

A museum devoted to the work of Thomas

MUSEUMS DEVOTED TO SINGLE ARTISTS ARE UNUSUAL and, probably, out of fashion. Art history prefers to compare and contrast the work of different artists; as temporary exhibitions so often demonstrate, academics often look for evidence in works of art for social changes rather to chart the development of a single artist's output; and, given the decline in museum visits in Britain, changes in fashion make an institution devoted to one artist particularly vulnerable. Nonetheless, without consideration of any of these factors, a number of museums have been founded that are devoted to showing the work of one artist. Many resemble an extended obituary, based on the collection that remained in the studio at the time of an artist's death. They can be less representative than one might wish: they often have slight representation of early work and, arguably, the best work may have been sold from the studio, leaving the less successful works for display. Some single-artist museums were established in artists' wills, but their instructions can take sometime to enact. In the case of J. M. W. Turner it took the British government nearly one hundred and forty years to comply with the artist's wishes and exhibit his bequest under one roof. His plans had been ruminating for sometime and his longevity helped as he was able to repurchase early work from the descendants of the original purchasers and form a representative collection of his production. Turner's desire, and he provided some funding, was to establish a purpose-built museum for the bequest but instead, in 1987, a wing was added to the national gallery of British Art at the Tate Gallery in London so that the artist's output could be seen in the context of his contemporaries. Perhaps an obvious comment, but the prerequisite to display a single artist's work together developed from two basic ideas: the nine-

Figure 1. Gainsborough's House. Like many other town houses in East Anglia, the brick facade was built on to the front of a half-timbered mediaeval building which, in parts, dates back to c. 1450.



Figure 2. On the left, the first Curator of Gainsborough's House, Frank Rees; in the centre Colonel Gerald Tuck, the Honorary Secretary of the Society and the Mayor of Sudbury and, on the right Sir Charles Wheeler, the President of the Royal Academy and President of the Society. They are shown purchasing catalogues of the opening exhibition in the House of Gainsborough drawings. In the background, hardly visible in this photograph, are, to the right, *The Millman Conversation Piece* (see fig. 10) and, behind Frank Rees, *The Cobbold Conversation Piece*, which entered the collection in 1998.

teenth-century notion of a museum as a repository of artifacts displayed for public enjoyment and edification, and the perception of the artist as 'genius' rather than artisan. In the case of Thomas Gainsborough, all these factors help to explain why the birthplace of the artist was opened as a museum in the small East Anglian market town of Sudbury as late as 1961.

Gainsborough died, aged sixty-one, on 2 August 1788 from a cancer of the neck. He lived in a large house designed as a terrace of three dwellings in Pall Mall close to St James's Palace with views over Green Park and Westminster. The household comprised his wife, the illegitimate daughter of a Duke, their two daughters, who can be described (with considerable charity) as eccentric, and his nephew and assistant Gainsborough Dupont. At



Figure 3. Thomas Gainsborough (1727–88), *Portrait of a Boy and Girl (fragments)*, c. 1744. Oil on canvas, 52½ x 28½ in and 17⅝ x 13⅜ in. The former purchased with contributions from the MGC/V&A Purchase Grant Fund, June 1984. The size and complexity of this composition follows the examples produced by William Hogarth at the same time. The ambitious scale of this canvas was not repeated until he removed to Bath with his family in 1759.

the back of the house, in a purpose-built garden room, was his studio which, for the preceding five years, had doubled as an exhibition room after his final break with the Royal Academy in 1783. His business was successful and, although, no doubt much less organised than his rival Sir Joshua Reynolds, Gainsborough would have needed an appointment diary for portrait sitters, an account book and he must have organised suppliers of frames, canvases and colours for the busy studio. None of these survive and it is reasonable to assume that, unlike the descendants of Reynolds, George Romney and Joseph Wright of Derby, immediately after his death Gainsborough's relations regarded the studio paperwork as working tools of no significance and destroyed them. Through fortuitous accident rather than design, one hundred letters survive in his hand, though none are known to exist that were addressed to him. The family clearly made a thorough job of clearing his desk. And yet, for a hallowed period between 1880 and 1920, Gainsborough was regarded as the greatest British artist who, as we can see from the walls of the Frick Collection,

Philadelphia Museum of Art and the National Gallery of Art in Washington DC, ranked with Rembrandt, Frans Hals, Rubens and Van Dyck. In the 1950s and 1960s Mr Paul Mellon, perhaps as a reaction to his father's taste, swung the pendulum of choice away from the ebullient sophistication of later works towards the charming naivete of Gainsborough's Suffolk-period. One prize that evaded his deep purse was the double portrait of Mr and Mrs Andrews, which was stopped from export and purchased by the National Gallery in London in 1960. Two years before, the sitter's descendants generously lent the painting to the Town Hall in Sudbury so that the inhabitants could view their erstwhile neighbours for a consideration towards the funds of Gainsborough's House (*fig. 1*).

In 1952 C. G. ('Micky') Doward, who spent much time in auction houses the world over, purchased the poetic *Haymaker and Sleeping Girl* in a New York sale and sold it to Vose Galleries in Boston, Massachusetts. They quickly sold it on to the Museum of Fine Arts. Interestingly, given the choice of any painting in the studio, Gainsborough Dupont chose it and it remained with his descendants in Sudbury until it was sold in 1891. With the profits from the sale, Micky Doward bought 46 Gainsborough Street in Sudbury to link his name with the great eighteenth-century artist. His wife found the small country market town dull and the house returned to the market. It was advertised in *Country Life*. Correspondence followed which activated the Mayor of the town to raise funds to purchase it. The horse painter, Sir Alfred Munnings who lived locally, gave a painting that was sold and provided half the purchase price and with much determination the property was eventually purchased from an irritated, but patient, Mr Doward in 1958 by a newly-formed charitable trust, Gainsborough's House Society. The sale of part of the garden and the help of Government agencies provided the funding for restoration and Gainsborough's House opened to the public with an exhibition of work by Gainsborough from local collections and the tour of an Arts Council exhibition of the artist's drawings was especially extended to show in the House (*fig. 2*).¹

Over the next twenty-five years the House exhibited works by Gainsborough that were lent on a long-term basis. It also held exhibitions of work by East Anglians including John Constable, John Crome and Cedric Morris. It was not until 1984 that the Society came of age

Figure 4. Thomas Gainsborough,
Wooded Landscape with Cattle by a Pool, 1782.

Oil on canvas 47³/₈ x 58¹/₈ in.

Purchased by Suffolk County Council and transferred to the Society with contributions from the National Heritage Memorial Fund, the MGC/V&A Purchase Grant Fund, the National Art Collections Fund, the Pilgrim Trust and many other trust funds and other individuals, January 1988. Perhaps this canvas attempts to compete with Old Master paintings more than any other of his landscapes. It embraces many of the themes that had appeared in his landscapes during the previous decade: the cottage door theme and the woodman carrying sticks.

and purchased its first work by Gainsborough. There were many factors that made any attempt to build a representative collection formidable. After two hundred years much of the artist's best work already graced the greatest galleries of the world and, given the manner in which the national museums in Britain had developed over the same period, there were gaps in their collections. Acting on a prescribed collecting policy was going to be difficult and the Society had limited resources.

The first acquisition, a fragment of a large double-portrait of a girl and a boy in a landscape, was criticised. One columnist wrote that it was a 'scrap of canvas that many say is only half a picture not by Gainsborough'² and some favoured an attribution to George Beare. Seven years later, another 'scrap of canvas' appeared (amusingly attributed to George Beare) cut from the same portrait. It was purchased and helped to confirm the attribution of the double portrait to Gainsborough (*fig. 3*). He must have painted it at the tender age of sixteen or seventeen. Anatomically naive and compositionally immature, the brushwork and unified lighting anticipate the future strengths of the artist.³

Although the British government has done much to encourage charitable giving, their generosity balks at imitating legislation in the United States which enables donors to offset gifts of money and art works against tax. However, a scheme of 'private treaty' sales enables a museum to purchase a painting at a beneficial price for both vendor and museum. Capital taxes due from the sale of a work of art can be deducted from the price paid by the museum and a 'doceur' representing a quarter of the capital tax due, is added to the price. This British compromise gives the vendor a higher price and the museum a lower one. If the bill for capital taxes is sufficiently large then a work of art can be accepted in payment and this has resulted in several major works, often from long-established collections, being transferred to public ownership.





Figure 5. Francis Hayman (1708–76), *Seeing (La Vue)* 1753. Oil on panel, 12 x 9½ in. Purchased with a contribution from the MGC/V&A Purchase Grant Fund and the National Art Collections Fund, January 2001. In the 1740s Gainsborough is documented as collaborating with Francis Hayman and during this period the two artists were a great mutual influence. This small panel, part of a series that were engraved, uses French colouring and contour which prepared Gainsborough with a balanced elegance that was so characteristic of his work.

In 1987 a late landscape failed to sell at Sotheby's and the owner wished to dispose of it by private treaty sale. It was the last landscape the artist showed at the Royal Academy and it had been widely exhibited and published (fig. 4).⁴ The legislation regarding private treaty sales only encompassed purchase by museums owned by local and national government and a number of other agencies. Museums run by private charitable trusts were not included. Much negotiation took place and yet another British compromise was found: the painting would be purchased by the local authority and ownership transferred to the Society. In the past decade this system, now widely accepted, has been used by several museums

including Gainsborough's House.

In 1988 the Society was offered a painting by Canaletto to benefit the acquisition fund. By the same legislation that encompassed the purchase of the great 1782 landscape, the painting, showing the Piazza San Marco in Venice, was sold, on behalf of the Society, by the National Art Collections Fund at Sotheby's for the world-record price of £880,000. The price, which was six times the estimate, was something of a surprise and provided Gainsborough's House with a sum which would give it a real ability to flex its muscles in the market place. Furthermore this designated fund was set up to meet the cost of conservation and framing expenses.

British regional museums are able to apply for grants from a fund set up by central government, the Purchase Grant Fund, and a private charity, from whom the Society had already reaped great benefit, the National Art Collections Fund. The National Heritage Memorial Fund and the Heritage Lottery Fund, set up in 1980 and 1994 respectively, can also help with larger acquisitions. Sadly, however, Government influence on the latter fund has recently shifted its priorities away from museum acquisitions. So, the value of local funding can be greatly increased with grants from nationally run charities and specific government funds and these criteria have provided the framework for purchasing the more costly acquisitions for the collection in Sudbury. The munificent gift from the sale of the Canaletto also enabled the Society to collect cheaper items without recourse to outside bodies.

If the Society's mission is to show and explain Gainsborough's work in all its variety and influence, not only should the Society purchase work by Gainsborough but also work by his teachers, Hubert François Gravelot (fig. 6) and Francis Hayman (fig. 5), and his followers, his assistant Gainsborough Dupont (fig. 7) and his great-nephew the lithographer, Richard James Lane. It should also chart the artist's influence through objects. Mezzotints after the artist's work are an obvious choice, but his popularity, particularly in the later-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, provide a gauge of taste and popularity through ceramic figurines of, for instance, *The Blue Boy* and *The Duchess of Devonshire*, the inspiration for political cartoons based on *Mr and Mrs Andrews* and the design of jewellery after Gainsborough's portrait of *Mrs Siddons*.⁵



Figure 6. Hubert François Gravelot (1699–1773), *Design for the title page of John Pine's The Tapestry Hangings of the House of Lords*, c 1739. Pen and ink with grey washes on laid paper, 18½ x 13½ in (detail). Purchased with a contribution from the MGC/V&A Purchase Grant Fund, May 1993. Gravelot was a prolific designer for engravings and book illustrations. He taught Gainsborough, amongst others, at the informal St Martin's Lane Academy which had been set up by Hogarth in the mid 1730s. Another design for John Pine's elaborate book is in the Cooper Hewitt Museum in New York.

Arguably Gainsborough's most imposing drawing, *Peasants going to Market* (fig. 8), was sold at auction by the son of the art historian, Lord Clark of Saltwood. A private collector who lived abroad purchased the drawing and it was stopped from export to give a public body in Britain an opportunity to purchase it at the sale price. With the intervention of all the funds discussed above, the sheet was bought for the House and provides the cornerstone of the collection of drawings in Sudbury. In his own writing Gainsborough was keen to persuade his readers that his work did not rely on external influences, and yet this drawing obviously draws on a Rembrandt etching of the *Flight into Egypt* dated 1651, one of the *Figurines* etched by Salvador Rosa in the 1650s and models of putti heads which are associated with the



Figure 7. Gainsborough Dupont (1754–97), *Wooded Landscape with Cows*, c 1795. Oil on paper, 11¼ x 15¼ in. Purchased by Suffolk County Council by private treaty and sold to the Society with a contribution from the MGC/V&A Purchase Grant Fund, June 1992. This oil sketch comes from a series that show Dupont at his most relaxed. There has been much confusion between the style of Gainsborough and his nephew. The latter's style is more nervous, the colours more acidic and the composition more wooden. Nonetheless, ignoring the shadow cast by his uncle, Dupont's landscapes are often highly successful.

Flemish/Italian sculptor François Duquesnoy.⁶

Gainsborough's drawings have an intimacy and immediacy which many of his canvases lack. He obviously used drawings as an extension of seeing and to tighten his visual memory and, like so many other artists, to develop compositions. Consequently a study of his drawings provides an insight into his understanding and of the direction of his work. Many drawings must have recorded the development of his ideas which finally bore fruit on canvas, though no more than a score remain. In the early 1760s, when Gainsborough had left his native Suffolk and moved to Bath in the West Country, he was serving patrons who were more adventurous and Gainsborough wanted to meet their demands with as much invention as he could. Firstly, especially at this point in his career, he



Figure 8. Thomas Gainsborough, *Peasants going to Market*, 1770–74. Black and white chalk, stump with grey and brown washes and extensively heightened with white chalk and gouache on prepared brown paper, 16 $\frac{1}{4}$ x 21 $\frac{1}{8}$ in. Purchased with contributions from the National Heritage Memorial Fund, the MGC/V&A Purchase Grant Fund and the National Art Collections Fund, January 1993. This drawing remained in family possession until 1831 when it was described as ‘spiritedly touched’.

was uncertain about developing a difficult pose or relating two figures together on the same canvas. The study on blue paper of his two daughters shows the development from the composition revealed in X-ray of the canvas in Worcester Art Museum. His choice of media, blue-tinted paper with black chalk enlivened with white chalk marks, apes the technique of painting and was a method that he learnt from his tutors who followed French precedents (*fig. 9*).⁷

The choice of available drawings is considerable but many of the images are similar, so careful consideration of each piece of the jigsaw is vital. Drawings are chosen to

show the variety of intention and subject matter. For instance, the Society purchased a moonlight landscape study which Gainsborough developed into a soft-ground etching with aquatint;⁸ one of three studies (the others are in the Cecil Higgins Art Gallery at Bedford, England and the Huntington Library and Art Collections, San Marino, California) which charts the evolution of Gainsborough’s only-known painting of a mythological subject, *Diana and Acteon* (the canvas is in the Royal Collection) and a landscape of 1783, inspired by his visit to the Lake District, which he used to facilitate the commission of a painting from the Prince of Wales. In

Figure 9. Thomas Gainsborough, *Study of the Artist’s Daughters*, about 1763.

Black and white chalks on blue paper, 11 x 8 $\frac{7}{8}$ in. Purchased with a contribution from the Heritage Lottery Fund, October 1996. To judge from extant drawings, it appears that Gainsborough especially favoured using studies to determine his more ambitious figure compositions in the uncertain (and ambitious) years of the early 1760s. The designs remained in his studio, perhaps to remind him how best he was able to overcome these particular figurative problems.





Figure 10. Thomas Gainsborough, *Group portrait of Peter Darnal Muilman, Charles Crockatt and William Keable*, c. 1748.

Oil on canvas, 30 x 25 in.

Purchased jointly with the Tate Gallery with contributions from the National Heritage Memorial Fund, the National Art Collections Fund, July 1993. This group has a striking intensity that shows the manner in which Gainsborough painted and researched individual elements. The figure of Muilman on the right is strongly influenced by Gravelot's example and Gainsborough clearly relied on a lay figure for the portrait of Crockatt on the left. Similarly the trunk of the oak tree in the centre and the burdock in the foreground are both closely observed.

Figure 11. Thomas Gainsborough, *Descent from the Cross after Rubens*, later 1760s.

Oil on canvas, 49³/₈ x 40 in.

Purchased with contributions from the Heritage Lottery Fund, the bequest of Miss Dorothy Elmer, the MGC/V&A Purchase Grant Fund and the National Art Collections Fund, November 1998. This unfinished study remained in the artist's studio until his death. The state of finish shows the degree of understanding Gainsborough wished to extract from scrutinising Rubens's design.





Figure 12. Thomas Gainsborough, *Portrait of Mrs Thomas Gainsborough* (1728–97), c. 1785.

Oil on card, 6 x 4½ in.

Given anonymously, December 1998. There is a tradition, not borne out by the number of extant paintings, that Gainsborough painted his wife on their wedding anniversary each year. This oil sketch on book board is exactly the same size as a number of small scale copies by Dupont of Gainsborough's portraits of the 1780s. The purpose of these studies is presently unexplained.

1786, he drew a woodman in a number of poses which provided Gainsborough with the material for him to paint *The Woodman*, a canvas which he was anxious to show Sir Joshua Reynolds shortly before he died. Tragically the painting was burnt in 1823 and is only known from a print by Peter Simon.⁹

Sadly the Society was unable to predict the price, and raise the money, for one of the magnificent studies of a promenading woman; it is now in the J. Paul Getty Museum in Los Angeles. Perhaps due to the unique way the collection of drawings has been accumulated, with a

full background of research and adequate funding, the collection in Sudbury rivals most other collections few of which have drawings of quality which show the range of the artist's work and development. For all the constraints outlined at the beginning of this essay, the painting collection is necessarily less comprehensive.

The energy of Mr Mellon's purchases in the 1960s prevented British museums from buying examples of his conversation pieces, a style which is closely linked to his years in Suffolk. Such a painting was a conspicuous gap in the collection of the Tate Gallery in London which was only filled with the loan of the double portrait of Mr and Mrs Joshua Kirby from the National Portrait Gallery. In 1984, the Tate purchased a lyrical portrait of Revd John Chafy playing his cello in a landscape and, no longer needing the Kirby portrait, the loan was transferred to Sudbury. Ten years later, the much finer triple portrait of Peter Darnal Muilman, Charles Crockatt and William Keeble (*fig. 10*) appeared at auction and the Society and the Tate purchased the work jointly. It must have been painted in about 1748 when the influence of Gravelot was still raw and made such an elegant contribution to the portrait of Muilman on the right. The pose of Keeble in the centre is extraordinarily adventurous and the seated figure of Crockatt on the left shows the traditional use of the lay figure.¹⁰ Four years later, in 1998, another conversation piece of a mother and daughter nursing a lamb with a ewe looking on was accepted in lieu of capital taxes and allocated by the Treasury to Gainsborough's House (*fig. 2*). Consequently Gainsborough's early conversation pieces are seen as well in Sudbury as at Yale or in the National Gallery in London.

An early unrecorded portrait of a Suffolk Rector, the Revd Tobias Rustat, was brought in for an opinion. It eventually became a gift and shows Gainsborough's uncompromising realistic approach to portraiture during the last years he spent in Suffolk. It forms an interesting comparison with the confident portrait of the Suffolk landowner Lambe Barry, long on loan to the museum, which the Society purchased last year. Barry is shown in a remarkably free landscape setting looking over his shoulder with a fleeting expression of disdain for the beholder. It is known that Barry visited Bath in both 1758 and 1759 and it is tempting to link the portrait with one of these visits.¹¹

The slump in the art market in the early 1990s enabled the Society to purchase the early 1760s portrait of Harriet, Lady Tracy, a middle-aged woman who had received a restorer's face-lift before being sold in the

United States. Although the overpaint on the head has flattened the impasto, the condition of the blue draperies are unaffected and recall the metallic folds of Gainsborough's mentor, van Dyck.¹² Flemish artists made a considerable contribution to Gainsborough's visual world especially during the 1760s. A number of copies after Van Dyck and Rubens appeared in Gainsborough's posthumous sales including a head-and-shoulder study from the Van Dyck of the Stuart Brothers in the National Gallery in London which is now in Sudbury and, yet more remarkable is the copy (*fig. 11*), probably taken from a print by Vosterman, of Rubens' huge Antwerp *Descent from the Cross*, a painting Gainsborough would have seen when he visited the city in 1783. It is unfinished and shows the artist's technique of drawing the outlines with dark brown paint, blocking in the main colours (we are told in restricted light) before working up the detail.¹³

One of the greatest gaps in the collection is the lack of a portrait of Gainsborough, so the gift in 1998 of the postcard-size portrait of his wife was especially welcome. Obviously painted as a private image there is a tradition that the artist painted his wife every year to mark their wedding anniversary; something which must remain questionable given the small number of portraits that are recorded. She is shown in a bonnet decorated with tangerine ribbon that provides a startling contrast to her ruddy complexion (*fig. 12*).

Other portraits and landscapes hang with those owned by the Society forming a coherent group of paintings from the whole of the artist's career. There are still funds to continue the programme of purchasing and so the collection will continue to grow and show other aspects of this remarkable artist. The Society is about to embark on a programme of development and refurbishment. It hopes to have a designated area to study the collection, provide educational facilities and improve its endowment income. To compliment Gainsborough, there is a programme of exhibitions and an open-access print workshop where, following Gainsborough's role as an innovative printmaker, practising artists can make etchings, screenprints and lithographs (*fig. 13*).

Although Gainsborough's House is a 'single-artist' museum, the collection has been crafted like few other institutions. Lacking the vagaries of natural selection



Figure 13. Gainsborough was an innovative etcher and aquatinter. The Society operates an open-access print workshop in the former coach house where practising print makers can make etchings, lithographs and screenprints. Courses in all these disciplines are arranged throughout the year.

through bequest and studio contents, the collection at Gainsborough's House has been built up from the thoughts and opinions of many scholars who, over the years, have discussed the relative merits of particular paintings and drawings. Nonetheless the Society has been blessed with the support and encouragement of many which has enabled it to show great works of art in a modest setting – a captivating combination suited to the honest approachability of the artist. There are perhaps better paintings per head of population in Sudbury than any other town in the south of England. And long may that be so.



NOTES

1. For a more detailed history of the purchase of Gainsborough's House, the formation of the Society, and its subsequent activities see F. Kinross, 'A history of Gainsborough's House Society 1958-1972' in *Gainsborough's House Review* 1994/95, pp. 38-49.
2. Brian Sewell in *Antiques Across the World*, no. 25, January/February 1985, p. 29.
3. The canvas is discussed by the author in 'The Gainsborough's House Collection: Starting from Scratch' in *Apollo*, August 1991, CXXXIV, pp. 112-5.
4. J. Hayes, *The Landscape Paintings of Thomas Gainsborough* [2 vols] Sotheby's Publications, London, no. 135 repr. and the present author's 'A Gainsborough Landscape for Sudbury' in *National Art-Collections Fund Review* 1988, pp. 103-5.
5. This aspect of the collection will be examined in an exhibition at Gainsborough's House called *Gainsborough Pop* from 2 November 2002 to 2 February 2003.
6. J. Hayes, *The Drawings of Thomas Gainsborough*, 2 vols, A. Zwemmer Ltd, London 1970, nos. 826 (pl. 119). The drawing and its sources are full discussed by the present author in 'Two works by Gainsborough' *National Art Collections Fund Review* 1992, pp. 8-12.
7. J. Hayes, *op. cit.*, 1970, no. 25 (plate 90).
8. See J. Hayes, *Gainsborough as Printmaker*, Yale University

Figure 14. Thomas Gainsborough, Wooded Landscape with Peasant Reading Tombstone
1780.

Soft-ground etching with some aquatint, 11⁵/₈ x 15¹/₂ in. Purchased with the Gainsborough Bicentenary Festival Fund and a contribution from the MGC/V&A Purchase Grant Fund, July 1989. This print is one of three complimentary landscape studies that Gainsborough intended to publish in February 1780. It is not known why he aborted the production; consequently prints produced by the artist himself are remarkably rare.

9. Press, New Haven and London 1971, pl. 43.
10. Respectively, J. Hayes, *op. cit.*, 1970, nos. 810 (pl. 343), 590 (pl. 181) and 853.
11. The three portraits are as follows: E. K. Waterhouse, *Gainsborough*, Edward Hulton Ltd, London 1958, no. 127, 420 (pl. 16) and 747 (pl. 19).
12. See P. I. Lewin, 'The Revd Tobias Rustat of Stutton and his family', *Gainsborough's House Society Annual Report* 1989/90, pp. 35-9 and cover illustration and Waterhouse, *op. cit.*, 1958, no. 41 (pl. 33).
13. Waterhouse, *op. cit.*, 1958, no. 672.
14. Waterhouse, *op. cit.*, 1958, nos. 1018 and 1027 (pl. 291) respectively.