (c.1768, Figure 10), Gainsborough portrayed the sitters with a sense of rigid formality and a serious tone. The sober expressions and angled poses of the Third Duke and Duchess of Montagu exemplify conventional modes of representation in eighteenth-century grand manner portraits. Particularly in Gainsborough’s portrait of Mary, Duchess of Montagu, the Duchess is painted with careful consideration to her age and social status that is emphasized by her reserved and stoic character.\(^72\) The Duchess does not acknowledge the spectator in the work, but averts her gaze to the right of the canvas instead with her hands elegantly posed on her lap, one hand clasping the wrist of the other as was conventional of female sitters.\(^73\) When comparing the emotional atmosphere between Gainsborough’s portraits of the Third Duke and Duchess of Montagu with Henry Scott, a


\(^{72}\) See Cormack, The Paintings of Thomas Gainsborough, 96.

\(^{73}\) For instance, see the similar posing of hands in Joshua Reynolds, Lady Anstruther (c.1761, London, Tate Britain, N06243).
more inviting and casual mood is evident in the latter. In comparison, in *Mary, Duchess of Montagu*, the Duchess projects a supercilious expression that does not welcome the spectator’s engagement. The conventional formality in both the Montagu portraits creates a less approachable tone, which distances the spectator. Although Gainsborough painted all three portraits around the same time, the casual tone in *Henry Scott* conveys a very different understanding of the sitter’s identity that flatters his youthful and open-minded character.

In *Henry Scott*, Gainsborough depicted the Duke in a relaxed pose with his shoulders at ease, head tilted in a friendly manner, and his arms tenderly wrapped around his dog. Gainsborough softens the effect of grandeur in the portrait by positioning the Duke in a relaxed posture instead of in an overbearing stance. Although Gainsborough’s *Portrait of William Wollaston* (c. 1758-59, Figure 11), painted over a decade before *Henry Scott*, is one of the first examples in which Gainsborough depicts a sitter in an informal or relaxed mood, the sitter does not acknowledge the spectator. As William Vaughan observes, the sitter in *William Wollaston* appears “wrapped in thought,” which leaves the spectator to gaze invasively rather than be welcomed into a visual dialogue like in *Henry Scott*. In *Henry Scott* the Duke does not look away from

---

74 In comparison, for an example of an authoritative and intimidating stance in another painting by the artist, see Thomas Gainsborough, *Admiral Vernon* (c.1767, Southampton, Southampton City Art Gallery, SOTAG: 1494).
75 See Vaughan, *Gainsborough*, 70.
76 The convention of an averted gaze is noticeable in Gainsborough’s other male portraits, for instance, the contemplative and solemn expression in Thomas Gainsborough, *Uvedale Tomkyns Price* (c.1760, Munich, Neue Pinakothek, 8576) and Thomas Gainsborough, *Philippe Jacques de Loutherbourg* (c.1777-8, London, The Trustees of Dulwich Picture Gallery, DPG066). These sitters convey a sense of disengagement from the spectator by being represented looking off to the side of the canvas. In the portrait of *Robert Craggs* (Fig.4), the sitter acknowledges the spectator but with a side-glance, as though we have interrupted him from his contemplative thoughts, and not as straightforward as the Duke in *Henry Scott*. 

the spectator with a grave expression that would imply his thoughts to be elsewhere – instead, he is present and aware of our gaze. The Duke acknowledges the spectator with a straightforward body position, directly confronting and returning the viewer’s gaze. The informal mood in Henry Scott also creates a sense of imposition, as though the spectator has interrupted the Duke and his dog enjoying the outdoors and they have reacted by posing casually rather than being rigidly staged, but the imposition is welcomed. It is this nonchalant and informal representation of the Duke in Henry Scott that adds layers of complexity to the painting, which seems to invite the viewer into the Duke’s domestic life and intimate relationships to learn more about his character than would be possible from conventional social markers. The Duke’s informality also creates a sense of cross-species social balance, allowing the non-human subject to rise in status and importance in the painting.

2.7 Gender, Innocence, and Intimacy

The unconventional intimacy in the portrait of Henry Scott would have made the work vulnerable to the criticism of Gainsborough’s contemporaries. Yet, as Rosenthal and Myrone write, the ideals of sensibility threatened constructed gender identities in the early modern period, but also enabled a representation of intellectual and emotional independence.77 John Hayes confirms that the painting was an unconventional male portrait in the early modern period that paralleled motherly affection found in female portraits, such as in Joshua Reynolds’s Lady Spencer and her Daughter (c.1759-61, Althorp, The Spencer Collection).78 In one way, the Duke’s masculinity is challenged by

77 Rosenthal and Myrone, Gainsborough, 183.
78 Hayes, Gainsborough, 215.
an outward portrayal of affection that was more common in female portraits of the era.
Alternatively, the Duke’s affection for his dog was also recognized as an acceptable
masculine feeling.\textsuperscript{79} The Duke’s association with a pet of the canine species further
conveys the Duke’s masculinity in the painting, seeing as dogs were gendered male
appropriate and cats were typically gendered female.\textsuperscript{80} However, to impose conventions
of human gender politics on the portrait of Henry Scott poses complications, since the
relationship portrayed seems to exist at the convergence of gender and inter-species
politics.

Eighteenth-century portraits of children convey a sense of innocence that is
abandoned in most grand portraits of adults in the same era.\textsuperscript{81} Adult sitters were
commonly represented as authoritative, contemplative, and rigidly posed in formal
manners. However, in Henry Scott we are reminded of a child-like innocence through the
informal and affectionate relationship portrayed between the Duke and his canine
companion – particularly unconventional because of the Duke’s adult age. Rosenthal and
Myrone write,

The manner in which the duke cuddles the dog suggests almost a child’s love for
his pet, but stresses the sitter’s sensibility in his kindness to animals.\textsuperscript{82}

In Henry Scott, several compositional similarities between the Duke and his dog
resemble the iconography of child-portraits with pets. As Donald writes,

It is true that eighteenth-century portraits of children of both sexes frequently
include ‘favourite’ pets, as projections of the sitters; charmingly affectionate
characters.\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{79} Tague, Animal Companions, 236.
\textsuperscript{80} Ibid, 139.
\textsuperscript{81} For more on child-portraits, see Marcia Pointon, “The State of a Child” in Hanging the Head, 177-226.
\textsuperscript{82} Rosenthal and Myrone, Gainsborough, 206.
For example, when we compare *Henry Scott* with Reynolds’s portraits of *Princess Sophia Matilda of Gloucester* (c.1774-7, Figure 12) and *Miss Jane Bowles* (c.1775, Figure 13), a striking comparison can be drawn between how the female children and the Duke embrace their dogs. Commissioned by the Duke and Duchess of Gloucester, *Princess Sophia Matilda of Gloucester* depicts an infant girl crouched beside a Maltese dog in an outdoor setting. The girl is painted with one plump arm slung over her dog possessively. Reynolds was known to enliven portraits of children by using pets as comic tropes to suggest similarities between the two subjects, such as a shared “manner of looking at the world.”84 The innocent gazes of the child and dog, as well as their close proximity to each other, creates a sense of equality between the subjects. The position of the child and dog, both crouched low to the ground, also literally implies both of their low social statuses. Children in the early modern period held “not-quite-human” statuses and were often compared with animals because children were thought to lack reason and were only capable of repeating things without understanding, like parrots.85 Pointon writes that children were understood as simple and uncomplicated subjects that a shared humanity gives the spectator ready access to and evokes empathy.86 Although we do not have access to the canine subject in the same manner, Gainsborough’s representation of the dog as a child-like substitute in *Henry Scott*, which I will discuss further, challenges the notion of accessibility. I argue that if the child and dog are intended to resemble one

83 Donald, *Picturing Animals in Britain*, 19.
86 Pointon, *Hanging the Head*, 177.
another, then the same notion of “ready access” to the non-human can be applied to the
dog because of their suggested similarities. Ironically, as Pointon notes, children did not
commission their portraits, but the meanings conveyed in these portraits are “designed
by the adult world.”

Therefore, it is the conscious (and perhaps unconscious) adult’s
decision to create parallels between the child and pet in such child-portraits to suggest
them as near-equal subjects – demonstrative of a projection of adult anxieties.

Even more comparable in composition to Henry Scott is Reynolds’s portrait of
Miss Jane Bowles (Fig.13), which depicts a young girl tightly hugging her pet dog
against her chest with her hands clasped around its neck. In Miss Jane Bowles, the girl
acknowledges the spectator with a friendly smile and a piercing gaze, while the dog also
lifts its paw and gazes back at the spectator, similar to the Dandie Dinmont’s pose in
Henry Scott. An interesting parallel between the portraits is that the English Setter-type
dog in Miss Jane Bowles appears to be a puppy because of its floppy posture and small
size next to the girl, while the dog in Henry Scott is presumably an adult dog. Therefore,

87 Ibid, 178.
88 Ibid.
89 For an example of another similar composition to Henry Scott, but of an adolescent male sitter and his
dog instead of young females, see Joshua Reynolds, William Charles Colyear, Viscount Milsington, later 3rd
Earl of Portmore (c.1759, unknown). In this painting, the dog’s close proximity to the boy, elevated
position, and acknowledgement of the spectator through a self-aware gaze is compositionally similar to
Henry Scott. However, in Reynolds’s painting, the boy’s social status is significantly less important than
that of the Duke’s and thus, further demonstrating the unconventional representation of the subjects in
Henry Scott.
90 Solkin writes that an acknowledgement of the audience implied a “heightened degree of self-
consciousness;” Solkin, Painting for Money, 32-36. I suggest that this notion of self-consciousness is also
attributed to the dogs in both the portraits of George Selwyn (Fig.19) and Henry Scott, who acknowledge
the audience through their alert posture and gaze.
the dogs parallel the ages of the human sitters in the paintings and serve as extensions of the human subject’s identities.  

Although there are several compositional similarities between Henry Scott and child-portraits, the meaning of the portrait changes when the Duke, an adult subject, adopts child-like iconography because of the higher status of the adult male human in Britain at this time. Michael Witmore writes that unlike children who were perceived as “simple” subjects in the early modern period, adults were regarded as capable of originality and reason. Because the Duke is understood as a rational adult in Henry Scott, his child-like representation with his pet perpetuates a sense of equality rather than merely comic similarity, challenging the spectator to perceive the dog with rationality as well. Although comparing Henry Scott with child-portraits leads to an understanding of an innocent friendship that is represented between the Duke and his dog, a different feminized understanding of the relationship is presented when comparing Henry Scott with portraits of mothers and children. 

The tender display of affection in Henry Scott also reflects the iconographic expectations of eighteenth-century British portraits of mothers and their children. An examination of mother-and-child portraits is more suitable in a comparative analysis of the unconventional modes of representation in Henry Scott than child-portraits because
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91 The black spots on the puppy’s paw and white muzzle resemble The English Setter breed standards. For more on The English Setter, see William Secord, Dog Painting: The European Breeds (Woodbridge: Antique Collectors’ Club, 2000), 228-232.
93 See Rosenthal and Myrone, Gainsborough, 206. For more examples of eighteenth-century mother and child paintings, see Joshua Reynolds, Portrait of The Duchess of Devonshire and her Daughter Lady Georgiana Cavendish (c.1783, Derbyshire, Chatsworth House Trust); George Romney, Mrs Agnes Ainslie and her Son, Henry (c.1787, Private collection); and Elisabeth Vigee Le Brun, Self Portrait with Daughter Julie (c.1786, Paris, Louvre).
of the Duke’s adult age and the conventional feminine role the Duke plays in the painting. When the representation of the same Dandie Dinmont dog in *Henry Scott* is compared with Joshua Reynolds’s portrait of the Third Duchess of Buccleuch with her daughter in *Elizabeth, Duchess of Buccleuch and Child* (c.1772, Figure 14), a very different understanding of the dog’s role is portrayed. In Reynolds’s *Elizabeth, Duchess of Buccleuch and Child*, the Duchess and her young daughter, with two accompanying dogs at their feet, are portrayed against a fantastical outdoor setting. The Duchess appears to be seated on an oval wooden bench to the left of the painting, positioned in front of a large tree with red drapery winding through the leafy top; the intertwining of the tree with drapery suggestive of a conquering over nature. In the painting, the Duchess is dressed in a bronze-coloured robe lined with fur overtop a silky white dress with a red sash tied around her waist. The blond-haired girl, who leans against her mother’s leg, wears a white gown and a matching blue ribbon around her waist and hair. Beyond the female figures in the foreground of the painting, Reynolds painted a stretching autumn landscape with rolling hills, shrubs, and trees. In the painting, the black English Springer Spaniel-type dog jumps playfully at the Duchess’s knees with its back to the spectator, turning its head slightly to the right to make eye-contact with the child.94 The other grey dog in the painting is the same Dandie Dinmont that appears in *Henry Scott*, who is positioned stoically sitting beside the bottom of the Duchess’s skirt to the right of the painting.

In Reynolds’s *Elizabeth, Duchess of Buccleuch and Child* (Fig.14), the Dandie Dinmont dog is depicted with unruly hair and small beady eyes. In the painting, the dog

peers timidly out at the spectator from behind the Duchess’s skirt while the visible portion of its body with wavy fur blends into the landscape behind it, marginalizing the dog into the shadowy corner of the painting. In *Elizabeth, Duchess of Buccleuch and Child*, the Dandie Dinmont’s stoic pose suggests the dog’s mature and reserved behaviour that contrasts with the black dog that jumps energetically at the Duchess’s lap, which may also reflect the different ages of the dogs.95 However, the Dandie Dinmont’s motionless stance, as well as lack of lively expression and interaction with the other figures in the painting conveys its emblematic purpose. By concealing the Dandie Dinmont into the background of the painting, Reynolds diminished the notability of the dog. As a result, Reynolds implies that the dog’s purpose is as a pictorial accessory that is not given the same amount of consideration in terms of realistic depiction as Gainsborough provides the dog in *Henry Scott*. In comparison, the same Dandie Dinmont dog that was “a family favourite”96 is almost unrecognizable in *Henry Scott*, where it appears as a substantially more important and life-like figure. A possible explanation for the difference in representation of the same dog in both paintings may reflect the different relationship the human sitters had with their pet. In *Henry Scott* the dog is presented in a more significant role and with details that offer greater insight about its inner thoughts and character because of the Duke’s more intimate relationship with his canine companion. In contrast, in *Elizabeth, Duchess of Buccleuch and Child*, the Duchess’s apathetic attitude, which is conveyed by her lack of interaction with the

95 The Dandie Dinmont’s serious mood is portrayed in both Reynolds’s and Gainsborough’s portraits, which implies an acknowledgement of the dog’s distinct character by both artists.
96 The Dandie Dinmont in the portrait of *Henry Scott* was a family favourite according to Scott Macdonald (Head of Collections & Conservation, Buccleuch Living Heritage Trust); Scott Macdonald, *Henry Scott (3rd Duke of Buccleuch) Research*, email, May 05, 2017.
dogs, suggests a more distanced relationship with the family pets. The Duchess’s less intimate relationship with her pets therefore marginalizes the roles of the dogs in the painting and establishes their purpose in the painting as merely symbolic pictorial accessories. Furthermore, in Reynolds’s portrait, the Duchess physically restrains Lady Mary Scott from engaging with the playful black dog, which she curiously peers down at, by holding her daughter close to her own body with one hand while gripping the girl’s wrist with the other. Through this action, the Duchess appears to project her distanced relationship with the pets onto her daughter by withhold her daughter from interacting with the dogs. As Yi-Fu Tuan suggests, by restraining her daughter the Duchess exerts her power as a mother in the painting – an exertion of power that ironically dehumanizes the child to the status of a controlled pet.97

Another interpretation of the restrained interaction between the child and dog in Elizabeth, Duchess of Buccleuch and Child (Fig.14) points to the notion of repressed childhood sexuality. Pointon writes that eighteenth-century paintings of children entertaining pets were understood as representative of childhood sexuality, where the act of “teasing” the pet alluded to and encouraged sexual play.98 Pointon also particularly notes that sexual innuendos were common in Reynolds’s portraits of children.99 In this interpretation, the energetic dog in Elizabeth, Duchess of Buccleuch and Child can be understood to symbolize male sexuality from which the Duchess protectively restrains
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97 Tuan, Dominance and Affection, 115.
98 Pointon, Hanging the Head, 192.
her daughter, resulting in the representation of the girl as chaste and innocent. Donald writes, “The addition of childhood to gender... often reinforced connections between the female, the natural, and the instinctive.” Therefore, Lady Mary Scott’s instinctive child curiosity to play with the jumping dog further feminizes the little girl. Although, to interact with the dogs would suggest an interaction with nature and a lower status being, an implication that may have been purposely avoided in the painting. Yet, in Henry Scott, the Duke is portrayed as indulging in a child-like desire to interact with his dog, unrestrained in his display of affection. However, as Pointon writes, “allegorizing structures” such as sexual innuendos found in paintings of female children with pets would not have same connotations in male portraits. Instead of sexualization in the portrait, I suggest there is a friendly intimacy at play.

Although Henry Scott may resemble the iconography of portraits of children with pets in the way the Duke embraces his dog, the Duke’s adult relationship with his canine companion more accurately resembles a parent and child relationship instead. In 
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100 However, the spectator is unable to confirm the dog’s gender from the portrait; the dog may be female or male. See Pointon’s analysis of the energetic dog in George Romney, The Clavering Children (c.1777, San Marino, Huntington Library, 78.20.35) in Pointon, Hanging the Head, 192-193.
101 Donald, Picturing Animals in Britain, 18.
102 Pointon, Hanging the Head, 184.
103 The Oxford English Dictionary defines “intimacy” as: “The state of being personally intimate; intimate friendship or acquaintance… and a euphemism for sexual intercourse;” Oxford English Dictionary Online, s.v. “intimacy,” accessed January 10, 2019, http://www.oed.com.libproxy.uregina.ca:2048/view/Entry/98503?redirectedFrom=intimacy. Unlike the depiction of children in eighteenth-century paintings as sexualized subjects, the same connotations would not have applied to adult male portraits. Thus, sexualization is not a plausible interpretation of the relationship between the Duke and his dog, which could also cross the boundary of bestiality. Alternatively, the term “intimacy,” with its implication of friendship, is a more fitting perception that adheres to the rhetoric of “sensibility” that informed eighteenth-century British society.
104 Inter-species parental relations were not unheard of in eighteenth-century Britain; see for instance the representation of the popular and outrageous story of “Mary Tofts” who fraudulently said she gave birth to rabbits in the print by John Faber the Younger, after John Laguerre, Mary Tofts of Godelman the Pretended Rabbit Breeder (c.1726, London, The British Museum, 1902,1011.1903).
*Henry Scott*, the Duke is portrayed in defiance of anthropocentric and masculine ideals through his outward display of affection for a non-human. When compared with mother-child-portraits, I suggest the dog acts as a child-like substitute.\(^{105}\) As John Plumb explains, the improved status of children in the eighteenth-century had objectified children and turned them into “luxury objects” on whom parents spent large sums of money.\(^{106}\) Plumb writes,

> In a sense, [children] had become superior pets – sometimes spoilt excessively like Charles James Fox, sometimes treated with indifference or even brutality, but usually, as with pets, betwixt and between.\(^{107}\)

If the attitudes towards children and pets in the eighteenth-century were analogous, so too were their roles. In *Henry Scott*, the dog takes on the role of the child and the Duke that of a parent protectively embracing his dog, which feminizes him only in the sense that he takes on a conventional motherly role. The purpose of pets was understood differently depending on which gender a pet was associated with. As Tague writes,

> Far from threatening traditional feminine roles, pets could be constructed as a safe means for girls and young women to test their future roles as wives and mothers. And for men, sensibility offered the vision of sympathy across the species boundary to enable a friendship of equals between man and beast.\(^{108}\)

Furthermore, Tague writes that in pictures of female children with pets, the child plays the role of a mother with infant.\(^{109}\) However, in Gainsborough’s portrait of *Henry Scott*, the relationship between the Duke and his dog is also understood as a friendship, which

\(^{107}\) Ibid.
\(^{109}\) Ibid.
adds masculine weight. Therefore, the boundaries of gender politics are blurred in the portrait of *Henry Scott*.

The effects of gender association with pets can be better observed when comparing *Henry Scott* with Gainsborough’s portrait of *Lady Jane Whichcote* (c.1775, Figure 15), which was painted five years after *Henry Scott* and shows an exceptional resemblance with regard to composition and content. In *Lady Jane Whichcote*, Gainsborough also depicted an intimate cross-species relationship. The artist positioned the dog as a near-equal subject through the dog’s unusual pose and shared characteristics, such as soft gaze and facial expression, with the human sitter. In *Lady Jane Whichcote*, Gainsborough painted a female sitter in a silky blue gown with yellow sash, set against an outdoor landscape, with her white medium-sized Spitz dog at her side. The dog stands on its hind legs, which anthropomorphizes the animal through a human-like stance, and places its front paws in the female sitter’s hand on her lap. In the painting, Lady Jane tenderly places her other hand over the dog’s paws, creating a sense of unity and equality between the subjects who both exhibit a sense of self-awareness as they gaze at the spectator with friendly expressions. Because portraying female subjects with their pets or vulnerable animals was commonplace in eighteenth-century portraits, the presence of the dog in *Lady Jane Whichcote* is easy to dismiss as representative of female virtues, such as compassion. However, in *Henry Scott*, the Duke’s male gender distinguishes the painting from any male portrait of the era in its unconventional

\[\text{References}\]

\[\text{110} \] Ibid, 233.

\[\text{111} \] For a discussion about the virtues associated with women and animals, see Pointon, *Hanging the Head*, 89.
representation of intimacy, which confronts gender stereotypes and social expectations of the relationship between male owners and their pets.

Donald writes that pets were signifiers of family life and a love of one’s dog was perceived as a virtue. Therefore, pets were directly linked with the concept of family life. The notion of “family” in the early modern period, however, was a “shifting concept rather than a fixed formation.” As Pointon writes, the concept of “family” and “childhood” are historical and cultural constructs that are not static. The flexibility of what constituted a family unit thus allowed pets to partake in new roles within the family dynamic. The unconventional role of the dog in Henry Scott therefore challenged prior preconceptions of what “family” meant, enabling the dog to take on the role of a child-like subject. The representation of the dog as a family member thus establishes the dog with a noble rank as a member of the Buccleuch family – a powerful association.

2.8 Pets and Portraits

In this section, I will examine works where pets were featured subjects and discuss how these kinds of images focused on representing the individuality of animals. Tuan writes that a distinct sentimentalized view of animals developed in Western Europe in the early modern period. In response, individual portraits of dogs emerged as a popular subject in portraiture in the eighteenth-century. In eighteenth-century pet-portraits, a pet was presented as a central subject and Gainsborough painted several of

113 Pointon, *Hanging the Head*, 162.
114 Ibid, 177.
115 Tuan, *Dominance and Affection*, 112.
116 Ibid. See also Donald, *Picturing Animals in Britain*, 112.
these types of portraits, including *Bumper* (c.1745, Figure 16) and *Tristram and Fox* (c.1775-85, Figure 17).\(^{117}\) Gainsborough’s first commissioned and dated portrait was indeed a pet-portrait, *Bumper*, which portrayed a white Bull Terrier dog set against a tree-lined landscape.\(^{118}\) Positioned in front of a tree trunk on a small dirt cliff, Bumper stands alert with his hooded ears erect and hind legs in a ready position in the foreground of the painting, intensely focused on something off to the left of the canvas. The inscription on the back of the painting reads: “A Most Remarkable Sagacious Cur.” There is some inconsistency, however, as to who inscribed this phrase on the back of *Bumper*, whether it was Gainsborough or Bumper’s owner, the Reverend Henry Hill (1715-1775).\(^{119}\) A telling choice of words, “Sagacious” was defined in the eighteenth-century as following: “n1. Quick of scent. Dryden,”\(^{120}\) but also “n2. Quick of thought; acute in making discoveries. Locke.”\(^{121}\) Although the first definition may hold weight in regards to the more common meaning of the word, the presence of the latter definition reinforces the notion of rationality, particularly animal rationality within the context of *Bumper*. Regardless of whether it was Gainsborough or Revd. Henry Hill who inscribed the painting with such a flattering description of Bumper, it demonstrates the perception of a non-human with high regard. The inscription also serves to commemorate the dog’s individuality and distinct character, which proves the work as belonging to the genre of portraiture because it achieves an accurate representation of both the likeness of the sitter.

---


\(^{118}\) Vaughan, *Gainsborough*, 28.

\(^{119}\) Hamilton suggests that it was Gainsborough who inscribed the phrase “a most Remarkable Sagacious cur” (see Hamilton, *Gainsborough*, 57) while Cormack writes that it was “commemorated by the owner” (see Cormack, *The Paintings of Thomas Gainsborough*, 12).

\(^{120}\) Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language* (Dublin: W.G. Jones, 1768), ebook, 538.

\(^{121}\) Ibid.
(Bumper) and distinct character traits, including the dog’s keen aptitude for hunting and athleticism. 

In Gainsborough’s pet-portrait of *Tristram and Fox* (Fig.17), the artist paid careful attention to the accurate representation of his dogs’ distinct characters and masterfully portrayed their inner thoughts. In the painting, Gainsborough created stark contrasts between the characteristic and compositional representations of the two dogs, Fox (a Spitz or Collie breed) and Tristram (a Cocker Spaniel). I suggest these differences convey Gainsborough’s recognition of the dogs’ individualities, but also exemplify the artist’s different relationship with the dogs. For instance, in *Tristram and Fox*, Gainsborough established Fox as a more prominent subject by portraying Fox’s entire body while only a third of Tristram is painted, with the rest of his body disappearing past the right side of the canvas. Gainsborough depicted Fox seated upright, in a moment of fierce concentration and in a state of alertness, staring intently off to the left of the canvas. Beside Fox, Gainsborough painted Tristram laying down with his head raised and a limp front paw dangling over the platform on which both the dogs are placed.
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122 Lorne Campbell writes, “It is, therefore, unwise to define ‘portrait’ in terms of likeness. A more serviceable definition was put forward by John Gere (see 1974 exh. cat.), according to whom a portrait is an image ‘in which the artist is engaged with the personality of his sitter and is preoccupied with his or her characterization as an individual’;” Lorne Campbell, “Portraiture,” *Oxford Art Online*, 2003, accessed September 20, 2019, https://doi-org.libproxy.uregina.ca:8443/10.1093/gao/9781884446054.article.T068853.

123 In the painting *Tristram and Fox* (Fig.17), Tristram is assumingly identified as the dominant figure, seated to the left of the painting and Fox to be the dog laying beside to the right, in corresponding with the order of names in the title of the work. However, in private letters that Gainsborough exchanged with his wife, Fox was supposedly Gainsborough’s “favourite” pet (which is why the artist signed his letters as Fox) and Tristram (to whom Gainsborough addressed the letter) was Margaret’s pet; see Rosenthal and Myrone, *Gainsborough*, 202. Therefore, the order of names in the title of *Tristram and Fox* should likely be reversed, since it is more probable that Gainsborough would paint his beloved Fox in a more prominent role than Tristram; for more on this issue, see “Fox and Tristram,” (London: Tate Gallery, 2018), accessed January 10, 2019, https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/gainsborough-tristram-and-fox-n01483.

124 For more on the Cocker Spaniel dog breed, see Secord, *Dog Painting: The European Breeds*, 215 and for Spitz and Collie dog breeds, see Ibid, 70 and 73.
Gainsborough depicted Tristram in a more relaxed pose in comparison with Fox whose stiff and tensed front paws conveys a sense of readiness. In the painting, the white of Fox’s coat illuminates the dark tones and enlivens the image of the dog, as opposed to Tristram whose black and brown coat blends into the dull background colours. Gainsborough also painted white specks in Fox’s eyes, illuminating his eyes to provide a visible direction for the animal’s gaze, unlike Tristram whose dark eyes do not show any indication of the dog’s gaze and may even be closed. Between the two dogs, Gainsborough provided more details in Fox’s facial expression, painting him with a lovable under-bite that exposes the dog’s tight-lipped mouth, which also resembles a sense of alertness like the Dandie Dinmont’s expression in *Henry Scott*. The numerous ways in which Gainsborough depicts the individuality of Fox in *Tristram and Fox* suggests the artist’s closer relationship with his dog, seeing as Fox was considered Gainsborough’s pet and Tristram was his wife’s. A closer relationship would have therefore enabled Gainsborough to more intimately know his dog’s inner character and be able to depict distinct character traits in the painting.

The portrait of *Tristram and Fox* (Fig.17) exemplifies another instance where Gainsborough acknowledged the individuality of dogs and represented their capacity for thought through body language and facial expressions. As Rosenthal and Myrone write, Gainsborough intended the dogs in *Tristram and Fox* to be perceived as “sentient beings in their own right, and as family companions rather than working or sporting animals.”

George Fulcher, in his biography of the painter, accounts that after an argument with his wife, the couple exchanged apology letters under the pseudonyms of their favourite dogs.  

Gainsborough’s “favourite” dog, Fox, was then trained to deliver the letters to Margaret by carrying them in his mouth.\(^{126}\) In light of this evidence, Gainsborough demonstrated a willingness to entertain the idea of pets as extensions of human identity. The artist’s playful anthropomorphism of his pets also attributes the animals with heightened emotional capacities; given the intimate nature of the tasks he involved his pets with.

Tristram and Fox were cherished members of the Gainsborough family, whose portrait hung above the chimneypiece in Gainsborough’s London house – however, it is unclear in which exact room.\(^{127}\) Recalling the hanging of Gainsborough’s *Henry Scott* over a chimney at Dalkeith House (the Buccleuch primary seat in Scotland) in a letter to a friend, the Third Duke of Buccleuch’s daughter, Lady Queensberry, wrote: “There is or was a pretty picture over the chimney (of Gainsborough’s) of my father with a rough water dog in the Library that was very like.”\(^{128}\) As Pointon writes, the arrangement of portraits in domestic interiors had symbolic meanings.\(^{129}\) Therefore, the placement of both *Tristram and Fox* (Fig.17) and *Henry Scott* above a chimneypiece that would have been the focal architectural element in any given room, conveys the central role dogs played in both Gainsborough’s and the Duke’s lives. Interestingly, both *Tristram and Fox* and *Henry Scott* were painted around the same time. The remarkable representation of the dogs as sentient and prominent subjects in both portraits indicates Gainsborough’s particular interest in dogs at this time. Since *Tristram and Fox* was painted after the commission of *Henry Scott*, perhaps it is possible that the Duke’s intimate relationship

\(^{129}\) Pointon, *Hanging the Head*, 17.
with his Dandie Dinmont and liberal views of dogs as near-equal companions inspired the artist to contemplate his own affection for his dogs, which resulted in the tender representation of his beloved pets.

Although the Dandie Dinmont in *Henry Scott* plays a significant role and shares an equal amount of attention in the portrait with the Duke, the Duke’s presence in the painting determines that the work cannot be considered a pet-portrait in its strictest definition. Malcom Cormack writes that Gainsborough had “sensitivity to the character of the dog”\(^{130}\) in the portrait of *Bumper* (Fig.16), which enabled the artist to depict the individuality of the dog. As a result, Cormack proposes that *Bumper* is an “animal conversation piece” and one of the first instances where the artist reacted to the individuality of the sitter.\(^{131}\) Cormack defines *Bumper* as an animal conversation piece based on the reasoning that it depicts the individual character of the dog, which I argue offers an interpretive dimension for defining the subgenre of *Henry Scott*.

Pointon defines conversation pieces as a popular subgenre in eighteenth-century portraiture that portrayed family gatherings, usually with pets, in which the spectator is invited to construct narratives about the subjects from the details.\(^{132}\) Henri Pierre Danloux’s painting of *Henry, 3rd Duke of Buccleuch, with his wife, Elizabeth Montagu, and family in the grounds of Dalkeith* (c.1798, Figure 18)\(^{133}\) serves as an ideal example.

\(^{130}\) Cormack, *The Paintings of Thomas Gainsborough*, 12.
\(^{131}\) Ibid.
\(^{132}\) Pointon, *Hanging the Head*, 159.
\(^{133}\) For brevity, I will refer to this painting as *Duke of Buccleuch with Family* further in the thesis.
of a conventional eighteenth-century conversation piece.\textsuperscript{134} In Danloux’s painting, the Buccleuch family is portrayed in perfect adherence to the conventions of conversation pieces, as Pointon outlines.\textsuperscript{135} In Danloux’s painting, the Third Duke of Buccleuch’s immediate family with pets are gathered together and details such as musical and art props, costumes, and bodily positions contribute to the narrative of the work, informing the spectator about the identity, character, and familial rank of the subjects.\textsuperscript{136} The three dogs in the \textit{Duke of Buccleuch with Family} conversation piece also assimilate into the detailed narrative of the family, but do not play central roles like the Dandie Dinmont in \textit{Henry Scott}. However, as with the human subjects, Danloux succeeds in illustrating the unique personalities of the three dogs in the painting, positioning them throughout the work in alignment with the characters of the people they are intended to parallel. For example, the Spaniel dog that sits stoically near Duchess Elizabeth’s leg demonstrates a sense of mature obedience and loyalty; the Terrier in front of Lady Elizabeth and her harp playfully lowers his chest to the ground, anticipating the spectator to engage in play;\textsuperscript{137} and in the right corner of the painting, the Pug sleeps unperturbed, which

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{134} For more examples of conversation pieces, also see Francis Hayman, \textit{Samuel Richardson, with His Wife Elizabeth, Their Daughters, and Miss Midwinter} (c.1740-1, London, Tate Britain, T12221) and Johann Joseph Zoffany, \textit{Queen Charlotte with Members of her Family} (c.1771-2, London, Royal Collection Trust, RCIN 401004).
\textsuperscript{135} See Pointon, Hanging the Head, 159.
\textsuperscript{136} For instance, in the \textit{Duke of Buccleuch with Family} (Fig.18) conversation piece, the positioning of the youngest son and daughter next to their parents conveys their child-like dependence and thus, their lower familial rank. In contrast, the older siblings are depicted in roles of maturity and authority, represented through military costumes and alignment next to their spouses, which suggests the greater social rank of those subjects within the family hierarchy. Meanwhile, the Third Duke and Duchess of Buccleuch are positioned near the center of the composition, situating them as central figures in the work and within the Buccleuch family dynamic. For more on the militia regiments in the painting, see John Montagu Douglas Scott, \textit{Drumlanrig: The Castle Its People and Its Paintings} (Hawick: Câique Publishing Ltd., 2010), 68. For more information about the sitters in Danloux’s \textit{Duke of Buccleuch with Family} (Fig.18), see Scott, \textit{Bowhill}, 20.
\textsuperscript{137} Positioned in front of the harp that Lady Elizabeth “plays,” the terrier dog’s “playful” behavior also serves as a clever visual pun on the word “play.”
\end{flushleft}
correlates with the blissfulness of a happy marriage. Because there are only two subjects in *Henry Scott*, the work challenges the expectations of a conventional conversation piece, which would typically involve more family members and a larger selection of pictorial accessories. As I have discussed previously, categorizing *Henry Scott* within the iconographic standards of other subgenres of portraiture has proven to be complicated. Yet, the portrait of *Henry Scott* should be considered an “animal conversation piece” because it invites the spectator to construct a narrative about the human and non-human sitters by examining their relationship through details that portray emotional qualities in the painting.

Pointon explains that eighteenth-century conversation pieces allowed for the articulation of social and familial decorum, noting that disconnected signs within the social situation related to cultural and political issues. 138 If *Henry Scott* is considered a conversation piece, then the “disconnected signs” that are the unconventional modes of representation in the portrait could be understood to point to a larger cultural commentary on the changing attitudes towards non-humans in eighteenth-century Britain. I suggest that the disconnected signs, such as the elevated position of the dog in the painting or the Duke’s intimate embrace of his dog that challenged social behavioural expectations, demonstrate a shift in the familial decorum of eighteenth-century domestic life. These disconnected signs invite the viewer to explore the complex personal relationships between the human and non-human subjects. The spectator gains an understanding of the role of pets within the domestic sphere as cherished family members and not just pictorial accessories. Although Gainsborough’s portrait of *Henry

138 Pointon, *Hanging the Head*, 159.
Scott is unparalleled in its representation of an intimate human and pet relationship, it is important to recognize two other portraits: William Hogarth’s *Self-Portrait with Pug* (Fig. 2) and Joshua Reynolds’s *George Selwyn* (c. 1766, Figure 19). Both portraits by Hogarth and Reynolds capture unique representations of canine individuality beside their owners and convey a sense of animal rationality.

In *Self-Portrait with Pug* (Fig. 2), Hogarth painted an oval self-portrait nestled against velvet green drapery. The self-portrait in the painting is positioned on top of three leather-bound books, beside which Hogarth painted his cherished Pug, Trump.\(^{139}\) The three books that support Hogarth’s self-portrait allude to the three literary geniuses that the artist admired and aligned his skills with: Shakespeare, Swift, and Milton. In front of the books, Hogarth painted a wooden palette with the inscription: “The Line of Beauty (and Grace).” The palette symbolized “a tool of [Hogarth’s] trade, and…a three-dimensional symbol of his aesthetic.”\(^{140}\) Trump is placed outside of the pictorial space of Hogarth’s self-portrait, but directly in the foreground of the painting, which makes the dog an immediately noticeable and animated subject.\(^{141}\) It is possible that *Self-Portrait with Pug* may have been intended as an in memoriam painting in which the Pug serves as a surviving legacy of the artist, which would anthropomorphize the dog by presenting him in a child-like role. Aligned within the same pictorial space as the material objects in the painting (the palette and books) that represents aspects of Hogarth’s identity, Trump the Pug therefore also contributes to inform the identity of the artist. Associating with a

\(^{140}\) Ibid.
non-human within the space of a portrait offered a frame in which the animal could serve
as an extension of human identity and as Rosenthal writes, “The dog is an emblem [of
Hogarth], small, fierce, and English.”¹⁴² In Self-Portrait with Pug, Trump contributes to
Hogarth’s identity as a visual pun, attesting to the artist’s “pugnacious” character.¹⁴³
Trump also represents Hogarth’s allegiance to the English monarchy given the
popularity of Pugs as a fashionable breed in English court society.¹⁴⁴ If the Pug is
understood as an extension of Hogarth’s identity, is the Dandie Dinmont in Henry Scott
also understood in the same way? Or perhaps the dog portrayed as an individual with
agency, independent of being understood as an extension of the Duke’s identity? Both
possibilities for the interpretation of the dog’s role in Henry Scott are perceivable,
although the unconventional representation of the dog as a near-equal rationally
independent subject challenges the representation of the dog as only an extension of the
Duke’s identity.

Humanist theory influenced eighteenth-century British ways of thinking, and as
Fudge writes, simply looking like a human is what provided someone with a “right to
possession” and thus, dominion.¹⁴⁵ “Humanism,” as Nayar defines it, “is the study of this
individual subject and the composite features we now recognize as the human.”¹⁴⁶
Therefore, in contrast to an animal’s visual characteristics, a human figure would assume

¹⁴² Rosenthal, Hogarth, 4. “Animals in portraits were…extensions of the sitter’s identity;”
Donald, Picturing Animals in Britain, 110.
¹⁴³ See “The Painter and His Pug,” (London: Tate Gallery, 2018), accessed January 10, 2019,
becomes in a sense Hogarth’s alter ego, though in a much more flamboyant manner than other artists’
pets;” Gibson, Pets in Portraits, 32.
¹⁴⁴ “Pug History,” American Kennel Club, Dog Breeds, accessed January 10, 2019,
http://www.akc.org/dog-breeds/Pug/detail/.
¹⁴⁵ Fudge, Perceiving Animals, 142.
¹⁴⁶ Nayar, Posthumanism, 5.
authority and dominance based on speciest Humanist principles in early modern European visual culture.\textsuperscript{147} However, Fudge points to the ironic complications associated with the assertion of human-ness in early modern British society through means such as regarding the animal as property or naming an animal in an attempt to distance oneself from the complexities of ownership, but which ultimately required a recognition of the animal’s individuality.\textsuperscript{148} Although the Dandie Dinmont dog likely had a name, but which remains unknown, the dog’s identifiable animal features in \textit{Henry Scott} successfully conveys the Duke’s ownership over the animal and thus establishes the Duke’s human-ness.\textsuperscript{149} However, I propose that the human subject also informs the animal’s identity by defining its “animal-ness,” which can only be perceived negatively from a humanist perspective. The construct of “human” and “animal” identities in \textit{Self-Portrait with Pug} (Fig.2) and \textit{Henry Scott} demonstrate how a reliance on the presence of subjects from different species informs the narrative of the sitters in the paintings, which leads to an equalizing effect based on interdependency. As a result, a mutually organized and established philosophical system emerges.

Despite the prominent role that Trump occupies in \textit{Self-Portrait with Pug} (Fig. 2), Hogarth maintains a calculated distance from his dog by including himself in the painting only as an image. Yet, Hogarth’s distance from his pet does not result in a lack of recognition for the dog’s individuality. Of Hogarth’s many pet Pugs, the dog in the painting is identified as Trump, which is suggestive of characteristic traits that define the

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{147} See Fudge, \textit{Perceiving Animals}, 136 and 142.
\textsuperscript{148} Ibid, 136. Also see Ibid, 34-65, where Fudge examining the notion of human-ness through complicated subjects that arguably lacked consciousness, such as infants.
\textsuperscript{149} However, earlier spectators of the painting may have been familiar with the dog and therefore could identify the animal by name.
\end{flushleft}
dog’s unique identity. Unlike the Dandie Dinmont in Henry Scott, Trump obediently poses in the painting without the presence of a human to dictate his actions, which conveys a sense of the dog’s independency and self-agency. However, Trump’s gaze appears to be averted to the left side of the canvas, unengaged with the spectator, which thus complicates attributing the dog with a sense of self-awareness. Furthermore, in comparison with Henry Scott, Trump is not portrayed in a physically intimate relationship with Hogarth or with a sense of near-equality in terms of social status or rational capacity because of the dog’s placement next to Hogarth’s cherished material possessions, which objectifies the dog. Therefore, the purpose of the dog in Self-Portrait with Pug seems to remain a misappropriated symbolic extension of Hogarth’s virtues and identity, despite what I suggest is also the artist’s acknowledgement of Trump’s individuality.

Self-Portrait with Pug (Fig.2) was not the first painting in which Hogarth exhibited sensitivity to the character of a non-human subject. In Hogarth’s pet-portrait of Vulcan (c.1735-40, Figure 20), the artist painted his friend Thomas Wood’s black and white Spaniel dog as an oversized subject seated in front of a leafy outdoor setting. According to a note attached to the back of the painting, Vulcan the dog was very clever and supposedly guided his master home with a lantern that he carried in his mouth,

---

150 Gibson, Pets in Portraits, 31. Trump also appears in William Hogarth, The Bruiser (c.1763, University of Manchester, The Whitworth Art Gallery, P.1994.103) and in an X-ray of William Hogarth, Self-Portrait Painting the Comic Muse (c.1757-8, London, National Portrait Gallery, NPG 289), in which Trump was painted urinating on a pile of old-master paintings; see Ibid, 32.
152 Similar to the sensitivity with which Gainsborough represents the canine subject’s character in Bumper (Fig.16).
which intrigued Hogarth. Vulcan’s friendly appearance in the painting seems to reflect the dog’s content in its role as a dutiful companion. In *Vulcan*, Hogarth paid particular attention to the dog’s facial expression by painting the dog’s gentle eyes in an exaggerated upward stare. Hogarth also painted Vulcan with a slightly curled lip that resembles a human smile – an anthropomorphized feature that I suggest emphasized the artist’s admiration for the dog’s intelligence.

Alternatively, Mark Hallet writes that in *Self-Portrait with Pug* (Fig. 2), Trump serves as a parody of dignified accessories that were traditionally found in high portraiture, which deflected Hogarth’s hubris associated with the other objects in the painting. Given Hogarth’s satirical works and cheeky personality, Hallet’s analysis of Trump’s role in the portrait is plausible, although it greatly degrades the role of the dog to that of a comic accessory and not a sincere representation of Hogarth’s companion. Matthew Craske also argues that the Pug serves as a self-parodying mechanism in the painting and quotes a pamphlet written by one of Hogarth’s supporters, who claimed that the Pug was “nothing more than ‘a little, pert snarling animal.’” Additionally, Craske writes that the Pug breed was perceived as a mongrel with an uncertain breed history and

155 For more on William Hogarth’s character, see Rosenthal, *Hogarth*; Gowing and Paulson, *Hogarth*; and Matthew Craske, *William Hogarth* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000). In William Hogarth, *The Bruiser* (c.1763, University of Manchester, The Whitworth Art Gallery, P.1994.103), Hogarth uses *Self-Portrait with Pug* (Fig. 2) as a template, but transforms the work into an unquestionably satirical subject. However, this later revision of *Self-Portrait with Pug* raises questions of whether or not the original painting was in fact a sincere representation of the artist and his beloved Pug and not intended as a self-parodying example as Hallet and Craske suggest. I argue that the original *Self-Portrait with Pug* was a sincere representation of both the artist and his pet, and only in the satirical print did Hogarth convert the Pug’s role into a comic purpose. For more on Trump’s role as a “comic safety-valve,” see Mark, Hallett. *Hogarth* (London: Phaidon Press Limited, 2000), 164.
not a “true” English thoroughbred, despite popular belief.\textsuperscript{157} Craske argues that the Pug therefore represents Hogarth’s “insignificant origins and cheeky social persona.”\textsuperscript{158} And lastly, Lawrence Gowing and Ronald Paulson claim that Trump “was a late and defiant addition to the picture,”\textsuperscript{159} challenging Hogarth’s initial intentions for the inclusion of the Pug in the work. While I disagree with Hallet and Craske, suggesting instead that Hogarth’s \textit{Self-Portrait with Pug} was a touching tribute to the artist’s cherished canine companion (as do many other scholars),\textsuperscript{160} Hogarth’s self-portrait does not depict the same level of emotional bond or vulnerability that Gainsborough achieves in \textit{Henry Scott}, which allows for a sense of equality. Scholars do however agree that Hogarth had a tremendous aesthetic influence on Gainsborough.\textsuperscript{161} Why is it then implausible to also consider the philosophical influence Hogarth may have had on Gainsborough too, especially considering that Hogarth was a moralist painter whose satires were rich with social and ethical commentaries?\textsuperscript{162} Furthermore, Hogarth was not only concerned with the politics of human society, but particularly with the way animals were treated. As Eisenman writes, it is with Hogarth that “the visual tradition of animal welfare and rights begins.”\textsuperscript{163} Postle accredits Hogarth for inspiring Gainsborough to break with convention and to trust his observations to “evoke a ‘living presence.’”\textsuperscript{164} While Gainsborough may not have flaunted his opinion of social issues through his art as openly as Hogarth, it is inaccurate to assume Gainsborough made no social commentary altogether. Considering

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{157} Ibid.
\bibitem{158} Ibid.
\bibitem{159} Gowing and Paulson, \textit{Hogarth}, 58.
\bibitem{160} Including Michael Rosenthal, Robin Gibson, and Ronald Paulson.
\bibitem{161} See Cormack, \textit{The Paintings of Thomas Gainsborough}, 11.
\bibitem{163} Eisenman, \textit{The Cry of Nature}, 15.
\bibitem{164} Postle, \textit{Thomas Gainsborough}, 28.
\end{thebibliography}
that Gainsborough’s pet-portrait of *Bumper* (Fig.16) was dated 1745, the same year as Hogarth’s marvellous *Self-Portrait with Pug* and several years after *Vulcan* (Fig.20), Hogarth’s unconventional modes of representing dogs as sentient individuals with unique characters may have indeed had an early influence on Gainsborough. I therefore propose that Hogarth’s paintings of dogs inspired Gainsborough to depict non-humans in bold and dominating roles in future commissions. I then suggest that before moral subjects emerged as central themes in Gainsborough’s fancy pictures, the artist capitalized on the opportunity to express his progressive view of dogs in the portrait of *Henry Scott*. In *Henry Scott*, Gainsborough commented on both the human and animal relationship, in addition to challenging societal preconceptions about the role and intellectual capacity of non-human companions.

Predating Gainsborough’s *Henry Scott*, Reynolds painted a portrait of George Augustus Selwyn (1719-1791) with an attentive Pug on the sitter’s lap. George Selwyn was an eccentric politician whose “wit owed more to its performance than to its content.”165 In life, George Selwyn was an offensive narcissist with an unsettling fascination with death.166 However, a different side of Selwyn’s character emerges in the portrait *George Selwyn* (Fig.19), one that depicts the sitter’s vulnerable affection for his pet. In the painting, Selwyn wears a lavishly opulent red velvet robe with black fur trim that hangs undone, exposing an intricately detailed gold vest. A white neck-piece and ruffled wrist cuffs peak out from under the sitter’s outer clothes, similar in style to the Duke’s costume in *Henry Scott*. Reynolds portrayed Selwyn in a serious mood, with his

166 Ibid.
eyebrows slightly raised in a condescending manner and his mouth tightly closed, defining his hardened jawline to convey a sense of the sitter’s aloof attitude. Reynolds exaggerated Selwyn’s contemplative mood in the painting by casually resting the sitter’s head against his left hand, with two fingers curled near the corner of his lip and his middle and index fingers pointed straight against his cheek, coming to rest near the corner of his left eye. Selwyn’s informal body language and indifferent facial expression creates a sense of arrogance, as though nothing else could interest the sitter more than his beloved Pug, Raton. Reynolds painted Selwyn’s left elbow leaning on the edge of an exterior wall with a sculptural relief of a smiling character wearing a crown of leaves. Behind Selwyn, Reynolds portrayed the edge of a vertical wall-like structure and a boundless blue sky with white clouds. Reynolds balanced the composition by positioning Selwyn’s right hand in a tight fist pressed against his thigh, which squares the sitter’s body and adds symmetry in comparison to the busy details on the left side of the painting. On Selwyn’s left thigh, Reynolds realistically painted a fawn coloured Pug with dark fur around his short-muzzled face and a black spot on the top of his head. In the painting, the Pug signifies the privilege of pet keeping, symbolizing the sitter’s upper class status. However, Reynolds paid careful attention to the character of Raton, portraying him with a surprised expression and wide-eyed alertness. Furthermore, Reynolds painted Raton sitting upright with one paw lifted tentatively, a reaction to a sense of self-awareness that is intensified through the animal’s gaze, which conveys the dog’s acknowledgement of the spectator.
Unlike the Dandie Dinmont in *Henry Scott* that Gainsborough painted wearing a leather collar,¹⁶⁷ the Pug in *George Selwyn* (Fig. 19) is collar-less, thus naked. By representing the Pug without a collar, Reynolds implies a sense of the dog’s independency and individuality, only identified as Selwyn’s dog through its close proximity to his owner in the portrait. While this representation of Raton is more liberating than the Dandie Dinmont’s in *Henry Scott*, it diminishes the implication of a bond between owner and pet. It also does not make the animal a consumer of fashion – thus, less of an equal. Since Raton is presented as an unidentified dog through the absence of a collar, it also jeopardizes the integrity of his social status. In comparison with the Dandie Dinmont whose collar elevates the dog’s social status from that of a stray to a noble pet, Raton appears as an unclaimed companion. Beyond the canvas, Raton is just a Pug without any identification as belonging to George Selwyn, unlike the Dandie Dinmont whose social standing as the pet of a nobleman is secure in and beyond the portrait.

In *George Selwyn* (Fig. 19), both Selwyn and Raton stare inquiringly at the spectator, creating what Tague defines as a “dog-human parallel.”¹⁶⁸ Tague writes that the “dog-human parallel” had humorous undertones, but resulted in dignifying the Pug breed through the notion of equality.¹⁶⁹ Donald writes,

Reynolds…deliberately aligned the heads of man and animal, and there is a witty counterpoint between Selwyn’s languid expression and Raton’s alertness to the artist’s or the viewer’s presence.¹⁷⁰

---

¹⁶⁸ Ibid, 235.
¹⁶⁹ Ibid.
¹⁷⁰ Donald, *Picturing Animals in Britain*, 112.
The difference in expression between the human and animal sitter in Reynolds’s painting resembles the expressions of the subjects in *Henry Scott*. While the contrasting expressions of the subjects in both paintings points to what Donald suggests is a “witty counterpoint,” I suggest it also emphasizes the individuality of the subjects. By posing the animals in a state of heightened alertness, both artists draw attention to the inner thoughts and self-aware states of the dogs, which contrast against the relaxed or less intense expressions of their owners. Unlike Hallet and Craske, who argue that the Pug in Hogarth’s *Self-Portrait with Pug* (Fig.2) serves a satirical and self-parodying purpose, Reynolds’s representation of the Pug in *George Selwyn* was likely partially sincere because the patron was a serious individual not known to be self-parodying like Hogarth. However, Tague maintains that there is an element of humour in both the portraits of *George Selwyn* and *Henry Scott*, which suggest that the pretended near-equality between the human and non-human sitters in the paintings was intended as a joke that the patrons were aware of, despite the seriousness with which they regarded their pets. Tague writes, “…this self-awareness is one reason why such images remain in the realm of acceptable masculinity.”¹⁷¹ However, I challenge the notion of a satirical element in the representation of the relationship between the Duke and his dog in *Henry Scott*, especially considering that Gainsborough was known for his sensitivity towards sitters and tendency not to use satirical commentary.¹⁷² While the inclusion of the dog as a central figure in *Self-Portrait with Pug*, *George Selwyn*, and *Henry Scott* may have been perceived as a type of visual comic relief by the general public, it does not diminish the representation of an emotional bond and favoured companionship that is presented more

conspicuous. For instance, Selwyn was very concerned with Reynolds’s ability to accurately portray his dog, insisting that Raton have several sittings of his own with the artist. Selwyn’s insistence on the likeness of Raton suggests the patron’s sincere interest in an accurate depiction of his beloved dog rather than the dog’s mere purpose as a comical accessory in the painting, in which case he would have probably cared less about accurate representation. The accurate and realistic depiction of the dogs in the portraits of George Selwyn and Henry Scott therefore suggests the shared sentiments the patrons had towards their dogs, cherishing them as individualized family members.

Although social expectations of acceptable masculine representations may have influenced a comical perception of the dogs in the portraits for eighteenth-century audiences, the genuine representation of their beloved pets likely held more personal, intimate meanings for these patrons.

Since Reynolds painted George Selwyn (Fig. 19) a few years before Gainsborough’s portrait of Henry Scott, it is possible that Gainsborough was aware of his competitor’s earlier work. Gainsborough may have attempted to surpass Reynolds with a more controversial portrait of an owner and pet relationship in Henry Scott, given the competitive nature between the artists. In some aspects, the two portraits share similar compositional qualities, such as portraying both canine subjects in states of acute self-awareness and positioned on elevated spatial planes. Both human male subjects in

---

173 Tague, Animal Companions, 235.
174 Reynolds also painted portraits of Henry Scott, Third Duke of Buccleuch (or sometimes spelled as Buccleugh) in 1767, 1768 and 1770; see Charles Robert Leslie and Tom Taylor, Life and Times of Sir Joshua Reynolds, Volume 1, ebook (London: John Murray, 1865), 281, 311, and 375. As his direct competitor, Gainsborough may have been aware of the Buccleuch’s patronage to Reynolds and took an interest in Reynolds’s previous works.
the paintings are also dignified upper class gentlemen who unconventionally display a close bond with their pets. As Tague writes, both the portraits of George Selwyn and Henry Scott “celebrate the possibility of blurring the boundary between human and animal.”\textsuperscript{175} However, Gainsborough achieved a much greater sense of intimacy in Henry Scott by portraying the Duke in the physical act of embracing his dog, which attributes the painting with more emotional and ethical implications. As Tague writes, “Holding their pets … create[s] a physical bond that reproduces and reinforces the emotional bond.”\textsuperscript{176} Therefore, by representing the Duke holding his dog in Henry Scott, Gainsborough emotionally charged the painting with notions of sentimentality that complicated social expectations of gender, age, and species roles. The unconventional depiction of the dog as a near-equal rational subject and the male human in an emphasized display of intimacy makes Henry Scott a dynamic example of the progressive attitudes towards non-humans in eighteenth-century Britain and an unsurpassed masterpiece in its depiction of an inter-species bond.

2.9 A Near-equal Companion

A significant compositional aspect in Henry Scott that contributes to the unconventional representation of the dog as a near-equal subject in the painting is the dog’s elevated position from the ground level on which the Duke stands. The more conventional placement of dogs in portraits of the era was by the human subject’s foot on ground level, a convention that can be traced to the Renaissance.\textsuperscript{177} Of significance,

\textsuperscript{175} Tague, Animal Companions, 235.
\textsuperscript{176} Ibid, 236.
\textsuperscript{177} See for example Marcus Gheeraerts the Elder, Elizabeth I (c.1580-5, Private collection). Other eighteenth-century examples of dogs positioned conventionally at the foot of their master include Edward
Gainsborough followed the convention in other paintings, such as in *Mr. and Mrs. Andrews* (Fig. 8) and in Thomas Gainsborough, *Thomas William Coke, 1st Earl of Leicester* (c. 1786, Norfolk, Collection of the Earl of Leicester). Although it is questionable whether Gainsborough made an exception to this convention in the portrait of *John Joshua Kirby and His Wife* (c. 1751-2, Figure 21), the image of the dog remains symbolically below the human torso. In *Mr. and Mrs. Andrews*, Gainsborough also positioned the dog at its owner’s foot rather than on an elevated plane, which suggests the dog as literally a subject of lower status in the painting. By placing the dog at the foot of its master in most of his paintings, Gainsborough conveyed the dog in roles of subservitude and symbolic purpose – likely in accordance with the character or request of his patrons. However, in *Henry Scott*, Gainsborough painted the dog elevated above the Duke’s legs, a position that enables the Duke to wrap his arms around his beloved companion. The raised position of the dog makes it a distinguishable subject in the portrait, creating a sense of equality that complicates an understanding of the dog’s representation in the work because of the dog’s closer proximity to the Duke’s upper body where symbolic organs including the heart and brain reside, along with their cultural connotations of love and rationality. Gainsborough emphasized the elevated position of the dog by painting it seated on a patch of turf on a small ridge that protrudes from an ambiguous dirt formation that seemingly resembles a pedestal, which further conveys the Duke’s brazen admiration for his dog. By placing the dog on a higher
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178 The gun dog is awkwardly positioned on a grassy mound beside John Kirby, which may have been a later addition to the work with the intent of brightening the right side of the portrait; see Gibson, *Pets in Portraits*, 69.
compositional level that conveys a literal elevation of the dog that complements its elevated status, Gainsborough portrayed not only an entirely different representation of the relationship between man and dog, but also presented the dog as a near-equal subject worthy of the spectator’s attention.

In *Henry Scott*, the canine and human subjects resemble one another through their similar gazes, which creates a “whimsical effect of pretended equality.” Kaja Silverman writes that the notion of the gaze is an imaginary apparatus that establishes a subject’s identity. Therefore, by attributing the dog with a vivid gaze, Gainsborough enables the spectator to perceive the dog with an identity. The expression of the eyes in different species was of particular interest in scientific observations in Europe’s early modern period. For instance, a comparison of physiognomy between humans and animals was explored in the drawings of the seventeenth-century French artist, Charles Le Brun (1619-1690). While some believed that certain expressions were more “eloquent” in humans than in animal counterparts, other important thinkers like William Smellie and Erasmus Darwin determined that animals were capable of a range of emotions like humans through facial and body expressions. One of the common expressions believed to be unique to humans in eighteenth-century drawings was as
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179 Donald, *Picturing Animals in Britain*, 112.
follows: “Eyes lifted to heaven, or the kitted brows that spoke of mental anguish, were both movements expressive of states of the soul…” With the pretended sense of equality established in *Henry Scott*, Gainsborough’s representation of the dog in a like state of anguish challenges the exclusion of non-humans from being capable of such an expression. In the painting, Gainsborough unconventionally attributes the dog with a more powerful and intriguing facial expression than the human sitter. Although the Dandie Dinmont’s eyes are not painting exaggeratedly “lifted to heaven,” the dog’s wide-eyed look and furrowed brow indicates the dog’s mental anguish, likely from being uncomfortably embraced by the Duke whose soft facial expression provides a stark contrast of content. By portraying the dog in a state of mental anguish, the dog is therefore attributed with having a soul according to the connotations associated with such an expression, which directly contradicts Cartesian thought.

Shared characteristics in the painting such as the Duke and Dandie Dinmont’s similar gazes serves to establish a pretended equality between the subjects. However, as Tague writes, “Both dogs and men reveal distinct personalities in these images, again implying the individuality of animal as well as human sitters.” For instance, in contrast with the Duke’s relaxed facial expression, which conveys a state of delightful bliss and an easy-going personality, the dog’s expression of intense alertness suggests the animal’s serious personality. Rather than painting the Dandie Dinmont in an idealized manner, such as the doting dog in *Sir Henry Bate-Dudley* (c. 1780, Figure 22) who idolizes his master through an upward gaze, the dog in *Henry Scott* is depicted in a
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183 Donald, *Picturing Animals in Britain*, 110.
state of realistic and self-interested behaviour, which conveys the animal’s distinct individuality and self-agency. As Tuan writes, “Equality presupposes a certain distance – the distance of respect as between two sovereign individuals.”

Therefore, I suggest that the sense of equality in Henry Scott can be understood as an apparatus for the establishment of respect, which allows the non-human subject to be perceived as a sovereign and reasoning individual.

Although Gainsborough created an endearing sense of intimacy in Henry Scott by portraying the Duke embracing his dog, the notion of dominance remains present. Tuan writes that dominance combined with affection produces the category of the pet.

Although the image of the dog as a domesticated pet reinforces the Duke’s human dominance, the dog challenges the notion of dominance and regains power in the painting by placing its paw overtop of the Duke’s arm, the weight of the paw appearing to even slightly lower the Duke’s arm. Unlike the dog in Lady Jane Whichcote (Fig.15) whose paws are held between the sitter hands, the Dandie Dinmont’s paw above the Duke’s hands suggests that despite the dog’s restrained state in the Duke’s embrace, the dog does not entirely lack control. Through the act of placing its paw over the Duke’s hands, the dog also conveys an expression of “nervous affection,” which suggests its capacity for reason.

What I mean by “nervous affection” is the dog’s reaction to the uncomfortable position of being embraced – a state of toleration and patience that comes with accepting the Duke’s affection. I suggest that the expression of “nervous affection”

185 Tuan, Dominance and Affection, 163.
186 Ibid, 2.
187 Drawing from my personal experiences with dogs, when dogs are restrained or embraced, they appear nervous and uncomfortable. Tague also observes that the dog in Miss Jane Bowles (Fig.13) is an “uncomfortable-looking dog,” see Tague, Animal Companions, 234.
implies the dog’s self-awareness and ability to think rationally in order to express its uncomfortable state rather than act instinctually defensive through aggression. The representation of the dog’s nervousness, illustrated by the dog’s tightly clenched jaw as opposed to a panting expression like the dog in *Sir Henry Bate Dudley* (Fig.22) or *Lady Jane Whichcote*, thus equates it with a sense of agency, the action of which is defined as: “[An] ability or capacity to act or exert power.” The emotion of nervousness therefore motivates the dog’s reasons for attempting to regain control in the situation, expressed through the placement of its paw.

The seated and well-mannered disposition of the dog in *Henry Scott* exemplifies the dog’s learnt behaviour from past experiences, which simultaneously reflects positively on the Duke’s character by promoting his skill in properly having trained his dog through the assertion of human dominance. In *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, Hume argued that animals were capable of learning; Hume writes,

> First, it seems evident that animals, as well as men learn many things from experience and infer that the same events will always follow from the same causes.  

Furthermore, Hume determined that animals learn from experience in similar ways as humans, emphasizing a sense of equality between species. Hume writes,

> This is still more evident from the effects of discipline and education on animals, who by the proper application of rewards and punishments may be taught any course of action the most contrary to their natural instincts and propensities. Is it not experience which renders a dog apprehensive of pain when you menace him or lift up the whip to beat him?  
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190 Ibid.
The dog’s calm disposition in the Duke’s embrace demonstrates the animal’s ability to reason based on learnt experiences because if it were to act inappropriately or instinctually, such as nipping at the Duke’s hands that the dog might perceive as threatening, the dog knows it would be punished accordingly. Hume’s contemporary, William Smellie, wrote about the ability of dogs to be trained to resist natural instincts in his *Philosophy of Natural History*. Smellie writes,

> With his eyes, his movements, and his voice, he makes the most humble and expressive petition. If this balancing of motives be not reasoning, I know not by what other name it can be called.\(^{191}\)

Indeed, the Dandie Dinmont’s distress, which is made evident in the dog’s wide-eyes, clenched jaw, and paw placed overtop the Duke’s arm, conveys a humble petition of the dog’s discomfort in the painting. Yet, by obediently tolerating the Duke’s embrace, the dog shows its ability to reason. Another way Gainsborough illustrated the dog’s capacity for reason can be observed through the principle of mirroring. What I mean by the term “mirroring” is a parallel gesture (whether identical in appearance or reversed, as would be the result of looking in a mirror) that is enacted by the human and non-human subject within the painting. In *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Hume asserted,

> ’Tis from the resemblance of the external actions of animals to those we ourselves perform, that we judge their internal likewise to resemble ours; and the same principle of reasoning…\(^{192}\)

In *Henry Scott*, both the Duke and Dandie Dinmont raise their front right ligaments (arm and paw). Therefore, the mirroring body gestures between the Duke and dog serve to establish a near-equal capacity for rationality by suggesting an anatomical resemblance
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to one another, despite physical differences. Both the Duke and Dandie Dinmont also mimic the same direction of their gazes, compelling the spectator to acknowledge both individuals as self-aware subjects in the painting.

In *Henry Scott*, the effect of what both Tague and Donald suggest is a “pretended near-equality”\(^{193}\) between the human and non-human subjects is fascinatingly conspicuous. To propose such a concept of equality between humans and non-humans in eighteenth-century Britain was a revolutionary new way of thinking about animals. By promoting the idea of the dog as a near-equal individual and self-agent subject in the painting, Gainsborough drew attention to both his and his patron’s progressive attitudes towards animals. As this thesis has demonstrated, the acknowledgement of animal consciousness in eighteenth-century British art was prevalent, although Tuan argues that it was not until the nineteenth-century that dogs were portrayed with human feelings and morality— or in other words, represented with consciousness.\(^{194}\) Tuan states that despite the familial role of dogs, “There was sentiment, but of an unselfconscious and practical kind.”\(^{195}\) However, there is no practical reason for the Duke’s overly intimate display of emotion in *Henry Scott*, which suggests an intentional and bold acknowledgment of the sitter’s sentiments for his non-human companion. The extraordinary impression that the unconventional modes of representation in Gainsborough’s *Henry Scott* had on eighteenth-century critics is made evident in an entry note for the painting in “Catalogue of Pictures at Dalkeith House,” published in 1911. The catalogue entry reads:
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\(^{194}\) See Tuan, *Dominance and Affection*, 112.

\(^{195}\) Ibid.
This picture was originally painted for the Royal Society, Edinburgh, but refused by them because of the dog, which they thought inappropriate.\footnote{Anonymous, \textit{Catalogue of the Pictures at Dalkeith House} (England: privately printed, 1911). I have written to the Royal Society of Edinburgh, enquiring for more information about the rejection of the painting, but have not received a response.}

What is unclear is whether it was the Duke’s intimate display of affection for his dog that the Royal Society of Edinburgh deemed inappropriate or the representation of the dog as subject of elevated near-equality in the painting that threatened the anthropocentric and regressive views towards non-humans held by the majority of the Royal Society members. Regardless, the unclear rejection of the painting by the Royal Society of Edinburgh exemplifies the provoking ideas and the controversial viewpoints towards non-humans Gainsborough put forth in \textit{Henry Scott} through unconventional modes of representation.
Chapter 3: Philosophical Capacity

As I have argued, Gainsborough paid careful attention to the representation of dogs as sentient and individualized subjects in his paintings. Yet, the unconventional representation of the Dandie Dinmont dog as a near-equal with a capacity for rational thought, self-agency, and self-awareness in *Henry Scott* remains an unparalleled example of Gainsborough’s sensitivity to the character and values of his sitters. By portraying the Duke in a vulnerable state of intimacy and reversing social expectations of species roles in the painting, Gainsborough challenged iconographic standards: Gainsborough was engaged with philosophical thought that influenced the unconventional representation of the dog as a near-equal subject in *Henry Scott*. I suggest faith was a reason for Gainsborough’s interest in moral issues regarding animals, as well as abstract multidisciplinary ways of thinking that shaped the artist’s progressive view of non-humans. Furthermore, the Third Duke of Buccleuch and Gainsborough’s liberal views pointed to changing social attitudes towards animals and their personal experiences with dogs were the grounds for the unusual representation of the Dandie Dinmont dog as a sentient being with a capacity for rational thought in the portrait of *Henry Scott*.

Based on Gainsborough’s lifelong personal experiences with dogs, the unconventional representation of the dog in *Henry Scott* reflects the artist’s careful consideration of an animal’s individuality and character. Yet, Gainsborough may not have realized that his moral and ethical considerations were shaped by philosophical discourses regarding animals that were developing in the early modern period. While many scholars agree that Gainsborough was not an intellect, and that there is some
debate about Gainsborough’s education,\(^1\) Henry Scott, the Third Duke of Buccleuch, did indeed possess a respected intellect.\(^2\) In a catalogue dated 1776 of the Duke’s library in his London house in Grosvenor Square, two of Hume’s works were recorded: *History of England* and *Political Discourses*.\(^3\) The inclusion of these two books by Hume demonstrates the Duke’s literary interests in history and politics, as well as his particular interest in Hume’s writing. I speculate that based on this evidence, the Duke would have likely read Hume’s well-known *Treatise* and *Enquiry*, in which Hume discussed his views of animals as capable of emotion and rational thought,\(^4\) thereby shaping the Duke’s philosophical perspective and progressive attitudes towards non-humans.

### 3.1 Music and Religion

How can it be true that Gainsborough did not live a “life of the mind”\(^5\) when music so profoundly influenced the artist’s craft, demonstrating his ability to apply abstract concepts across disciplines to present new ways of thinking? In a letter to his friend, composer William Jackson (1730-1803), Gainsborough expressed his love for music, writing: “I’m sick of Portraits and wish very much to take my Viol da Gam and walk off to some sweet Village where I can paint Landskips…”\(^6\) In another letter from Gainsborough to Jackson, the artist explained the connection he found between music
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\(^1\) See Postle, *Thomas Gainsborough*, 6; Cormack, *The Paintings of Thomas Gainsborough*, 4 and 22; and Fulcher, *Life of Gainsborough*, 156. For an argument in opposition to this view of Gainsborough’s intellect, see Sloman, *Gainsborough in Bath*, 141.


\(^3\) Crispin Powell, “Further Henry Scott Portrait Questions,” email, December 08, 2017. Catalogues for the Buccleuch’s collections of books are located in several locations, but I was unable to gather information about book catalogues regarding the Dalkeith and Bowhill libraries.


\(^6\) Hayes, *The Letters of Thomas Gainsborough*, 68.
and painting, demonstrating his view of the two distinct arts as complementary of each other. As both Vaughan and Cormack agree, Gainsborough drew inspiration from the harmony in music and applied it to his perception of “pictorial characteristics” in his paintings. Gainsborough’s cross-disciplinary approach between music and art was a tradition followed by many artists since the Renaissance, but it likely contributed to his open-mindedness. If Gainsborough thought in multidisciplinary ways, why could the artist not be capable of merging ideas from other disciplines, for instance, between philosophy or economics and the visual arts? I therefore propose that Gainsborough’s unorthodox representation of the dog as a near-equal subject in *Henry Scott* was influenced by the changing social attitudes towards pets in eighteenth-century Britain, which was directed by both philosophic and economic changes that Tague and Fudge discuss in their books. Gainsborough’s broad-mindedness therefore enabled the artist to perceive non-humans in progressive ways, such as sentient near-equals with the capacity for rational thought.

Religion was also an important aspect that shaped Gainsborough’s character and artistic practice, which I suggest ultimately, influenced the artist to think unconventionally and philosophically. In particular, I argue that Gainsborough’s Puritan values had a remarkable influence on the artist’s cross-species sentimentality. Gainsborough’s mother, Mary Burrough (1690-1755), came from the religious
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7 Ibid, 74.
9 For more on the tradition of relating music with art, see Leslie Anne Korrick, “"Ut Pictura Musica": Observations on the Reform of Painting and Music in Post-Tridentine Rome.” Order No. NN11964, University of Toronto (Canada), 1996, available from Pro Quest Dissertations Publishing.
background of the Church of England, while Gainsborough’s father, John Gainsborough (1683-1748), was a Protestant Nonconformist. However, the Gainsborough family mainly identified as Protestant Dissenters or Nonconformist members, upholding Puritan values. As Vaughan writes, although Methodist values disapprove of luxurious or excessive lifestyles, “Methodism [is] a religion of emotion and ‘natural’ sentiment, the elements that dominate [Gainsborough’s] later art.” The emphasis on notions of emotion and “natural” sentiment that the Methodist faith preaches likely influenced Gainsborough’s representation of non-humans in paintings as subjects with emotional capacities. Fletcher accredits Puritanism with shaping Gainsborough’s character, suggesting that it was Puritan values that encouraged the artist to be “independent” and “original,” which I suggest also inspired the artist to break with social expectations and artistic convention. Furthermore, Martin Postle writes that it was the Nonconformist Church that provided Gainsborough with an awareness of his human frailties, thus, shaping the artist’s non-anthropocentric perspectives. Robert Watson argues that anti-cruelty attitudes to animals actually began in England with the

12 Cormack, Thomas Gainsborough, 5.
13 For more on the religious background of Gainsborough’s family, see Vaughan, Gainsborough, 22 and Cormack, Thomas Gainsborough, 5; Whitley, Thomas Gainsborough, 3. Gainsborough’s sister, Mary, married Christopher Gibbon (1715-1760), a Church of England clergyman (see Hamilton, Gainsborough: A Portrait, 13), although Vaughan claims Mary was the wife of a Methodist minister (Vaughan, Gainsborough, 18). In general, Gainsborough upheld Puritan values according to A. E. Fletcher, The Makers of British Art: Thomas Gainsborough, R.A., edited by James A. Manson (London: The Walter Scott Publishing Co., Ltd., 1904), 5.
14 Vaughan, Gainsborough, 18.
15 See Fletcher, Thomas Gainsborough, R.A., 5.
16 Postle, Thomas Gainsborough, 7.
English Protestant sects in the early modern period. As Watson writes, Puritanism inspired people to sympathize with animals by imagining their “intense inward experiences” and desires, which was commonplace across English culture. The Protestant involvement in the discussion of non-human animal consciousness also contributed to the later development of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, which was established in 1824 (Royal status in 1840). Andrew Ritchie writes,

In a word, moral criticism is never individual criticism alone; the resentment of the thing abhorred is born of a social or religious convention or dogma, and the individual artist is simply an instrument of expression.

Therefore, it is possible that the moral criticism in Gainsborough’s paintings regarding the human perception and treatment of animals was largely influenced by the conventions of Puritan values.

3.2 Moral Fancy Pictures

By 1780, Gainsborough began to paint “fancy pictures,” which was “a genre dealing with rural and urban low-life themes.” The genre of fancy pictures was common in the art of seventeenth-century Low Countries, and typically illustrated proverbs or popular sayings. In Gainsborough’s fancy pictures, a consistent motif of children with pets or livestock points to the artist’s growing interest in animals as key

18 Ibid, 1123.
subjects in paintings, unlike Reynolds’s fancy pictures that usually portrayed only child subjects. In Gainsborough’s fancy pictures, both human and animal subjects contribute to the narrative of the painting with animals playing prominent roles, similar to the Dandie Dinmont in *Henry Scott*.

Gainsborough’s recognition of dogs as sentient and conscious animals, evident in earlier paintings like *Henry Scott*, manifests more prominently in fancy pictures where the artist directly involved dogs in moral themes to evoke the spectator’s empathy for non-humans. The moral themes in Gainsborough’s fancy pictures, such as *A Shepherd Boy* (c.1781, Figure 23) strongly contradict scholarly claims that Gainsborough was in want of philosophical intellect. I suggest that the philosophical context in Gainsborough’s fancy pictures, which were painted later in his career, demonstrates the artist’s liberty over the subject matter in his art because of his established reputation. Because fancy pictures emphasized the relationship between humans and animals, the genre enabled Gainsborough to experiment with an expression of his thoughts on the subject of companion animals that coincided with the social changes in attitudes towards
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23 Compare for instance Gainsborough’s *Cottage Girl with Dog and Pitcher* (Fig.25) and Thomas Gainsborough, *Girl with Pigs* (c.1782, North Yorkshire, Castle Howard Collection) with Joshua Reynolds, *The Infant Samuel* (c.1776, London, Tate Britain, N00162) and Joshua Reynolds, *The Age of Innocence* (c.1788, London, Tate Britain, N00307).

24 Not to be confused the artist’s earlier oval painting: Thomas Gainsborough, *The Shepherd Boy* (c.1757-59, Ohio, The Toledo Museum of Art, 1933.21). Also see Thomas Gainsborough, *Two Shepherd Boys with Dogs Fighting* (c.1783, Kenwood, English Heritage, 88028787). Some scholars argue that *Two Shepherd Boys with Dogs Fighting* was painted as a social comment about the American War of Independence (1775-1783) (see Rosenthal and Myrone, *Gainsborough*, 142). However, I suggest the painting more clearly illustrates Gainsborough’s exploration of the issues concerning human morals towards animals. It is odd that Gainsborough would have painted *Two Shepherd Boys with Dogs Fighting* at the end of the war rather than during at the height of the conflict years earlier. I would also like to note the human-dog parallel in *Two Shepherd Boys with Dogs Fighting*, in which the two fighting dogs resemble the boys with which they are associated, creates a sense of inter-species equality through parallels of similarity.
animals, as well as the philosophical debates that were taking place in the early modern period.

The first of Gainsborough’s fancy pictures to be exhibited at the Royal Academy was *A Shepherd Boy* (Fig. 23). The painting depicts a poor boy in tattered clothes, seated in an outdoor setting in front of a tree with a stick in his hand and a faithful dog near his side. The boy is portrayed looking up towards a divine light that irradiates from the upper left corner of the painting, illuminating the boy and the white patches on the dog. In the painting, the herding-type dog protectively guards the boy as it lies behind him with watchful and wise eyes. Postle writes that the painting has “quasi-religious” notions and that Gainsborough drew inspiration from the works of the seventeenth-century Spanish artist, Bartolome Esteban Murillo (1617-1682), seen in such work as *The Good Shepherd* (c.1660, Figure 24). Although, unlike the sacrificial sheep that symbolizes innocence in Murillo’s painting, Gainsborough chose to include a dog in *A Shepherd Boy* instead. In comparison, the dog in Gainsborough’s fancy picture contributes conventional notions of loyalty and friendship to the narrative of the
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25 Rosenthal and Myrone, *Gainsborough*, 140. *A Shepherd Boy* (Fig. 23) is known today only as a mezzotint engraving by Richard Earlom.

26 In Peter Simon’s, *The Woodman*, after Thomas Gainsborough (c. 1790, Sudbury, Trustees of Gainsborough’s House, 1990.026), the artist portrayed both the human and dog subjects reacting to a divine light from the left upper corner of the painting, unlike in *A Shepherd Boy* (Fig. 23) where only the beggar boy reacts to the divine interaction, suggesting the exclusivity of animals from religion. However, in *A Shepherd Boy*, the calm disposition of the dog and its wise eyes conveys the animal’s higher intellect, which elevates the dog from its mere symbolic purpose. Besides the dog’s symbolic purpose in the painting to convey virtues of faithfulness, loyalty, and compassion, I suggest that the dog is also portrayed in a state of familiarity or awareness of the divine presence in the painting. Therefore, the dog is not represented in a startled state and does not react to the divine light behind him. In a sense, the dog may embody a sense of divinity itself through his calm depiction. In this example, we see yet again Gainsborough including dogs as active and engaged subjects rather than apathetic pictorial accessories.

27 Postle, *Thomas Gainsborough*, 56. Also see Bartolome Esteban Murillo, *The Young Christ as the Good Shepherd* (c. 1660s, Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, 58.1425).
painting, characteristics that elevate the role of the animal by situating it in an intimate relationship with the human subject. Rosenthal and Myrone write that Gainsborough elicited the spectator’s sympathy by portraying poor children with emblems such as animals that represented the child’s responsibilities, thus “elevating the child to an iconic stature.” However, by portraying pets in fancy pictures such as *A Shepherd Boy* and *Cottage Girl with Dog and Pitcher* (c. 1785, Figure 25), Gainsborough complicates the understanding of the animals as mere “emblems.” Because of the personal relationship between children and their pets, as well as the suggested equality between these subjects, the dogs in Gainsborough’s fancy pictures take on more complex and significant roles. Therefore, do we not attribute the same sympathy to the watchful dog in *A Shepherd Boy* or to the poor puppy in *Cottage Girl with Dog and Pitcher* that we do to the poor children? In *A Shepherd Boy*, Gainsborough not only inspires the spectator to sympathize with the moral social issues associated with rural poverty, but to sympathize with the faithful canine companion that accompanies the child – thus, elevating the status of the dog to an “iconic stature” as well.

3.3 Conclusion

The intimate display of affection between an owner and his dog in Gainsborough’s portrait of *Henry Scott* is a tender representation of a timeless inter-species bond that spectators centuries later have continued to relate to – perhaps even more than ever with the rise of animal rights discourses and scientific advances that progress our understanding of non-humans. Yet, the unconventional representation of the
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dog in Henry Scott as a near-equal subject in terms of rational capacity and importance challenges the iconographic standards of non-humans in early modern portraits and traditional humanist views that revolved around anthropocentric values. In my analysis of Henry Scott, my conclusions are two-fold. My first conclusion is that Gainsborough’s unconventional modes of representation in Henry Scott, such as the minimal landscape and compositional resemblances to portraits of children with pets and of mother-and-child portraits, all challenged iconographic standards that defied species and gender role expectations. As a result of breaking with convention, Gainsborough complicated the categorization of Henry Scott within the portraiture genre. However, I propose that Henry Scott should be considered an animal conversation piece because it portrays a man and his dog as a “family” unit, providing the spectator with a detailed narrative about the identity and character of both subjects – qualities that were characteristic of eighteenth-century conversation pieces.

My second conclusion is that the unconventional representation of the Dandie Dinmont dog in Henry Scott as a near-equal rational subject, with a distinct identity and character traits, points to the influence of early modern philosophies regarding animals. The unconventional representation of the dog also highlights the complex status of pets in eighteenth-century British society that encouraged owners to intimately know the individuality of their non-human companions. The unusual representation of the dog in Henry Scott is unlike any other portrait of the era. By focusing the analysis on the canine subject in the portrait of Henry Scott – a subject often overlooked in art history studies because of its non-human status - I argue that Gainsborough represented the dog as an individual with affectations that suggest a capacity for rational thought and self-agency,
emphasizing the near-equal status of both subjects in the painting. As previously discussed, a dialogue on the topic of human morals regarding the perception and treatment of animals in the early modern period shaped the way the dog would have been portrayed and understood. The representation of the dog as a conscious individual in *Henry Scott* thus demonstrates a shift away from the use of animals as merely symbolic or pictorial accessories in portraits and is illustrative of the progressive change in social attitudes towards animals in the period. This thesis has also suggested that the writing of David Hume, and therefore the philosopher’s arguments in support of animal rationality, directly influenced Henry Scott, Third Duke of Buccleuch. Furthermore, I suggest that the Duke’s relationship with and perception of his dog was influenced by the rhetoric of sensibility that normalized the expression of sympathy towards non-humans in the eighteenth-century, which Gainsborough sympathetically captured in the portrait. And lastly, I argue that Gainsborough was appreciative of philosophy and indeed interested in morality, which can be seen in fancy pictures in his later career. I conclude that in *Henry Scott*, Gainsborough expressed his view of dogs as conscious and rational individual subjects, taking an early opportunity to explore moral issues regarding animal rationality and the unique status of pets.

Beyond the rich layers of luxuriously painted costumes that adorn the flamboyant sitters in most of Gainsborough’s portraits, we have seen that there is much more to the artist’s paintings than meets the eye. Hamilton unjustifiably assumes that Gainsborough was not a judge of character in his portraits, writing:

But while we certainly go to Gainsborough’s portraits for likeness, exuberance of spirit, status, and sumptuousness of costume, fabric and fur, with a few notable exceptions we do not go to him for insight into character. He catches the nature
of his people through their clothes; rarely, however, through their eyes or expression. That is not his business: after all, he would later describe himself merely as ‘your likeness man’, not as ‘your examiner’. 29

Addressing Hamilton’s views, first I argue that there is no emphasis on costume or fabrics to convey the “nature” of the human sitter in *Henry Scott*, apart from the insignia on the Duke’s breast as a pictorial accessory that suggests the sitter’s social achievement rather than his “nature.” Instead, the “eyes and expression” of the Duke and his dog are in fact the most convincing aspects in the portrait that convey the character of the subjects. Secondly, can we take the role of “examiner” to mean what Hamilton interprets it to, or was Gainsborough referring to his duty as a portraitist to capture likeness without passing judgment – perhaps suggesting that he was careful not to “judge” his sitter by assuming the role of an “examiner”? 30 I argue that Gainsborough’s portrait of *Henry Scott* is indeed a “notable exception” with profound insights about both the characters of the sitters and the changing social attitudes in eighteenth-century Britain towards non-humans. *Henry Scott* defies all of Hamilton’s claims, showing us a different side to the observantly detached and profit-minded Gainsborough that some scholars make the artist out to be. By analyzing *Henry Scott* through a posthumanist lens – one that considers human morals and ethics, as well as acknowledges the significance of the unconventional role of the non-human in the portrait – we are reintroduced to one of England’s greatest artists and his noble patron.
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