

## Corrigenda

### *The British Art Journal* X, 3 (10th anniversary double number)

Owing to a computer glitch, a few lines were missing from final paragraphs of the published versions of the three articles below. Here are the final paragraphs in full.

#### ‘Elysian Fields such as the poets dreamed of’

The Mughal garden in the early Stuart Mind

*Paula Henderson*

page 42

Peter Mundy also added sketches to his journal, demonstrating a lingering fascination with Mughal culture and a desire to complement his earlier descriptions of it. Like John White’s drawings of American Indians, Mundy’s sketches also suggest admiration for a distinctly different foreign culture.<sup>87</sup> Certainly Mundy’s writings can not be interpreted as ‘proto-colonial’: the English could barely keep ahead of fellow-Europeans in the area, much less envisage taking on the militaristic Mughal Empire. At the same time, it would be very difficult to argue that these accounts had any direct influence on the innovative builders and garden creators of the period, although they might have recognized that certain features, already evident in English gardens, had parallels in India: an unusual predilection for octagonal garden buildings; ornamental pools and baths; banqueting houses on islands; and, not least, an emphasis on geometric order in the designed landscape. For whatever reasons, these accounts of Mughal gardens were more detailed and descriptive than those of European gardens: all Mundy had written about the gardens of the Louvre, for example, was that ‘the Kings Gardens [were] full of curious knots and rare inventions’.<sup>88</sup> Even Fynes Moryson, the most important contemporary chronicler of Italian gardens, was never as precise in his descriptions of the Medici gardens, nor (so far as we know) did he sketch them.<sup>89</sup> In the end, it is the clarity and completeness of the descriptions and drawings that has mattered – perhaps not immediately to the English, but certainly to subsequent scholars of Mughal culture, who have relied on them to put flesh on the skeletal remains of these magnificent monuments.

#### America’s first public Turner

How Ruskin sold *The Slave Ship* to New York

*Nancy Scott*

page 74

The financial and epistolary energy employed by Blodgett, Norton, and Johnston, with the final seal affixed by John Ruskin, to place the Turner *Slave Ship* in America is an ironic story. By 1877, Blodgett had died, and Ruskin, though teaching as Slade Professor at Oxford, was less involved with writing on art. Johnston was named ‘president for life’ at the Metropolitan Museum in 1877, but was no longer an active collector. Only Charles Eliot Norton continued on with Turner and the Ruskinian doctrine: in Boston he exhibited the plates of the *Liber Studiorum* (1874) and that same year, gave his first lectures on Turner; whereas in Cambridge, in shaping the Harvard fine arts curriculum, he was one of the foremost advocates of Ruskin’s precision of draughtsmanship and close observation of nature.<sup>92</sup> His seminal role in bringing *The Slave Ship* to New York, even as it ended in Boston, is a neglected aspect of an important legacy.

#### ‘The Blood-Stained Brush’

David and the British circa 1802

*William Hauptman*

page 93

Within the equivocal relationships David had with Britain, there is one episode that bears recounting as a fantastic anecdote rarely cited in the literature on the painter. After David was arrested on 2 August 1794 on the pretext of his being a terrorist,<sup>155</sup> he was languishing in the Luxembourg prison when, as Henry Redhead Yorke noted, he was called upon by two visitors ‘sent to inform him that they were commissioned by certain persons in England to save his life’ through the procurement of safe passage to London.<sup>156</sup> According to Yorke, David never doubted that his subsequent release resulted directly from intervention by important figures in London. But who in Britain could have instigated such an action at a time when frontiers were closed and David was so reviled as an uncompromising agitator and criminal, for whom many across the Channel thought imprisonment to be a just reward for his political actions? Research into the powerful Royalists and allies of French Revolutionary zeal, such as those who met at the British Revolutionary Club in 1792, where Yorke himself was a disgraced member, has revealed no evidence verifying the event. Indeed, while it seems highly unlikely that any member of the government or indeed the *émigrés* would have been involved in the plot to free David, Yorke insisted that his information came from David himself – ‘I heard this from his own mouth’. David himself in fact believed afterwards, begrudgingly, that he was in the debt of Britons for his liberation and life.