The Belmont Murals in the Taft Museum
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The Taft Museum is the site for the most significant domestic mural paintings in early American art. These monumental decorations grace the main halls of the imposing mansion which was home to some of Cincinnati's most prominent families. The obscure history of the murals is integrally related to the history of the house. Unique in American art, the murals were the creation of America's first Afro-American artist to earn international acclaim, Robert S. Duncanson (1821-1872). Combining his early experience as a house painter with his love of landscape painting, Duncanson created the largest works of his career and a monument of early American decorative art.

The Taft and Longworth family traditions claim that Nicholas Longworth commissioned Robert S. Duncanson to decorate the halls of his home, "Belmont" (now the Taft Museum), with landscape murals around 1850. The "Belmont" murals consist of eight large landscape decorations in *trompe-l'oeil* French rococo frames (approximately 9' x 7'), three over-the-door floral vignettes, and two patriotic eagles that grace the entrance and cross halls of Longworth's former home. The monumental Hudson River School style landscapes stand as the most accomplished domestic mural paintings in America before the Civil War. Although they are painted in imitation of popular wallpaper designs, the murals are unique among domestic decorations, either wallpaper or mural designs. The "Belmont" murals mark the boundaries of three traditions in early American culture: wallpaper fashions, domestic mural painting, and the fine art of landscape painting.

The works are unsigned, and no contemporary records of the murals exist. They are not mentioned by writers, Longworth did not refer to them in his letters, and the lavish descriptions of the house written for the celebration of Longworth's golden wedding anniversary in 1857 do not describe them.1 In her 1939 biography of Nicholas Longworth, Comtesse Clara Longworth de Chambrun alludes to letters by her great-grandfather that cite the author of the murals as "the well-known decorative painter Duncanson."2 Unfortunately, these papers have been lost for the past fifty years. Despite the lack of contemporary documents, connoisseurship has consistently attributed the works to Robert S. Duncanson.3

A second-generation artist in the Hudson River School style, Robert S. Duncanson was the first Afro-American to earn an international reputation as a landscape painter. A self-taught artist, Duncanson initially apprenticed as a house painter. Born in 1821 in Fayette, New York, to an interracial family of handymen and house painters, Robert Duncanson first practiced the trade in Monroe, Michigan, where his family moved around 1832.4 For approximately one year Duncanson and an associate, John Gamblin, worked...
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The “Belmont” murals in the Taft Museum are the finest domestic mural decorations in the antebellum American culture.
in Monroe as painters and glaziers. The two disbanded around 1840 and young Duncanson moved to Cincinnati to embark on a career as an artist. During the 1840's he copied prints, painted portraits and estate views, and made daguerreotypes often traveling to Monroe and Detroit. His painting ultimately attracted the attention of Nicholas Longworth.

A major landholder and horticulturalist, Nicholas Longworth had a reputation for sponsoring artists he felt had both great merit and great need. In his correspondence to the sculptor Hiram Powers, Longworth often spoke about the arts in Cincinnati and on several occasions mentioned Duncanson. In several letters Longworth remarked that Duncanson was “one of our most promising painters.” Nicholas Longworth demonstrated great faith in the young black artist to entrust the decoration of “Belmont” to him. Duncanson had just become a landscape painter and had never executed anything of the scale and difficulty of the mural commission. Yet, Longworth obviously believed that Duncanson was capable of handling the project. It is remarkable that an artist in his formative stages could execute a mural commission of this complexity. During the remainder of his career Duncanson created no subsequent work on this scale establishing the murals as his most ambitious achievement. In this commission Duncanson was forced to combine his skills in interior decoration and contemporary wallpaper fashions with landscape painting. Longworth’s commission was grandiose in its decorative intentions as well as its scale. The challenge of creating the “Belmont” murals forced Duncanson into artistic maturity and launched his career as a landscape artist.

The sequence of landscape murals and overdoor decorations is a well-orchestrated decorative scheme. As guests entered Longworth’s home, a pair of idyllic landscapes of continental scenery flanked the foyer. Walking down the front hall into the cross hall the scenes became increasingly more picturesque and reminiscent of the Ohio River Valley. The style of the landscapes falls squarely within the Hudson River School tradition. Unlike many mural cycles, no theme or narrative seems to link the “Belmont” murals together. Although some of the murals allude to the “stream of life” or “voyage of life” theme, it is not consistently conveyed throughout the decorations. The motif of a river flowing through the stages of life was popular in Romantic landscape painting of the period. The idea was exemplified by Thomas Cole’s popular series The Voyage of Life (1842, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.) which was in a Cincinnati collection during Duncanson’s lifetime. The views for the “Belmont” murals seem to have been chosen simply to entertain Longworth’s appreciation for both the European and regional landscapes. Often taking land in payment for his fees as a young attorney, Longworth amassed great tracts of land. Some of the scenes in the murals may allude to his lands or depict actual sites in the Ohio River Valley. However, none of Duncanson’s sketches or studies survive, so it is impossible to link the murals to specific locations.

!["Belmont" murals during restoration 1931-1932. Transverse hall, northeast wall, Taft Museum. Discovered under many layers of wallpaper during the restoration of the Taft home, the murals were in good condition with the exception of the floral vignettes over the doorway to the music room.]
Unfortunately, the “Belmont” murals are a treasure that was lost for many years and rediscovered only in 1930. Their hidden history is intricately intertwined with that of the house. Begun in 1820 for the original owner, Martin Baum, the grand Federal style residence was purchased by Nicholas Longworth in 1829 to house his growing family and estate.1 “I have bought ‘Belmont’ which is large enough to contain all the Longworths in the nation.”10 Twenty years passed before Longworth commissioned the mural decorations for his front hallways to accompany his collection of paintings, sculptures, and decorative arts. The house served the family for almost two decades. But after the children had grown, and Nicholas Longworth died in 1863, “Belmont” was too large for the family of the eldest son, Joseph Longworth.

By the time Joseph Longworth sold the house in 1869 to David Sinton, the murals were covered with wallpaper.11 This ignominious fate occurred within Duncan's lifetime. In the late nineteenth century pattern wallpapers from England were very popular in America. For more than fifty years the murals were repeatedly covered with layers of patterned wallpaper. Only in 1927, upon the donation of the estate to the people of Cincinnati, did curiosity about the murals surface. At that time Mrs. Charles Phelps Taft (David Sinton’s daughter) mentioned that mural decorations, which she had never seen, were under the wallpaper in the entrance halls. She recalled her father discussing the decorations when talking about the history of the house.12 After receiving a construction permit in 1931, the paper was removed to reveal an exciting rediscovery in American art.

The murals were in excellent condition, having been heavily varnished and covered with several layers of wallpaper and paste. Repairing the landscapes required only minor inpainting to the skies in several panels. None of the elements of the design were lost. Unfortunately, one floral vignette over the music room doorway had to be entirely repainted and is now the work of a restorer. Originally three vignettes decorated a much larger doorway to the room. Only portions of these vignettes remained when the wallpaper was removed due to an earlier architectural change in the doorways. Almost completely eradicated, the flanking vignettes were covered with house paint during the restoration. After restoration was completed, the building was opened to the public on November 28, 1932, and the murals were received with enthusiasm. A reviewer for the Cincinnati Post expressed popular opinion when she wrote: “For many formerly familiar with the interior of the beautiful Taft home, the hall holds the biggest thrill.”13 The public greeted the “Belmont” murals with astonishment at their quality, scale, and the novelty of the decorative scheme. To appreciate this unprecedented monument of American decorative painting, it is necessary to view the murals in relation to domestic decoration, the mural tradition, and American landscape painting.

Landscapes and floral bouquets with trompe l'oeil frames were very popular in the mid-nineteenth century. This decorative scheme was derived from French wallpaper designs that were abundant and available all over America at this time.14 For the “Belmont” murals Duncan used a variation on the enframing motif found in Etienne Delicourt’s pattern book of wallpaper designs from around 1850.15 These wallpaper frames, called “fresco papers,” were used to border a variety of wallpaper patterns, including figural, floral, and scenic papers, and were very popular in the 1840’s. It is obvious in photographs of the restoration that a pedes
tal motif, similar to the wallpaper, was originally used below the wainscoting.

During Duncan's time French scenic papers were the most popular in America, but English papers were in favor earlier.16 The “Belmont” murals display influences from both sources. The Stephan Van Rensselaer home, formerly in Albany, New York (now reconstructed in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York) was decorated with English wallpaper with landscape vignettes around 1768. The enframing motif bespeaks the rococo flamboyance found in the frames of the “Belmont” murals. The English wallpaper vignettes were printed in grisaille to present the illusion of prints after paintings framed upon the wall. During the middle of the eighteenth century it was popular to glue

![Etienne Delicourt, Panel Set Wallpaper Designs, c. 1850.](https://example.com)
engraved prints onto the wall of a room with wallpaper frames. This decoration gave the appearance of a room of framed prints and was the source of the term “print room”.

Only after 1800 did the French develop the first full-color, continuous landscape views in imitation of paintings. Through the first half of the nineteenth century, French scenic papers were the rage in interior fashion. The most prevalent scenes were views of Italy and France; however, some views of America were also available. The panorama populated with lively figural groups dominated the design of these scenics. The illusion created by the French panoramic papers was of a continuous, unframed space breaking through the wall. The “Belmont” murals, on the other hand, were bordered stressing the verticality of the walls and mimicking framed paintings. This created the effect of a picture gallery with monumental landscape paintings elaborately framed. Although wallpaper was widely used in the nineteenth century, much of it has not survived in restored homes. From what is preserved, it is known that Duncanson used none of the existing wallpapers as an exact source for his murals.

The floral bouquets over the doorways are
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more closely identified with French wallpaper styles. Bouquets by designers such as Jean Zuber were intended to be incorporated into framed vertical wall panels. In American households this French wallpaper was often used to decorate fireboards. One design from around 1800 at Old Sturbridge Village provides the general prototype for the floral vignettes in the “Belmont” mural scheme. This floral bouquet style links directly with the fashions of early American domestic mural painters. These floral designs were also a standard for itinerant house painters and, like the wallpapers, were usually found as overmantels and on fireboards. Rarely were they used over entranceways and doors as in the “Belmont” murals.

Over a brief period of time Duncanson painted other still lifes earning a reputation for his “fruit and fancy pictures” in 1849 and 1850. Duncanson debuted at the Western Art Union in 1849 with a “fruit” painting as well as a landscape subject. He also exhibited a still life of fruit at the Michigan State Fair in 1849 where he won a premium. In addition, he earned his only entry to the American Art Union in 1850 with a fruit still life. The Detroit Free Press admired his work: “The paintings of fruit, etc., by Duncanson, are beautiful, and as they deserve, have elicited universal admiration.” Six of the eight extant still life paintings by Duncanson can be dated to 1849, just prior to the “Belmont” commission. Yet none of Duncanson’s easel paintings resemble the floral vignettes and, therefore, were not studies. His fruit still life paintings are in the style established by James (1749-1831) and Raphaelle Peale (1774-1825) with random groups of fruit arranged on a tabletop. The floral vignettes were executed in the manner of interior decoration derived from wallpaper patterns. The easel paintings bear little relation to the mural decoration except the subject matter and the time period in which they were created.

Above the arched doorways in the transverse hall are two eagle vignettes that appear to be the earliest of the mural decorations. Their style also differs from Duncanson’s easel paintings. Duncanson’s early painting the Vulture and its Prey, 1844, displays a similarly primitive understanding of the eagle’s anatomy. This is especially obvious where the neck joins the head to the body. However, the eagle vignette is not by the same hand as the easel painting. The blank tan background and the flattened volume of the eagle vignette are completely dissimilar to the rest of the mural scheme. If the eagles were part of Duncanson’s mural commission, he would have used a background similar to the floral vignettes or a color in the tonal range of the mural scheme. The two eagle vignettes more closely resemble the work typical of the late eighteenth century itinerant house painters. Such images were popular in the decades following the Revolutionary War, but occurred less frequently in the mid-nineteenth century. Therefore, another artist probably painted these vignettes at a much earlier date as part of an earlier decorative scheme in the cross halls.

Floral Vignette, c. 1850, oil on plaster, Taft Museum.

French floral bouquet wallpapers were the model for the floral vignettes in the mural commission.

Floral Fireboard, c. 1800, French printed wallpaper mounted on canvas. Old Sturbridge Village, Sturbridge, Massachusetts. Old Sturbridge photo by Henry E. Peach.

Robert S. Duncanson. Fruit Piece. 1849. oil on canvas. Detroit Institute of Arts; gift of the Estates of Miss Elizabeth Gray Walker and Mr. Henry Lyster Walker. Duncanson’s easel paintings of fruit still life subjects were in the early American tradition of James and Raphaelle Peale.
The “Belmont” murals are closely related to the domestic mural painting tradition in other ways, but they are far superior to any examples before the Civil War. Domestic mural painting in America was the domain of the itinerant painter. Advertising himself as a painter and glazier, the house painter was capable of painting a house, decorating it with murals, painting a coat of arms, gilding, lettering, coach, and sign painting. If a patron wanted, he could even have his likeness painted. The execution of these works was very crude and primitive. Most artisans had apprenticed in the house painting trade and had no fine arts training. Imitations of wallpaper were common for house painters executing interior decorations.26 Duncanson’s landscape murals for Longworth are no exception. In the “Belmont” murals
the levels of illusion are deep. The panels were painted as imitations of wallpaper that resembled framed paintings on a wall. It is ironic that Duncanson's murals were eventually covered by the wallpaper they were created to imitate.

Beginning his career as a painter and glazier in 1838, Robert Duncanson was very familiar with interior decorations and wallpaper fashions. Progressing onto easel painting around 1840, Duncanson spent his early years as an itinerant artist moving regularly among Cincinnati, Monroe, and Detroit painting portraits, genre subjects, and a few landscapes. Although his work matured slowly in the 1840's, Duncanson's artistic ability increased dramatically in the 1850's. In 1850 William Sonntag, the foremost landscape painter west of the Appalachian Mountains, moved into a studio adjoining Duncanson's on Fourth Street in Cincinnati. From Sonntag Duncanson learned many painting techniques, and his works began to reflect Sonntag's style. As the exhibition records for the 1850's show, under Sonntag's influence Duncanson began to specialize in landscape painting. Duncanson's ability to conceive and execute artworks of merit blossomed under Sonntag's example in the early 1850's. During this period of increasing artistic maturity, Duncanson created the "Belmont" murals.

Because of his early career as a painter and glazier, Robert Duncanson was experienced in executing interior decorations and knew how to approach this project. In several contemporary accounts Duncanson was described as a very fast painter. One British reviewer remarked: "He is one of the most rapid painters I have met with; his largest works have been begun and finished in ten days, perhaps not at work on them only, but on others during the same time." In general, it was not unusual for house decorators to work very quickly. One itinerant house painter claimed that he could "paint the entire walls of a parlor, with all of the several distances, and a variety of fancy scenery, palaces, villages, mills, vessels, &c., and, a beautiful set of shade trees on the foreground, and finish the same complete in less than five hours." This was certainly an exaggeration or the fellow was a very sloppy painter. Duncanson must have spent many months completing a mural project with this degree of accomplishment and complexity.

Painters and glaziers usually worked in teams and, for a project of this scale, Duncanson no doubt had a group of assistants to help him. From the letters exchanged between Duncanson and his friend Junius Sloan, it is probable that Sloan stayed with Duncanson during the winters of 1850 and 1851. Sloan was an Ohio artist who was tutored by Duncanson on an informal basis for many years. During the 1840's he, too, was an itinerant painter who had done sign and house painting before becoming a portrait and landscape artist. None of Sloan's surviving works resemble the murals, but his hand should not be evident in the murals. The assistants in a decorative project prepared the pigments, and only painted in the main highlights and shadows, and perhaps the frames and the vignettes. Duncanson would have drawn in the designs and painted the majority of the landscapes and detail work. The assistants may have been given the responsibility of copying a pattern for the floral vignettes. This might account for the differences between the vignettes, the landscape murals, and Duncanson's other easel paintings. It is likely that the vignettes are the work of an assistant, perhaps Junius Sloan, John Gamblin (Duncanson's earlier partner), or even Duncanson's brothers who were in the decorating business in Monroe, Michigan.

Although the "Belmont" murals are not firmly dated, a comparison with Duncanson's other paintings allows us to date the mural commission to around 1850-1852. When considering the qualitative development in Duncanson's easel paintings at this time, definite parallels in the murals

Robert S. Duncanson, Mural, c. 1850, oil on plaster. Taft Museum. The northeast mural in the transverse hall was probably the first mural painted in the decorative project.
can be established. Comparing the easel paintings to the mural commission allows one to consider the sequence in which the artist may have executed the murals. An overview of the murals makes it evident that, generally, the murals in the transverse hall recall Duncanson's work of the 1840's, while the work in the entrance hall looks forward to his more mature paintings of the 1850's. In addition, the entrance hall murals are more accomplished in draftsmanship, paint handling, and composition, displaying Duncanson's enhanced understanding of landscape painting in the 1850's. The following progression of the murals suggests a sequence in the creation of the landscapes over a period of perhaps two or three seasons between about 1850 and 1852. The murals in the transverse hall seem to have been painted first, then Duncanson executed the entrance hall murals later.

The more rustic murals of the cross hall resemble Duncanson's first landscape painted between 1848 and 1850 in both style and technical accomplishment. Duncanson seems to have begun the "Belmont" mural commission on
the northeast side of the cross hall. The dramatic cliffside in this mural dwarfs the two men in the middleground who gaze across an abyss to a high waterfall. The tepee in the foreground leads the eye into a wilderness scene more remote than any of the other murals. But, the drawing of the figures and the handling of the foliated hillside betray Duncanson’s immature early work. This panel is the weakest work in the mural scheme for these reasons and must be the earliest of the eight. The trees in this mural are treated in the same manner as those in the *Carp River, Lake Superior* painted in the summer of 1850. This suggests that Duncanson may have begun the commission in the fall or winter of 1850.

Across the hall Duncanson painted a family cabin scene nestled into a midwestern landscape. Off in the distance is a group of buildings reminiscent of the warehouses one found on the Cincinnati riverfront at that time. The family at the door of the cottage recalls the cabin scene in Duncanson’s earlier genre subject the *Drunkard’s Plight* (1845, Detroit Institute of Arts). Although the easel painting is melodramatic in its moralizing subject, the composition with a group of figures before a cabin link the two works. The trees and the cabin in the mural are much more sensitively rendered and imply that it was painted at a later date than the *Drunkard’s Plight*. The panel also confirms Duncanson’s growing awareness of the English tradition of picturesque landscape painting. The subject of a cottage nestled in the woods was popularized by Thomas Gainsborough’s (1727-1788) *Cottage Door* pictures of the 1780’s. These were well-known in mid-nineteenth century America through prints. Duncanson was familiar with Gainsborough’s work and used the British master’s example to amplify his earlier treatment of the cabin theme with curving, picturesque trees that caress the cabin.

Moving into the main entrance hall the four landscape murals have a distinctively pastoral mood inspired by European classical landscape painting. Whereas the transverse hall murals are picturesque landscape views, the entrance hall murals shine with the beautiful golden light of classical landscape painting. The change in aesthetic sensibility from the picturesque to the beautiful is characterized by the differences between the southwest mural in the cross hall and the northeast panel in the entrance hall. The composition of these two murals is remarkably similar with a river flowing from the distance into the foreground flanked by balancing masses of trees. But slight differences in the handling of the


The composition of these murals is very similar suggesting that Duncanson may have finished the transverse hall decorations with the southwest wall and begun the entrance hall on the northeast wall.
trees, rocks, and river change the entire mood of the paintings.

The transverse hall panel is a rocky riverscape that is unique among the murals because it is devoid of references to man's existence in nature. The focus of the composition is the swiftly flowing river. Surging forth from the distance, the river winds into the foreground where it cascades into a hidden ravine only to reappear pouring into the spectator's space. It breaks in the foreground plane and places the viewer precariously in the middle of the rapids. The haggard enframing trees, cascading fall, and rotttrunks present a forceful image of a torrent in the wilderness. This mural panel is undoubtedly the most accomplished of those in the transverse hall.

Walking into the entrance hall one notices that the northeast mural strikingly resembles a more tame variation on the compositional format of the transverse hall mural. This suggests a possible sequence in the execution of the murals from the transverse hall to the entrance hall. A torrent in the previous design, the river in the entrance hall panel gently flows into the foreground and safely off to the left. Two trees brimming with verdant foliage enframe the view onto some buildings nestled into the rolling hillside. The rocky riverbank is very accessible, and overall, the mood is harmonious natural reverie. The golden light emanating from the horizon bathes the scene with the idyllic glow of a classical landscape. Although the composition is almost the same as the mural in the transverse hall, Duncanson tamed the landscape motifs and created a pastoral scene that sets the mood for the remainder of panels in the entrance hall.

The two murals flanking the main entrance of the Taft Museum are directly inspired by classical pastoral landscapes. On the north side a grand estate is the focus of the painting and the stage for an anecdotal figure group boarding a boat. Tall stately trees anchor the left side of the panel, while a river winds into the luminous distance on the right. Although Duncanson's buildings and arched bridge are imaginary, the motifs originated in harbor scenes by Claude Lorrain and Joseph M. W. Turner.

The south mural flanking the front entrance displays the greatest influences from the European masters of the classical landscape. In a perfectly balanced composition a group of horse riders cross a river winding through a scene of idyllic serenity. The steady zig-zag flow of the river into the luminous horizon, the arched bridges, and the enframing tree groups are hallmarks of a classical landscape composition. Duncanson was certainly aware of the classical prototypes for these compositions through the printed volumes of masterworks circulated among artists. In this
case, Turner’s “Bridge in the Middle Distance” from the *The Liber Studiorum* could have served as a source as could several other compositions in that portfolio.

The fourth landscape and final panel in the entrance hall is the climax of the “Belmont” decorations and the most distinctive of the murals. Unlike the continental scenery of the other entrance hall murals, this panel depicts a wilderness scene with twisting tree trunks and a swiftly flowing river. A group of pioneers rest atop a rocky prominence, crowned by a rich rose sunset on the horizon that endows the scene with an inspirational mood. Nature is here witnessed by diminutive pioneers in all its grand and beautiful splendor. The bright hues of the sunset and the highly expressive tree trunks set this panel apart from all of the other murals. The thick textures of the tree bark, the details of foliage, and the brilliant sunset demonstrate a marked improvement in Duncanson’s paint handling.

Twisting, storm-blasted tree trunks were stock motifs in the repertoires of Hudson River School artists. For the first time in Duncanson’s work romantic trees reach their expressive potential in this mural panel. These trees become an anchor for Duncanson’s picturesque and sublime views of the 1850’s such as the *Landscape with Shepherd* (1852, Metropolitan Museum of Art). The cascading fall, enframed by twisting trees link the mural to the later casel painting. But the mural is emotionally elevated by the rich sunset conveying a reverence for nature. One tree trunk curling around another was a device described by British aesthetianer William Gilpin (1724-1804) as a picturesque formula for endowing paintings with a lively mood and inciting the imagination. This motif appears in the mural panel, yet Duncanson used this device to its greatest effect much later in the dramatically sublime *Western Forest*, 1857. The sunset mural is certainly the most accomplished of the murals in its technical achievements and elevated sentiments. Its relation to Duncanson’s later works of the 1850’s suggests that it was the last of the murals to be executed.

Although very little documentation exists link-
ing Duncanson to the murals, a comparison with his easel paintings leaves no doubt that the “Belmont” murals are his work. Nicholas Longworth’s commission came at a crucial period in Duncanson’s artistic development. Despite his having created nothing comparable prior to this commission, Duncanson summoned his great industry and rose to the challenge. The vast scale and complexity of the mural project challenged Duncanson’s technical capabilities. After he completed the project, his skills were dramatically enhanced, and the artist embarked on a career of critical and popular success in America, Canada, and England. By 1861, a reviewer for the Cincinnati Gazette raved: “Mr. Duncanson has long enjoyed the enviable reputation of being the best landscape painter in the West.”

Nicholas Longworth’s commission for the mural decorations launched Duncanson’s career and allowed him to become the first Afro-American artist to earn a national and international reputation. It is difficult to imagine Duncanson’s achieving this success without having overcome the challenge of the mural commission. In contracting the decoration of his home to a young, untrained artist, Longworth revealed a remarkable trust in Duncanson. The result of Longworth’s trust and his philanthropic spirit is a legacy in American art that now graces the halls of the Taft Museum. The “Belmont” murals are unique in American art, combining the traditions of interior fashions, mural painting, and the fine art of landscape painting. Duncanson’s eight landscapes and overdoor paintings are the most accomplished domestic decorations executed in America before the Civil War.

This essay has been adapted from an article for the catalog of the Taft Museum collection which is currently being prepared.
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