

Title	"The death of Richard Montgomery" (2)
Sub Title	
Author	松本, 典久(Matsumoto, Fumihisa)
Publisher	慶應義塾大学藝文学会
Publication year	1983
Jtitle	藝文研究 (The geibun-kenkyu : journal of arts and letters). Vol.45, (1983. 12) ,p.280(63)- 296(47)
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00072643-00450001-0296

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

“The Death of Richard Montgomery” — (2)

Fumihisa Matsumoto

These said, however, we have to be careful not to be too particular about factual details; because, for one thing, Trumbull has made no claim for the authenticity of presence of these six figures, and, for another, the artist in those days was not supposed to pursue accuracy in itself, whether natural or historical. A typical artistic discourse of the day had it, for example, that just as Nature was perfected on the canvas by having her defects removed by the artist, so was history ennobled by having a quality attached to it which appealed to the imagination of beholders. Alexander the Great in modern dress was indeed “against the truth of history” but “not against Painting” if it helped to elicit the hidden essence of that person. This, of course, did not mean that facts or real Nature should not be respected—they were the basis of representation—but that the real goal of the artist was not “minute neatness” but “the perfect state of nature” which was called “the Ideal Beauty.”²⁰⁾ Although it may be true that Trumbull did not know much about the attack on Quebec when he painted this picture, it is also true that he was not so much interested in representing the fact itself as in idealizing it and transmitting its essence or augustness to posterity. Moreover, in this scheme of representation, there was much license in selecting secondary figures; any person, indeed even George Washington, who would add to the dignity of the occasion could be represented if it did not go too grossly against historical facts. Trumbull’s truth, therefore, was not a mere historical truth, but an artistic truth based upon or deduced from it.

Who then were the persons Trumbull depicted here and tried to immortalize for the future generations? What was the significance of the event Trumbull idealistically presented here? Let us briefly look at the lives of Trumbull's heroes and consider the significance of this historical occurrence.

Richard Montgomery was born in Ireland in 1738 as the third son of Thomas Montgomery, "an Irish member of British parliament." After being educated at St. Andrews and graduated from Trinity College in Dublin, he entered the British army at the age of eighteen (1756). Because the Great Britain was then fighting the French and Indian War (1754-63), he was soon sent to Canada to participate in the siege of Louisburg. During this siege and the subsequent operations against Ticonderoga, Crown Point, and Montreal, he is said to have "made a reputation for a knowledge of military tactics quite unexampled in an officer of his age." In 1762 he was sent to the West Indies to engage in another campaign against Martinique and Havana, and in 1763, when peace was signed, was ordered back to New York, where he stayed for two years. It may have been there that he adopted the view of the colonials, for, when he came back to England in 1765, he sought the acquaintance of such liberal Members of Parliament as Isaac Barré, Edmund Burke, and Charles James Fox, the last two, incidentally, being the very persons who were to help Trumbull get out of jail in 1781. During his stay in England, however, his attempt to obtain a majority (he was then a captain) was twice discomfited and no help seemed to be forthcoming from his friends, so in 1772 he decided to "retire to America" and purchased "a farm of sixty-seven acres" at King's Bridge, New York. There he married Janet Livingston (July, 1773), the eldest daughter of Judge Robert R. Livingston, who was to become a member of the Continental Congress and one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. At the outbreak of the hostilities, which he seems to have regarded with certain distaste, he was appointed a brigadier general, an unusual honor for someone with his background; and in less than

three months, for the second time in his life, he was sent to Canada. He knew that this was "an event which must put an end for a while, *perhaps for ever*, to the quiet scheme of life [he] had prescribed for [himself]," but he could not help swearing to his friend that "*the will of an oppressed people, compelled to choose between liberty and slavery must be obeyed.*"²¹⁾

The Canadian campaign, which was undertaken with the obvious purpose of reducing the immediate threat from the north and attaching, if possible, the whole territory to the American Confederacy, was launched by two detachments: the one (comprising some 3,000 men) commanded by General Philip Schuyler, and the other (comprising some 1,100 men) commanded by Col. Arnold. Schuyler's division started from Albany at the beginning of September and, with the commander soon replaced by Montgomery because of Schuyler's illness, took the route of Lake Champlain; while Arnold's division pushed through the wilderness of Maine, intending to effect a reunion with the main body either at Quebec or Montreal. Montgomery took, in his way, Ticonderoga, St. John's, Chambly, and finally on November 12, Montreal; while Arnold lost during the march more than half of his men because of hunger, coldness, illness, and desertion.²²⁾

That Montgomery had once fought at Quebec under General James Wolfe seems groundless; for, according to one of Wolfe's biographers, it was "Capt. Alexander Montgomery (his elder brother?), who incurred the censure of his brother officers for inhumanity to some prisoners that fell into his hands when serving under Wolfe before Quebec." Sir Guy Carleton, the British commander in the Town, however, did join the surprise attack (or surprise landing) on "Wolfe's Cove" (then called "Anse de Foulon") and saw his general fall on the very plains on which Montgomery set up his headquarters.²³⁾ Is it not an ironic twist of fate that Montgomery, now fighting the people he had fought for, had to trace Wolfe's footsteps backward to meet the same end?

The present-day evaluation of Quebec is rather harsh, some

criticizing the foolhardiness of the attempt and others pointing out that even if they had succeeded in the capture of the city, there would have been no way of holding it against the British reinforcements that were on the way.²⁴⁾ To contemporary Americans, however, it was an event to be honored and remembered till long afterwards. At the news of Montgomery's death, the city of Philadelphia is said to have been in tears; everyone "seemed to have lost his dearest friend." (Despite Trumbull's undue criticism) Congress immediately ordered a marble monument through Benjamin Franklin who was then in Paris, and had it raised in front of St. Paul's Church, New York—to which Montgomery's remains were to be removed in 1818. The inscription on the monument reads: "THIS MONUMENT / was erected / By the order of Congress, 25th January, 1776, / To transmit to posterity / A Grateful Remembrance / of the / Patriotism, Conduct, Enterprize and Perseverance / of MAJOR GENERAL RICHARD MONTGOMERY / who after a series of successes / Amidst the most discouraging difficulties, / Fell in the attack on Quebec, / 31st December, 1775. Aged 38 years." In British Parliament, Edmund Burke referred to this event, "contrasting the condition of the 8,000 men starved, disgraced and shut up within the single town of Boston, with movements of the hero who, in one campaign, had conquered two-thirds of Canada."²⁵⁾

Not much is known about Jacob Cheesman (?-1775) and John Macpherson (1754-75), aids-de-camp to Montgomery. Cheesman had "supervised the raising of two sunken British vessels after [the] capture of St. Johns" and, having "a presentiment he would not survive the assault on Quebec," put some money in his pocket to "insure a decent burial"; and Macpherson, who received an M.A. from Princeton in 1770, had his home in Mount Pleasant, Philadelphia, occupied by Arnold in 1779. Nor is the life of Donald Campbell (?-1799) known well. Though, like Macpherson, he received an M.A. from Princeton (1774), he seems to have held the same rank for the nine years of his military career. According to one account, the survivors of Montgomery's party "voted the lieutenant colonel

who ordered the retreat out of office"; and Henry, one of the captured, went as far as to say that "[t]he disgust caused among us, as to Campbell was so great as to create the unchristian wish that he might be hanged."²⁶⁾

Less is known about Samuel Cooper (?-1775), William Hendricks (?-1775), and John Humphries (?-1775), those killed at the entrance of the Lower Town. The eulogy given to Hendricks that he was a "splendid, long suffering character, well liked by his men, but lacking in forcefulness" is perhaps the best we could say about them. The surviving officers, on the other hand, had left enough records: Return Jonathan Meigs (1740-1823), who was commissioned by Governor Trumbull as lieutenant in a Connecticut regiment (1772), was later very active in Indian affairs, dying (at the age of 83) of pneumonia which he contracted for "having given up his quarters to an elderly visiting Indian chief and moved into a tent"; Matthias Ogden (1754-91), who left Princeton soon after the outbreak of the war, planned and directed the abortive attempt to "capture Prince William Henry (subsequently William IV)" when he was visiting New York in 1782, and, while in France, was permitted by Louis XVI to "sit in the royal presence"; and Samuel Ward (1756-1832), who started a business career after retiring in 1781, was in Paris when Louis XVI was sentenced to death (1791).²⁷⁾

The case of William Thompson (1736-81) in connection with the Canadian campaign is a different matter. For he was not at Quebec on December 31, 1775, but in Boston, participating in the famous siege of that town. When he did go to Canada in March, 1776, he was commanding a detachment of some 2,000 men, the first reinforcements that were sent to Canada. Leading this detachment successfully and effecting a union with the troops retreating from Quebec (April, 1776), he surrendered the command to General Sullivan, who came after him, leading another detachment (June 4). Then on the night of June 7, he planned to surprise the enemy at Trois Rivières, was misguided into a swamp, and was captured. Meanwhile, Colonel John Trumbull, who was also sent to the

northern campaign in July, 1776, heard "the news of fresh disasters" in Albany, and, advancing as far as Crown Point, found "not an army but a mob, the scattered remains of twelve or fifteen battalions, ruined by sickness, fatigue, and desertion, and void of every idea of discipline or subordination." Thompson was a veteran of the French and Indian War but was a man of "unruly temperament," whom Washington dared not trust with an "excessively responsible" task. When, on parole, he accused a member of Congress of hindering his immediate exchange, the members voted that he was "guilty of an insult to the honor and dignity of this house."²⁸⁾

Judging from these circumstances, it seems improbable that Trumbull did not know where Thompson was at the time of Montgomery's death. The fresh disaster he mentions is no doubt the capture of Thompson; Trumbull himself had been in the siege of Boston till March, 1776; besides, is it possible that, engaged in the same campaign, an officer in one detachment did not know the movements of the commander of another? Had it not been for Benedict Arnold's treason at West Point, Trumbull surely would have chosen him as the "fifth" figure in his picture, but, as it was, he seems to have been obliged to be content with the second best.

The identity of the Indian is hard to determine. Trumbull himself has presented him merely as "an indian Chief known by the name of Col. —," and then in the *Key*, as "An Indian Chief known by the name of Col. Louis." Despite Jaffe's careless assumption that it was Trumbull, it was in fact Theodore Sizer who identified him as "'Colonel Joseph Lewis,' Chief of the Oneida Indians," and R.W. James R. Case who suggested the possibility of its being "Louis, a chief of the Caughnawaga Indians, a friendly group living near Montreal."²⁹⁾ The reason Sizer named the Oneidas is obvious. They were the people who, at the outbreak of the Revolution, sent a message to Governor Trumbull, assuring him that "Oneidas intended to stay neutral in the conflict." It was the Oneidas, too, who, in the latter stage of the war, "fought alongside colonial soldiers, serving as scouts and guides," and who, by

delivering maize, "enabled Washington and his troops to survive the terrible winter at Valley Forge." In fact, they were one of the two peoples in the League of the Six Nations that openly sided with the Continentals and had land ownership granted after the war.³⁰⁾

Case's argument is no less convincing; for the Caughnawagas were the people living much nearer to Quebec and, according to him, Louis was a member of the treaty that "visited Governor Trumbull at Lebanon, Connecticut, and Washington at Cambridge during February, 1776."³¹⁾ The only difficulties with these arguments would be that it is unlikely that Montgomery would take an Indian chief living in New York all the way to Quebec (it was Frenchmen living in Quebec that served as guides for Montgomery's attack), and that if Louis was at Lebanon and Cambridge in February, 1776, it would have been difficult for him to be at Quebec on December 31, 1775.

Trumbull had a great admiration for Indians. He twice refers to them approvingly in his *Autobiography*, and has left at least five drawings and three miniatures of them (the latter at Yale being those of a Seneca, an Oneida, and an Indian also belonging to the Six Nations). Although as a boy of nine or ten he "already partook in the prevailing contempt for Indians," he had his view completely changed by an incident that took place at his home. He had seen an old Mohegan—one of the hunters employed by his father, who was "as drunken and worthless an Indian as ever lived"—resolutely quit drinking at the prospect of his ascending the throne of his tribe. Taught through this incident the importance of keeping one's resolution, Trumbull had held ever since "deep feelings of awe and respect" toward them. Their value as artistic models must have been as great. When a deputation of the Creeks were visiting New York in 1790 (Trumbull had just finished one of the portraits of President Washington there), he could not resist the urge to obtain "by stealth" the drawings of some, who "possessed a dignity of manner, form, countenance and expression, worthy of Roman senators."³²⁾ His personal veneration, artistic consideration, as well as

regard for their role in the Revolutionary War seem to have induced him to include one of the Indian representatives in his (second) earliest Revolutionary painting.

We cannot, of course, ignore the influence of Benjamin West, in whose *The Death of General Wolfe* (1771), an Indian very similar to Col. Louis is squatting in the left forefront with a musket and a tomahawk beside him. Because Trumbull's Col. Louis is evidently an afterthought—only he is missing in one of the sketches for *Quebec*—we are all the more inclined to emphasize West's influence. But despite this seeming unoriginality and the ambiguity of Col. Louis' identity—indeed, he is so ambiguous a figure that we cannot but wonder if he was someone who attended the expedition of Trumbull himself—he had certainly his own reasons to put him in his picture, idealizing him as “An Indian Chief known by the name of Col. Louis.”

An unexpected person was there with Montgomery: Aaron Burr (1756-1836), the very person who was to become the vice-President of the United States (1801-05), and who was to give a mortal wound to Alexander Hamilton in the duel in 1804. Burr had joined Arnold's expedition with his Princeton classmates, Matthias Ogden, Samuel Spring (the chaplain) and others, and, having carried Arnold's message to Montgomery “in the dead of winter, through 179 miles of the Canadian wilderness from Quebec to Montreal,” had been appointed one of Montgomery's aids-de-camp. At the time of the storming of Quebec, it is said, he was marching close to Montgomery and, creeping through the pickets which the general himself helped cut down, heard him say, “In two more minutes, Quebec will be ours”—which were his last words. Seeing Montgomery fall down and finding his comrades unwilling to advance, Burr decided to save Montgomery's body, hoisting it to his shoulders and “stumbling through deep snow for several yards before dropping [it] to avoid capture.” It was also (Capt.) Burr who was unanimously recommended by the survivors of Montgomery's party to take the place of Col. Campbell who ordered the retreat.³³⁾

Questions arise as to whether Trumbull knew this at all, and whether someone as fastidious as Burr could have remained silent if he by any chance found that he had not been represented in what should be an important historical document. Apparently Trumbull knew nothing about this; but Burr seems to have found out the mistake. As late as September, 1833, three years before his death, he was still complaining "of Trumbull not placing him in the picture"; it was "in his Arms," a friend of William Dunlap (an artist who was critical about Trumbull's works) heard him say, that Montgomery fell, receiving the fatal shot.³⁴ If, the question naturally follows, Burr was so clamorous and Trumbull's serious mistake was known to Dunlap, his foe, could Trumbull have remained ignorant for long? Obviously he could not; and so he made up his mind to put Burr in his second *Quebec*, which he was going to paint for the Wadsworth Atheneum.

The reason we make this conjecture is that, among other changes he made in his second *Quebec* (finished 1834)—the faces of Montgomery and his staff are more clearly seen, but have been completely changed; Macpherson is holding the hilt of his sword, instead of its blade; the figures in the right background are not marching but looking toward the central group; etc.—there is an unmistakable change of the uniform worn by the person holding Montgomery. That is, the red uniform worn by Matthias Ogden in the first *Quebec* has been changed into the same blue and buff uniform as worn by Montgomery. Moreover, in place of Ogden's sturdy physique, we now see a slim young figure, short of stature and almost childish in countenance. Since Trumbull regarded the blue and buff as "Uniform of the Staff," the person here cannot but be one of Montgomery's aids-de-camp; and since we know that Burr (or "Little Burr," as he was called by his classmates) was "a mere stripling in appearance" (he was nineteen when he volunteered for the expedition, but looked much younger), slender in form, and "five feet six inches" tall,³⁵ our conclusion is inevitable. Nor do the contemporaries seem to have had much doubt about the identity

of this person; for Matthew L. Davis, one of Burr's biographers, writing in 1836, testified that "Colonel Trumbull, in a superb painting recently executed by him, descriptive of the assault upon Quebec, has drawn the general falling in the arms of his surviving aide-de-camp," Aaron Burr.³⁶⁾ The Wadsworth Atheneum version of *Quebec*, therefore, is a very rare example, perhaps the only one, in which Trumbull, becoming aware of his mistake, replaced the original figure with another.

This picture also raises a question as to the validity of Trumbull's claim that the three figures marked with a star in the *Key*—Montgomery and his two aids—"are the only real likenesses." These figures, as has been noted, have had their countenances completely changed in the second *Quebec*. How could he have made such drastic changes if he was so sure of their likenesses? Could it be that he later obtained more accurate portraits, or, by any chance, took in Burr's advice?—we have to wonder. John H. Morgan, talking about the first *Quebec*, has suggested the possibility (and Jaffe follows it) that Montgomery's portrait was "adapted from a print of his portrait by C.W. Peale which it resembles," but we cannot, of course, draw any definite conclusion from such an imperfect comparison between a profile and an upturned face.³⁷⁾ Besides, if, as C.C. Sellers suggests, Peale's Montgomery was copied from the original between 1785 and 1795 (Philadelphia), it is improbable, though not impossible, that the print reached Trumbull (London) by the beginning of 1786, when the sketch for Montgomery had been completed.³⁸⁾ Although there still is a strong possibility that, after all, Trumbull copied from Peale's portraits or drawings—especially because their master, Benjamin West, intending to depict American Revolutionary scenes himself, had asked Peale in 1783, to "send whatever [Peale] thought would give [West] the most exact knowledge of the costumes of the American armies, and [also] portraits in small, either painting or drawing, for the conspicuous characters necessary to be introduced into such a work"—unfortunately we know nothing about these portraits or drawings. All we can say about Trumbull's Montgomery

is that it does not contradict our knowledge that Montgomery was a princely Irishman, "tall and slender, well limbed," and of light brown hair.³⁹⁾ The source of the two other portraits used for Macpherson and Cheesman is totally unknown.

Before considering Trumbull's intention and motives in painting this picture, we have to take a look at the uniforms of the Revolutionary soldiers; for the ones represented here are so diverse in color and style it should be questioned whether there were "uniforms" at all in those days. The modern-style uniform, with its functions of efficiency and differentiation, is said to have come into existence about a century before the Revolution; and the Continental leaders, well aware of the merit and necessity of having one, had adopted, as early as October, 1775, brown as "the first official color for Continental uniforms." Nevertheless, many militias had already chosen their own combinations; besides, clothes, as well as shoes, were in such short supply that it was impossible to carry out this Congressional recommendation. Even in 1778 Washington was still worrying about "the Army [coming] into the field half clad in a thousand different colors as to uniform." Consequently, he had to recommend hunting shirts (or hunting frocks) as field dress and, in 1779, issue another general order, settling the ground color upon blue.⁴⁰⁾

Since brown, blue, red, and green, especially in the early stage of the war, were the dominant colors of Continental uniforms, it seems that, for once, Trumbull was faithful in representing historical truth. There is, however, no reason to assume that those at Quebec, or for that matter, most Continental soldiers, were in uniforms when they fought, or that the blue and buff, which was in fact "the Uniform of the Virginia regiment commanded by Colonel George Washington in the French and Indian War," was also the uniform of Montgomery and his staff.⁴¹⁾ Thompson and his men certainly should not have been dressed in brown coats and tricorne hats, but in "white frocks, or rifle shirts, and round hats," which were their uniforms. Furthermore, if Trumbull had wanted to be most faithful to historical

truth, he should have dressed most of his figures not in Continental uniforms but in British uniforms; for, as Ogden tells us, they had already worn out their own and had to wear the ones Montgomery had brought from Montreal (he had of course taken them from the British prisoners). On the day of the attack, it is said, American soldiers had to "wear sprigs of evergreen in their hats" or "pin bits of paper over their brow" to distinguish themselves from the enemy.⁴²⁾ So here again, Trumbull has modified historical truth to suit his artistic truth.

It is not easy to say which was the most predominant among Trumbull's motives for painting *Quebec*: the success of Benjamin West and John Singleton Copley as history painters, West's suggestion as to painting Revolutionary scenes, Trumbull's personal relations with Edmund Burke and Charles James Fox, his experiences as a Continental soldier, or his desire to become a history painter himself. In those days, especially before 1771, when West executed *The Death of General Wolfe* against the advice of Sir Joshua Reynolds and King George himself, it was generally thought that contemporary figures in contemporary costumes were not fit for any serious pictures except portraits; at the idea of their contemporaries presented in "boots and breeches," instead of togas and sandals, the people in those days were filled with "mirth and horror." West's *Wolfe*, though not the first of its kind, was the first to achieve such a success as to attract "larger crowds than had any other painting in all British history."⁴³⁾ It was, therefore, a trail-blazing work, which was soon followed by Copley's *The Death of the Earl of Chatham* (1779-81) and *The Death of Major Peirson* (1782-84), which were also successful.

Trumbull's indebtedness to these two masters is apparent. Like West (though not in such a classically symmetrical manner), he divided his figures into three groups, and like Copley (in *Peirson*), he put them in a central parallelogram and, roughly, two triangles on both sides. The Indian, as has been noted, was borrowed from West, and the two flags pointing to the falling figure and the swords

and bayonets diversely arranged were suggested by Copley's *Peirson*. Although its diagonal composition, elevated ground, and exquisitely curved body of the hero are unmistakably Trumbull's, *Quebec* also belongs to this new tradition of depicting contemporary figures in contemporary costumes.

That Trumbull began *The Death of General Warren at the Battle of Bunker's Hill, 17 June, 1775*, and *Quebec* at the suggestion of Benjamin West is unquestionable. (Trumbull, as usual, is silent on something unfavorable to him.) West, who had refrained from painting American subjects during the war, determined soon after the signing of peace to execute "a set of pictures containing the great events which had effected the revolution of America," and, as has been seen, sent a letter to Peale asking for necessary materials. Later, however, finding it still unadvisable for the King's favorite to depict his defeats openly, he turned the task over to one of his disciples, who had actually served in the war.⁴⁴⁾

The reasons that Trumbull chose the death of Montgomery as the subject for one of his earliest Revolutionary paintings are many. First, living in London, he must have felt a similar delicacy in representing British defeats openly. Second, like Warren's death at the battle of Bunker Hill, which (battle) he had seen from a distance, Montgomery's death was closely connected with his military career—he was in one of the earliest detachments that were sent to Canada as reinforcements. Third, like General Wolfe, whose death had been commemorated in West's painting, Montgomery was killed at Quebec—after an interval of sixteen years, but within a distance of a few miles. And finally, the liberal Members of Parliament with whom Montgomery was intimate were also on good terms with Trumbull—Fox and Burke, especially, finally effecting Trumbull's release from "Tothill-fields Bridewell" on the bail of £400 (which was to be prepared by West, Copley, and Trumbull himself). It is not improbable that, on the frequent visits of "many distinguished men"—among whom Fox—in the winter of 1781, Trumbull heard much about the Irishman, whom they must have remembered as a

youth with "a bright, magnetic face, winning manners, and the bearing of a prince."⁴⁵ Certainly they would not have been displeased to find him represented on Trumbull's canvas as a champion of the oppressed, who died for the cause of liberty and independence.

All of these coincidences, however, would have come to nothing, had it not been for Trumbull's own willingness to put them together as a history painter. Almost all his life, Trumbull seems to have had a sense of unworthiness for not becoming a man of great importance to his country: his military career, to which he looked back with great honor, had stopped short of truly significant accomplishments; his brief experience as a businessman turned out disastrous; and even his achievements as a diplomat did not receive due attention from his countrymen. Under these circumstances, almost the best thing he could do was to combine his experience and artistic talent and commemorate the great event that his country had just gone through. Indeed the profession of painting was not very highly regarded in his country, but, as he eloquently declared to Thomas Jefferson who was in Paris, "To preserve and diffuse the memory of the noblest series of actions which have ever presented themselves in the history of man; to give to the present and the future sons of oppression and misfortune, such glorious lessons of their rights, and of the spirit with which they should assert and support them; and even to transmit to their descendants, the personal resemblance of those who have been the great actors in those illustrious scenes, were objects which gave a dignity to the profession, peculiar to [his] situation." He might not be the greatest artist of his age, he admitted, but surely there was no one who could be his rival in representing the "truth and authenticity" to which he was an eyewitness.⁴⁶

In the age of rationality, which was also the age of secularization, in which the sacred deeds of Christ were being replaced by the heroic deeds of earthly beings, nothing was so true to the devout Congregationalist-turned-Episcopalian⁴⁷ as "the beautiful language of our Savior, in his last conversation with his disciples,

as recorded by St. John ‘*that greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.*’”⁴⁸⁾ Nobleness, in his mind, meant sacrificing one’s life for one’s country. Who was more suitable for this theme than the princely figure who came from Ireland, who fought for the people he had recently adopted as his countrymen, and who died with his two aids, being watched by his officers?

Quebec was finished in West’s studio in June, 1786,⁴⁹⁾ three years after the signing of the peace treaty. Although, perhaps, nothing is correct historically except the fact of Montgomery’s death, the people looking at this picture would surely have grasped the meaning the artist tried to convey—which is something he also wanted us to know.

NOTES

- 20) Roger de Piles, *The Art of Painting, with the Lives and Characters of Above 300 of the Most Eminent Painters* (in translation), London, J. Nutt, 1706, 13-27; Sir Joshua Reynolds, *Discourses on Art*, New York, Collier Books, 1961 (first published in 1797), 43-52.
- 21) John Armstrong, “Life of Richard Montgomery,” in Jared Sparks, ed., *The Library of American Biography*, vol. I, Boston, Hillard, Gray and Co., 1834, 181-226; *Appletons’*, vol. IV, 370-71; Mark Mayo Boatner III, *Encyclopedia of the American Revolution*, New York, David McKay Company, 1974, 726; *The National Cyclopaedia of American Biography* (NCAB hereafter), vol. I, New York, James T. White & Company, 1898, 101-2; Dumas Malone, ed., *The Dictionary of American Biography* (DAB hereafter), vol. XIII, New York, Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1934, 98-99; Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee, eds., *The Dictionary of National Biography* (DNB hereafter), vol. XIII, London, Oxford, and New York, Oxford University Press, 1917, 767-68.
- 22) Boatner, *op. cit.*, 726; *Appletons’*, vol. IV, 371; NCAB, vol. I, 100; DAB, vol. XIII, 99; Meigs, *op. cit.*, 227-38; Ogden, *op. cit.*, 18-28; etc.
- 23) DNB, vol. XIII, 771-5; vol. III, 1002.
- 24) Boatner, *op. cit.*, 908-9; Burt, *op. cit.*, 227; Cohen, *op. cit.*, 9.
- 25) Trumbull, *Autobiography*, 287; NCAB, vol. I, 101.
- 26) Case, *op. cit.*, 22, 33; Philip Vail, *The Great American Rascal*, New York, Hawthorne Books, 1973, 23; Henry, *op. cit.*, 388.
- 27) Case, *op. cit.*, 28; *Appletons’*, vol. IV, 388, 561; vol. VI, 354; DAB, vol. XII, 508-9; vol. XIX, 437-38; NCAB, vol. I, 83; vol. IV, 62; vol. V, 71; Boatner, *op. cit.*, 699-700, 814-15, 1162.

- 28) *Appletons'*, vol. VI, 95; *DAB*, vol. XVIII, 476; *NCAB*, vol. I, 70; Boatner, *op. cit.*, 1098-99; Trumbull, *Autobiography*, 26-27; Theodore Sizer, ed., *The Autobiography of Colonel John Trumbull*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1953, 26 (footnote).
- 29) Jaffe, *op. cit.*, 91; Sizer, *The Works*, figure 153; Case, *op. cit.*, 31.
- 30) Cara E. Richards, *The Oneida People*, Phoenix, Indian Tribal Series, 1974, 49-54.
- 31) Case, *op. cit.*, 31.
- 32) Trumbull, *Autobiography*, 6-8, 164-65.
- 33) Vail, *op. cit.*, 17, 23; Milton Lomask, *Aaron Burr: The Years from Princeton to Vice President, 1756-1805*, New York, Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1979, 41; James Parton, *The Life and Times of Aaron Burr*, vol. I, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1836, 61 (Arnold's letter to Montgomery), 67-69.
- 34) William Dunlap, *Diary of William Dunlap*, vol. III, New York, New York Historical Society, 1931, 737.
- 35) Parton, *op. cit.*, 66; Boatner, *op. cit.*, 147; etc.
- 36) Davis, *op. cit.*, 71.
- 37) Peale's portrait of Montgomery is reproduced in Charles Coleman Sellers, *Portraits and Miniatures by Charles Wilson Peale*, Philadelphia, The American Philosophical Society, 1952, 305, no. 562.
- 38) John H. Morgan, *Paintings by John Trumbull at Yale University*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1926, 33; Jaffe, *op. cit.*, 317; Sellers, *op. cit.*, 141.
- 39) James Thomas Flexner, *America's Old Masters, First Artists of the New World*, New York, The Viking Press, 1939, 70; Meigs, *op. cit.*, 246.
- 40) Dorothy C. Barck, "Introduction to Uniforms of the American Army," in Charles M. Lefferts, *Uniforms of the American, British, French, and German Armies in the War of the American Revolution, 1775-1783*, New York, New York Historical Society, 1926, 9-12; John C. Fitzpatrick, A.M., "The Continental Army Uniform," *Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine* vol. LIV (November, 1920), 629-39; Boatner, *op. cit.*, 1131.
- 41) Fitzpatrick, *op. cit.*, 629. Peale's Montgomery is in a dark blue and buff uniform; Fitzpatrick says, however, that the "blue and buff that instinctively comes to mind whenever we think of the Continental soldier is a curious survival of mixed impressions, helped out by the costume portraits and Revolutionary paintings of Trumbull, Peale and others of less fame."
- 42) *DAB*, vol. XVIII, 476; Bird, *op. cit.*, 189-90. Thomas Ainslie, a British officer, also says that the "prisoners had slips of Paper pin'd to their hats with these words: *Liberty or Death*" (Cohen, *op. cit.*, 38).
- 43) Flexner, *op. cit.*, 65-67.
- 44) *Ibid.*, 67-70.

- 45) Trumbull, *Autobiography*, 75-78; *NCA*, vol. I, 101.
- 46) Trumbull, *Autobiography*, 158.
- 47) Benjamin Silliman, "Note Book" (a typescript in Trumbull Papers at Yale), 1858: "He was educated as a congregationalist, but he became an Episcopalian I suppose by adoption in consequence of his marriage. I believe he was a communicant in that church - for - he one day asked me whether he as such an [*sic*] one, might unite in the sacrament in the [Yale] College Chapel where he usually attended worship to which I replied in the affirmative.... He was a punctual attendant on our family prayers, and tears would sometimes flow down his cheeks when certain passages of the bible were read, for he had great sensibility both moral and physical" (22-23).
- 48) Trumbull, *Autobiography*, 287-88.
- 49) *Ibid.*, 93; Trumbull, "Account of Paintings" (a handwritten notebook in Trumbull Papers at Yale).