Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism: The Final Generations

Amanda B. Waterman

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

2016

Reading Committee:

Susan Casteras, Chair

Stuart Lingo

Joseph Butwin

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Art History

©Copyright 2016
Amanda B. Waterman

University of Washington

Abstract

Neo Pre-Raphaelitism: The Final Generations

Amanda B. Waterman

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:
Professor Susan P. Casteras
Art History

The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood was a group of seven young men who wanted to rebel against the teachings and orthodoxies of the Royal Academy. It was a short-lived movement, beginning in 1848 and ending in the early 1850s, but this dissertation will argue that their influence lived on and inspired a group of artists who were working at the turn of the century and well into the twentieth-century.

This dissertation is unprecedented; it is the first publication which aims to specifically categorize certain artists whose oeuvres are indebted to various generations of Pre-Raphaelitism. In short, I am characterizing these artists and thereby dubbing them "Neo-Pre-Raphaelite," channeling an early twentieth-century description of some of these artists. The most obvious reason to refer to them by this term is that they are stylistically and/or thematically linked to members of the original PRB or later generations / manifestations of Pre-Raphaelitism. The

individuals on whom I am focusing are all British and produced Pre-Raphaelite inspired work from roughly 1895-1950.

Consequently, the parameters within which I am working are threefold; firstly, the artists were exhibiting in the late 1880s/1890 – 1920 (a Neo-Pre-Raphaelite period that overlapped for most of them); secondly, those whose work echoed that of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood; and thirdly, persons having a working relationship with Edwin Austin Abbey—an American artist who was in a unique position to be a hybrid between the earlier PRB and these younger artists. Accordingly, the investigated artists are: Frank Cadogan Cowper, John Liston Byam Shaw, Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale, John William Waterhouse, and Thomas Cowper Gotch.

There is an additional investigation that establishes a Neo-Pre-Raphaelite classification which could exist outside of Abbey. This alternate combination was directly connected to Pre-Raphaelitism through Edward Burne-Jones, and demonstrated a visual indebtedness to both the Pre-Raphaelites and the artist—these devotees applied the unique Burne-Jonesian style to favorite subjects of the PRB. For the purposes of this dissertation, this supplementary circle has been termed "outliers"—in that they met the same aforementioned criteria but did not share an alliance with Abbey—including: Marie Spartali Stillman, Kate Bunce, Evelyn Pickering de Morgan, Sidney Meteyard, and John Melhuish Strudwick.

DEDICATION

To my Bubba

Mary Pogorzelski Smith (1922-2008)

You always said my time would come

To my Parents

For their constant love, support and perspective

For walking with me every step on this road and cheering me along the way

You made my dream a reality

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation evolved as an extension from my Master's Thesis *Frank Cadogan Cowper: The Last Pre-Raphaelite*. Over the course of massive research, I realized that there were others, as described in this dissertation, who continued the Pre-Raphaelite style into the twentieth-century. These Neo-Pre-Raphaelites ought to be thanked first and foremost; for, without whom, this opus could not exist. Because of our many years together, countless hours of researching, writing and editing, and the familiarity that results from it, I feel justified that they would graciously grant permission for me to dispense with formalities and henceforth refer to them on a first name basis.

Artistic muses aside, I wish to express my deepest and sincerest appreciation to all of those who took an active interest in my research and supported both it and me along the way. Above all, it is with great thanks to my Dissertation Advisor and Committee Chair, Professor Susan Casteras, for being my mentor and editor. She has been a constant source of encouragement, a vast font of knowledge, and a patient but persistent advisor who went to extraordinary lengths to push for the excellence she expected and of which I was capable. Professor Casteras was right, of course, in her motto that "great ideas happen over pastrami sandwiches" and to that end, ideas were formed, new considerations addressed, and challenging questions were posed over lunches and Pepsis. I am proud and honored to have been her advisee for the entirety of my graduate career and am a better person and academic for it. To my other supportive Committee Members, Professor Joseph Butwin and Professor Stuart Lingo, I thank you for all the positive encouragement along the way and for adding insights from your own respective specialties. Perhaps the most difficult part of the dissertation process is the paperwork, detail-oriented questions, and logistical matters that occur at the most inopportune time. Ann

Langford-Fuches, you are a doctoral candidate's academic advisor dream come true. Thank you for navigating me through the paperwork, finding solutions and making contingency plans when needed.

Traveling *to* the objects was of vital importance to my research. I am grateful to the Division of Art History for the awarded Pell Grants as well as the most generous Luce American Art Dissertation Research Award, which allowed me to travel to the Yale Art Gallery and explore the Edwin Austin Abbey Memorial Collection. The time at Yale was invaluable and it is with special appreciation that I acknowledge Tanya Pohrt (paintings department), who not only took me through the off-site facility that houses Abbey's vast material, but also for her generous offer of assisting in additional research. Lucy Gellman (prints and drawings department) was generous with her time and schedule, making it possible to examine certain Abbey preparatory sketches and chalk drawings. My contact at the Yale Center for British Art was kindred spirit Lisa Thornell-Gargiulo. A fellow Pre-Raphaelite enthusiast, she retrieved works by Rossetti, Millais, and Hunt after my appointment had ended so that the objects could be viewed and appreciated. It was a rare and enjoyable opportunity to explore such an extensive collection in person. And thank you to Professor Timothy Barringer for sharing a copy of his publication on Byam Shaw and our exchanges about the artist.

As would be expected, much of the research and examining of objects took place in England. Since I had maintained my contacts after our initial meetings during earlier research trips for the MA degree, they were delighted to continue their help and most generous with their time. At the Royal Academy, deepest thanks go to Archivist Mark Pomeroy who kept me aware of new correspondence relevant to my research that was accessioned into their collection over the past eight years; as well as Rachel Hewitt, who continually allowed me into storage and

pulled the Diploma works of Cowper and Abbey for my viewing and research pleasure. Her generosity permitted me ample time to examine the objects and for that, this art historian considers herself most lucky. Additionally, the Deputy Curator of the House of Commons, Parliament, Melanie Unwin, has been unfailingly generous and willing to assist with any inquiries in regards to the murals. I have been granted special access to the King's Corridor, the Archives of the 1908 Mural Program, as well as additional documentation she believed to be of use. Gotch's work was primarily found in one institution in Kettering, England -- the Alfred East Gallery. Special thanks to curator Katie Boyce for granting me access to Gotch's works in storage as well as carte blanche with the accompanying archival material. It was through this connection that I was given special permission as well as a personal copy of Adam Gotch's privately published "Gotch Family of Kettering 1755-1964" which not only had primary source and anecdotal material on T.C. Gotch and his family, but also personal photographs which otherwise would not have been available to any scholar.

Finally, to my family-- sister Heather, aunt Lanna, friends Jayme and Sarah, and my Beloved Intended, Terry—all of whom walked with me during this marathon. There are no words to express my gratitude and love for your unconditional support during the difficult times and the long-distance cheering during the easier ones. There were shoulders on which to cry, fresh eyes and ears to look and listen to my arguments or queries, hugs to give and receive, and that much needed "last push"—all of which helped me to summit Mount Dissertation. For that and everything else, I am eternally grateful. And in the words of our sweet Jason, "we did it!"

During your times of trials and sufferings,
When you saw only one set of footprints,
It was then that I carried you.
-- Excerpt from *Footprints*

I shall be telling this with a sigh
Somewhere ages and ages hence:
Two roads diverged in a wood, and I—
I took the one less traveled by,
And that has made all the difference.
--- Robert Frost

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

List of Figures ………………………………………………………. ii

Introductory Overview …………………………………………….. 1

Chapter 1: Pre-Raphaelitism and Beyond …………………………..18

Chapter 2: Edwin Austin Abbey …………………………………... 37

Chapter 3: Abbey and the Pre-Raphaelite Legacy ………………..... 59

Chapter 4: The *King's* Corridor ……………………………….... 80

Chapter 5: Frank Cadogan Cowper ………………………….… 108

Chapter 6: John Liston Byam Shaw………………………………. 138

Chapter 7: Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale …………………………. 169

Chapter 8: John William Waterhouse ……………………………. 184

Chapter 9: Thomas Cooper Gotch ……………………………..… 203

Chapter 10: Outliers ………………….…………………….…….. 233

Chapter 11: Conclusion …………………………………..……. 265

Bibliography ……………………………………………………... 274

Please note that the electronic version of this dissertation does not include images.

List of Images

Fig. 1 John Everett Millais, *Princes in the Tower*, 1871
Fig. 2 Edwin Austin Abbey, *May Day Morning*, 1890
Fig. 3 Edwin Austin Abbey, *Fiammetta's Song*, 1894
Fig. 4 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *A Vision of Fiammetta's Song*, 1878
Fig. 5 Edwin Austin Abbey, *Play scene from "Hamlet,"* 1897
Fig. 6 Edwin Austin Abbey, *Coronation of King Edward VII, August 9th,1902*, 1902-07
Fig. 7 Edwin Austin Abbey, *Fair is my Love,* 1900
Fig. 8 Edwin Austin Abbey, *Who is Sylvia? What is She, That all the Swains Commend Her?* (1896-99, reworked in 1900)
Fig. 9 Edwin Austin Abbey, *The Lute Player*, 1899
Fig. 10 John Everett Millais, *Rosalind in the forest*, 1868
Fig. 11 Frank Cadogan Cowper, *La Belle Dame Sans Merci,* 1905
Fig. 12 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *Helen of Troy,* 1863
Fig. 13 John Everett Millais, *Bridesmaid*, 1851
Fig. 14 John Everett Millais, *Ophelia*, 1851-52
Fig. 15 Edwin Austin Abbey, *King Lear*, 1898
Fig. 16 Ford Madox Brown, *Cordelia's Potion,* 1866-72
Fig. 17 Ford Madox Brown, *Cordelia parting from her sisters*, 1850
Fig. 18 Thomas Cooper Gotch, *The Dancing Lesson*, 1905
Fig. 19 Thomas Cooper Gotch, *Study for Golden Youth*, 1906
Fig. 20 Edwin Austin Abbey, *Richard, Duke of Gloucester and the Lady Anne*, 1896
Fig. 21 John Gilbert, *Richard III* from Dalziel Brothers' *The works of Shakespeare*, 1867
Fig. 22 Daniel Maclise, *Play scene from "Hamlet,"* 1842
Fig. 23 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *Bocca Baciata*, 1859
Fig. 24 Kate Bunce, *The Keepsake*, 1898-1901
Fig. 25 Evelyn Pickering de Morgan, *The Hour Glass*, 1905
Fig. 26 Frank O. Salisbury, *Henry VIII and Katharine of Aragon Before the Papal Legate at Blackfriar's,* 1908-10
Fig. 27 Earnest Board, *Latimer Preaching before Edward VI at St. Paul's Cross,* 1908-10
Fig. 28 J.L. Byam Shaw, *The Entry of Queen Mary I and Princess Elizabeth into London*, 1908-10
Fig. 29 Henry A. Payne, *Plucking the White and Red Roses in Old Temple Garden*, 1908-10
Fig. 30 Denis Eden, *John Cabot and his Sons Receive the Charter From Henry VII in Search of New Lands*, 1908-10
Fig. 31 Frank Cadogan Cowper, *Erasmus and Thomas More Visit the Children of Henry VII at Greenwich*, 1908-10
Fig. 32 Ford Madox Brown, *The Seeds and Fruits of English Poetry,* 1853
Fig. 33 Edwin Austin Abbey, *Study for the Trial of Queen Catherine of Aragon, from Henry VIII*, n.d.
Fig. 34 Edward Burne-Jones, *Briar-Rose Series: Rose Bower*, 1870-90
Fig. 35 Hans Holbein, *Portrait of Henry VIII*, 1540

Fig. 36 William Holman Hunt, *King of Hearts,* 1862-63
Fig. 37 Albrecht Dürer, *Portrait of Erasmus,* 1520
Fig. 38 Hans Holbein, *Desiderius Erasmus*, 1523
Fig. 39 Frank Cadogan Cowper, *St. Agnes in Prison receiving the "shining white garment,"* 1905
Fig. 40 Frank Cadogan Cowper, *Lucretia Borgia reigns in the Vatican in the absence of Pope Alexander VI*, 1914
Fig. 41 John Everett Millais, *The Huguenot*, 1852
Fig. 42 John Everett Millais, *Ferdinand Lured by Ariel*, 1849-50
Fig. 43 Frank Cadogan Cowper, *Self Portrait,* 1899
Fig. 44 Frank Cadogan Cowper, *An Aristocrat answering the summons to execution—Paris 1793*, 1901
Fig. 45 Frank Cadogan Cowper, *Hamlet- The Churchyard Scene*, 1902
Fig. 46 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *Ecce Ancilla Domini!*, 1849-50
Fig. 47 Edward Burne-Jones, *Annunciation*, 1879
Fig. 48 Edwin Austin Abbey, detail of Ophelia from *Play scene from Hamlet,* 1897
Fig. 49 John Everett Millais, *St. Agnes' Eve,* 1857
Fig. 50 John Everett Millais, *St. Agnes' Eve*, 1854
Fig. 51 Edwin Austin Abbey, *Study for The Reconciliation of the Merchant Taylor's Company with the Skinners' Company in the Time of Richard III, after a quarrel as to precedence*, 1904
Fig. 52 Jacques-Louis David, *Consecration of the Emperor Napoleon I and Coronation of the Empress Josephine in the Cathedral of Notre Dame de Paris on 2 December 1804*, 1808
Fig. 53 Diego Velázquez, *Pope Innocent X,* 1650
Fig. 54 John Everett Millais, *John Henry, Cardinal Newman*, 1881
Fig. 55 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *Borgia,* 1851
Fig. 56 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *Lucretia Borgia,* 1860-61
Fig. 57 Frank Cadogan Cowper, *Vanity*, 1907
Fig. 58 Frank Cadogan Cowper, *Blue Bird,* 1918
Fig. 59 Edward Burne-Jones, *Sidonia von Bork*, 1860
Fig. 60 Giulio Romano, *Portrait of Isabella d'Este*, 1531
Fig. 61 J.L. Byam Shaw, *Jezebel*, 1896
Fig. 62 Frederick Sandys, *The Pearl,* early to mid 1860s
Fig. 63 Frank Cadogan Cowper, *Damsel of the lake called Nimüe the enchantress*, 1924
Fig. 64 Edward Burne-Jones, *The Beguiling of Merlin,* 1874
Fig. 65 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *Beata Beatrix,* 1863
Fig. 66 Frank Cadogan Cowper, *The Four Queens Find Lancelot Sleeping*, 1954
Fig. 67 Frank Cadogan Cowper, *La Belle Dame Sans Merci,* 1926
Fig. 68 Frank Cadogan Cowper, *La Belle Dame Sans Merci*, 1946
Fig. 69 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *King Arthur and the Weeping Queens,* 1857
Fig. 70 Edwin Austin Abbey, *Before the Princess's Pavilion—Love's Labour Lost*, 1891
Fig. 71 J.L. Byam Shaw, *Silent Noon,* 1894
Fig. 72 John William Waterhouse, *Ophelia,* 1889

Fig. 73 John Everett Millais, *Spring (Apple Blossoms),* 1859
Fig. 74 William Holman Hunt, *The Hireling Shepherd,* 1851-52
Fig. 75 J.L. Byam Shaw, *Queen of Hearts,* 1896
Fig. 76 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *Regina Cordium*, 1860
Fig. 77 J.L. Byam Shaw, *Evelyn, Daughter of J.N. Pyke-Nott, Esq.*, 1898
Fig. 78 Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale, *Sir Lancelot du Lake*, 1897
Fig. 79 Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale, *Spring*, 1897
Fig. 80 Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale, *The pale complexion of true love*, 1898
Fig. 81 Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale, *The Little Foot-Page*, 1905
Fig. 82 William Holman Hunt, *Isabella and the Pot of Basil*, 1867
Fig. 83 John Everett Millais, *Lorenzo and Isabella*, 1850-51
Fig. 84 Frank Cadogan Cowper, *Lorenzo and Isabella,* 1900
Fig. 85 Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale, *June is Dead,* 1915
Fig. 86 J.L. Byam Shaw, *"In a Gondola"* from *Poems of Robert Browning*, 1897
Fig. 87 Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale, *Guinevere (The somber close of that voluptuous day)*, 1910-11
Fig. 88 Charles Allston Collins, *Convent Thoughts*, 1851
Fig. 89 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *Arthur's Tomb: The Last Meeting of Lancelot and Guinevere*, 1855
Fig. 90 J.L. Byam Shaw, "*…There an abbess lived for three years…"*, 1906
Fig. 91 John William Waterhouse, *A Flower Stall,* 1868
Fig. 92 John William Waterhouse, *Lady of Shalott*, 1888
Fig. 93 Jules Bastien-Lepage, *Joan of Arc,* 1879
Fig. 94 William Holman Hunt, *Study for Lady of Shalott- the lady sitting cross-legged*, 1850
Fig. 95 William Holman Hunt, *Study for Lady of Shalott,* 1850
Fig. 96 William Holman Hunt, *Study for Lady of Shalott—the lady in her boat*, 1850
Fig. 97 William Holman Hunt, *Lady of Shalott*, 1857
Fig. 98 William Holman Hunt, *Lady of Shalott*, 1886-1905
Fig. 99 Elizabeth Siddal, *The Lady of Shalott at her loom,* 1853
Fig. 100 John Everett Millais, *The Lady of Shalott*, 1854
Fig. 101 Arthur Hughes, *The Lady of Shalott,* 1873
Fig. 102 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *The Lady of Shalott*, 1857
Fig. 103 John William Waterhouse, *Ophelia*, 1889
Fig. 104 Edward Burne-Jones, *Laus Veneris*, 1868
Fig. 105 John William Waterhouse, *St. Cecilia*, 1895
Fig. 106 Edward Burne-Jones, *Astrologia,* 1865
Fig. 107 John William Waterhouse, *Crystal Ball (without skull)*, 1902
Fig. 108 John William Waterhouse, *Tristan and Isolde Sharing the Potion*, 1916
Fig. 109 Edward Burne-Jones, *Sigurd the Crusader*, 1862
Fig. 110 Edward Burne-Jones, *Sleeping Beauty*, 1871
Fig. 111 John William Waterhouse, *Ariadne*, 1898
Fig. 112 Thomas Cooper Gotch, *Sharing Fish*, 1891
Fig. 113 Thomas Cooper Gotch, *My Crown and Sceptre*, 1891
Fig. 114 Ford Madox Brown, *English Boy*, 1860

Fig. 115 John Everett Millais, *Christ in the House of His Parents*, 1849-50
Fig. 116 Edward Burne-Jones, *Merciful Knight*, 1863
Fig. 117 Thomas Cooper Gotch, *The Child Enthroned*, 1894
Fig. 118 Edwin Austin Abbey, *A Celtic Queen*, 1898
Fig. 119 Thomas Cooper Gotch, *The Awakening*, 1898
Fig. 120 Thomas Cooper Gotch, *Dawn of Womanhood*, 1900
Fig. 121 John William Waterhouse, *Annunciation*, 1914
Fig. 122 Thomas Cooper Gotch, *Holy Motherhood*, 1902
Fig. 123 Ford Madox Brown, "*Take your Son, Sir*", c. 1851-92
Fig. 124 Frank Cadogan Cowper, *Morning of the Nativity*, 1908
Fig. 125 Ford Madox Brown, *Marie Spartali at her Easel*, 1869
Fig. 126 Marie Spartali Stillman, *Self-Portrait*, 1871
Fig. 127 Marie Spartali Stillman, *Self-Portrait (On a Balcony)*, 1874
Fig. 128 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *Regina Cordium*, 1866
Fig. 129 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *Dante's Dream,* 1871
Fig. 130 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *Bower Meadow,* 1872
Fig. 131 Marie Spartali Stillman, *Beatrice*, 1896
Fig. 132 Marie Spartali Stillman, *Beatrice*, 1898
Fig. 133 Edward Burne-Jones, *The Tower of Brass*, 1888
Fig. 134 Edward Burne-Jones, *The Golden Staircase*, 1872-80
Fig. 135 Kate Bunce, *Melody*, 1895-97
Fig. 136 Jan van Eyck, *The Arnolfini Wedding*, 1434
Fig. 137 Jan van Eyck, detail (mirror) of *Arnolfini Wedding*, 1434
Fig. 138 Kate Bunce, detail (mirror) of *Melody*, 1895-97
Fig. 139 William Holman Hunt, *The Awakening Conscience*, 1853
Fig. 140 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *Veronica Veronese*, 1872
Fig. 141 Sidney Meteyard, *St. Cecilia*, n.d.
Fig. 142 Edward Burne-Jones, *St. Cecilia*, 1897
Fig. 143 John Melhuish Strudwick, *St. Cecilia*, 1896
Fig. 144 Sidney Meteyard, *"I am half-sick of shadows,"* 1913
Fig. 145 John William Waterhouse, *"I am half-sick of shadows,"* 1915
Fig. 146 J.L. Byam Shaw, *Lady of Shalott*, 1898
Fig. 147 John Melhuish Strudwick, *Songs without words,* 1875
Fig. 148 John Melhuish Strudwick, *Isabella*, 1879
Fig. 149 John Melhuish Strudwick, *The Golden Thread*, 1885
Fig. 150 Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale, *Time the Physician*, 1900
Fig. 151 John Melhuish Strudwick, *The Golden Thread* (bottom register), 1885
Fig. 152 John Melhuish Strudwick, *The Golden Thread* (top register), 1885
Fig. 153 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *Fair Rosamund*, 1861
Fig. 154 Edward Burne-Jones, *Queen Eleanor and Fair Rosamund*, 1862
Fig. 155 Evelyn Pickering de Morgan, *Queen Eleanor and Fair Rosamund*, n.d.
Fig. 156 Evelyn Pickering de Morgan, *The Gilded Cage*, 1900-19
Fig. 157 Edward Burne-Jones, *Dorigen of Bretagne longing for the safe return of her husband*, 1871

Introductory Overview

"It doesn't matter how beautifully a thing is painted, it is no good if it isn't right - it's got to come out... What does it matter how you do it? Paint it with a shovel if you can't get your effect any other way."
-- John Everett Millais[1]

STATE OF THE QUESTION

The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood was a group of seven young men who wanted to rebel against the teachings and orthodoxies of the Royal Academy. It was a short-lived movement, beginning in 1848 and ending in the early 1850s, but this dissertation will argue that their influence lived on and inspired a group of artists who were working at the turn of the century and well into the twentieth-century.

This dissertation is unprecedented; it is the first publication which aims to specifically categorize certain artists whose oeuvres are indebted to various generations of Pre-Raphaelitism. In short, I am characterizing these artists and thereby dubbing them "Neo-Pre-Raphaelite," channeling an early twentieth-century description of some of these artists. The most obvious reason to refer to them by this term is that they are stylistically and/or thematically linked to members of the original PRB or later generations / manifestations of Pre-Raphaelitism. In some instances, artists' correspondence and other documentation has survived-- irrefutable evidence specifically aligning them with this earlier movement. The individuals on whom I am focusing are all British and produced Pre-Raphaelite inspired work from roughly 1895-1950.

Numerous artists have been deemed in scholarly literature from the 1980s onward as the alleged "last" of the Pre-Raphaelites. Such candidates usually start with William Holman Hunt and Edward Burne-Jones, original PRB member and associate, respectively; continue to self-proclaimed award winner Ford Madox Ford (to be discussed in chapter 1); and end with a

[1] "Famous Artist Quotes", *Collage in Art,* http://collageinart.net/famous-artists-quotes/ (accessed January 27, 2016).

sampling of later Victorians Frank Cadogan Cowper, Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale, and John William Waterhouse.[2] However, in 2008, my MA thesis argued that ultimately, the final and "true" proponent of Pre-Raphaelitism was indeed Cadogan Cowper, a claim supported by the fact that his oeuvre– in the same manner as Holman Hunt-- maintained a faithful application of the original spirit of Pre-Raphaelitism until his death in 1958.

This dissertation extends the scope and argues that there were others, like Cowper, whose production reflect a strong connection to the styles and principles of the mid 19th century group. As such, the artists were, in general, aesthetically similar to and contemporaries of Cowper. Furthermore, the parameters of this post-Victorian group are such that their production, roughly from 1890-1920, typically echoes one or more members of the original PRB, be it stylistically, compositionally, or thematically. A vital component of these Neo-Pre-Raphaelites are that while they knew each other (most often from their studies at the RA schools or via mutual friends), they also were acquainted with, studied under, or were part of a social circle with Edwin Austin Abbey. Therefore, an indebtedness to the PRB as well as an association with Abbey (to be discussed later in this chapter) will prove to be the ultimate reason that these artists can be grouped together.

Yet, while Cowper maintained a Pre-Raphaelite style throughout the majority of his career, and Thomas Cooper Gotch was a late arrival to an interest in Pre-Raphaelitism, the turn-of-the-century provided an atmosphere where not every work created by these Neo-Pre-Raphaelite artists followed the Pre-Raphaelite inclinations. At times, these proclivities were more prevalent in different phases of individual careers, and for others, these segments appear as fluid notations throughout the entirety of a professional life. It was a conscientious decision for

---

[2] Aubrey Beardsley has also been named the "last" Pre-Raphaelite, but his nomination for this title is an anomaly, as his work is more closely stylistically aligned with other movements.

this dissertation that only the most compelling works of art would be selected for comparison to the PRB and Abbey. Whereas Cowper's work continues a thread of Pre-Raphaelitism until the 1950s, it ought to be noted that the bulk of the visual material explored is dated no later than 1900, with an occasional example made within the first quarter of the twentieth-century. Reasons for periods of non-Pre-Raphaelite inspired work differ from artist to artist. These phases in a career were often the result of the new modern age; there was an interest in subject matter aligned with current events or advancements in technology; individuals were called to military service during WWI; or death due to illness or age.

Consequently, the parameters within which I am working are threefold; firstly, the artists were exhibiting in the late 1880s/1890 – 1920 (a Neo-Pre-Raphaelite period that overlapped for most of them); secondly, those whose work echoed that of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood; and thirdly, persons having a working relationship with Abbey. Accordingly, my focus will be on the following artists: Frank Cadogan Cowper (hereafter referred to as CC), John Liston Byam Shaw, Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale, John William Waterhouse, and Thomas Cowper Gotch.

It will ultimately be revealed in chapter 10 that there is another possibility for a Neo-Pre-Raphaelite circle stemming this time from Burne-Jones' influence. Such an investigation was necessary in order to establish that a Neo-Pre-Raphaelite classification could exist outside of those surrounding Abbey. Like the "Abbey Group," this alternate combination was directly connected to Pre-Raphaelitism through Burne-Jones, and demonstrated a visual indebtedness to both the Pre-Raphaelites and Burne-Jones—these devotees applied the unique Burne-Jonesian style to favorite subjects of the PRB. For the purposes of this dissertation, this supplementary circle has been termed "outliers"—in that they met the same aforementioned criteria but did not

share an alliance with Abbey—including: Marie Spartali Stillman, Kate Bunce, Evelyn Pickering de Morgan, Sidney Meteyard, and John Melhuish Strudwick.

SCHOLARSHIP

Art historical scholarship has yet to establish a definite classification of artists who can be considered, as a whole, Neo-Pre-Raphaelites. The phrase "the last of the Pre-Raphaelites" or a similar variation has been used to describe Burne-Jones, Fortescue-Brickdale, Hunt, and Frank Cadogan Cowper.[3]

The existing literature which discusses the specific artists can be placed in three succinct categories: exhibition catalogues, publications about individual artists, and resources about the Parliamentary murals. The 1908 murals are an important part of the Neo-Pre-Raphaelite historiography; in fact this very term was used in 1908 by the German critic Hermann Muthesius who saw the Parliament murals produced by Cowper, Shaw and Eden.[4] Muthesius prophetically described the works produced by these three muralists as "Neo-Pre-Raphaelite."[5] Critics at the time viewed this particular band of artists, like their eminent predecessors, the PRB, as struggling to break free from the restrictions of the Royal Academy traditions. Muthesius, in particular, saw them as the "most promising hope for a revival of decorative art in Britain."[6]

---

[3] Aubrey Beardsley, also termed a "last Pre-Raphaelite" will not be considered, as his work does not fall within the stylistic and other characteristics of which I am using to define Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism. While he did receive encouragement from Burne-Jones, Beardsley, who died in 1898, is stylistically more aligned with the Aesthetic and Art Nouveau movements.

[4] William Denis Eden was a student at the Royal Academy from 1898-1901; Royal Academy Archives. Eden's mural, *John Cabot and his sons receive the charter from Henry VII to sail in search of new lands, 1496*, was commissioned for the Palace of Westminster by William Henry Wills, 1st Lord Winterstoke.

[5] Quoted in Clare A.P. Willsdon, *Mural Painting in Britain 1840-1940: Image and Meaning* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 96; Letter from Edwin Austin Abbey to the Earl of Carlisle, a patron of Cowper's panel (17 July 1908).

[6] Quoted in ibid., 97; H. Muthesius, "Kunst and Leben in England," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst,* 13 (1902), 69.

Exhibition catalogues offer perhaps the most information about a variety of these Neo-Pre-Raphaelite artists, by way of color illustrations paired with scholarly text or brief visual analysis of a particular image. The most recent Pre-Raphaelite exhibition opened at the Tate Britain in fall 2012. The exhibit *Pre-Raphaelites: Victorian Avant-Garde* brings together over 150 works in different media, establishing the PRB as an early example of the avant-garde. The catalogue offers a collection of essays which describe the movement in terms of its origin, manifesto, history, artistic beliefs related to beauty, spirituality, and aesthetics. Interspersed in each chapter are catalogue entries about particular objects—most of which are already established as canonically Pre-Raphaelite.

Nonetheless, a serious omission of this exhibit is its lack of attention to and acknowledgement of later, Neo-Pre-Raphaelite, generations of artists. The last section of the catalogue, written by Elizabeth Prettejohn, is entitled *The Pre-Raphaelite Legacy*. This chapter is particularly short and attempts to provide a placement of Pre-Raphaelitism in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Prettejohn discusses retrospective exhibitions about particular artists, like Millais and Rossetti, but offers only limited commentary, a mere sentence or so, on the Neo-Pre-Raphaelite successors:

> Among English artists of the turn of the twentieth-century, there was a notable phase of Pre-Raphaelitism revival in the work of such artists as Eleanor Fortescue Brickdale and John Liston Byam Shaw—artists who are themselves due for a revival after decades of neglect.[7]

Shaw's 1901 work, *Boer War*, as well as Cowper's *Saint Agnes* are singled out, illustrated and briefly commented upon;

> Shaw…returns again to Millais' *Ophelia* in the tangled foliage and vibrant color of the riverbank, and also to the social concerns of early Pre-Raphaelitism… Cowper's *St. Agnes in Prison* (1905) manages to combine an allusion to the mystical encounter of

[7] Elizabeth Prettejohn, "The Pre-Raphaelite Legacy," in *Pre-Raphaelites: Victorian Avant-Garde,* ed. Timothy Barringer et al. (London: Tate Publishing), 234.

> angel and human in Rossetti's *Ecce Ancilla Domini!* with realist details borrowed from Millais' *The Return of the Dove to the arc*, as to reconcile the two-halves of the original Pre-Raphaelite project, half a century on.[8]

Two incredibly useful catalogues which helped to ground arguments presented in the chapters to come are *Heaven on Earth* (Anderson, 1994) and *The Last Romantics* (Christian, 1989). The strength of Anderson's publication lies in the vast quantity of Neo-Pre-Raphaelite imagery reproduced and briefly discussed in subsequent succinct catalogue entries. There are multiple entries for each of the following artists: Cowper, Pickering de Morgan, Fortescue-Brickdale, Gotch, Shaw, Marie Spartali Stillman, J.M. Strudwick, and John William Waterhouse. Each image is cross-referenced with others presented in the catalogue according to style, theme, or movement. Both catalogues provides short entries with basic, and often minimal, information on the literary reference of the image (Christian's catalogue is particularly heavy in this subject-based approach), stylistic characteristics that are specific to the artist, or iconographic interpretation. Anderson's publication occasionally includes preparatory sketches by the artist which are useful for consideration of the final image.

John Christian's *Last Romantics* aids the scholar in a different way. Christian has divided the catalogue entries into subsections, such as "Burne-Jones and his followers" and "The Early Academic Tradition*."* The artists, therefore, are paired together in a more stylistic way. For example, works by Pickering de Morgan and Spartali Stillman are illustrated and discussed after those by Burne-Jones, thereby visually linking the two women as his stylistic followers, an argument with which I agree. In the section titled *the early academic tradition,* Abbey, Gotch, Cowper, Shaw and Fortescue-Brickdale are included. However, a visual analysis of the selected works of art emphasizes only the stylistic and compositional similarities.

---

[8] Ibid., 234-235.

The abundance of artists that Christian has provided (grouping them together) gives credence to my argument that such a group exists and provides fodder for future scholarship. Christian's division of artists, therefore, provides a starting point for broad categorization. His chapter discussing those working in the early academic tradition alone includes twenty-five artists, all of whom might be considered Neo-Pre-Raphaelites.

The exhibition catalogue for the 2012 show *A Pre-Raphaelite Journey: The Art of Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale*, is not only a catalogue for the exhibit but also serves as the first monograph to be produced of this artist's work. It was the first exhibition of her work in over forty years, bringing together pieces from museums and private collections. An essay by scholar / curator Pamela Gerrish Nunn offers a look at the artist's life, opportunities, influences, and indebtedness to Pre-Raphaelitism. The catalogue entries for each image are concise, and of the over thirty works reproduced, the vast majority of them appear in color.

An earlier catalogue and monograph is *Byam Shaw 1872-1919* (1986). The introductory essay offers an overview of Shaw's life as well as excerpts from Rex Vicat Cole's 1932 biography of the artist, *The art and life of Byam Shaw*. The most valuable part of this catalogue / monograph is the collection of titles presented from Shaw's oeuvre. Not every image is given a text entry, but those that do are brief but informative. While it is a short catalogue (43 pages), it is the only source I have found thus far in my research that attempts to bring a collection of Shaw's work together to be discussed in a single publication.

Apart from these types of publications which offer a sampling of works by various individual artists, there is a selection of literature, though slim, which provides more insight into particular artists. The volumes are not necessarily large or prolific, but they do exist in limited numbers.

Frances Spalding's *Magnificent Dreams: Burne-Jones and the late Victorians* (1978) is a slim publication discussing late Victorian classicism, focusing primarily on the principal artists of the Grosvenor Gallery—George Watts and Burne-Jones, though Rossetti and his relationships are also examined throughout. There are analyses of several works by each of these artists as well as stylistic links with a brief selection of their followers. For example, Spalding discusses (albeit cursorily) the relationships between Burne-Jones and Rossetti; Pickering de Morgan and Rossetti; Burne-Jones and Watts; and finally between Rossetti with Sandys, Val Princep, Albert Moore and Frederick Leighton.

For my needs, Spalding's book is helpful due to its comments on the established relationships concerning Burne-Jones, Rossetti, and Pickering de Morgan. Furthermore, it allows me to contradict the notion that "the Pre-Raphaelite movement was in the ascendancy by the sixties and reached its zenith in the eighties."[9] Spalding additionally claimed that

> Pre-Raphaelitism never died, but merely went to ground and that faint reverberations of it are still to be found in the annual Royal Academy summer exhibitions. Well into the second and third decade of this century [1920s, 1930s], work was being produced in the Pre-Raphaelite tradition, although the visions gradually paled, becoming increasingly decorative and lacking in conviction.[10]

While I understand and agree with Spalding's assertion that there was work being produced in the Pre-Raphaelite style well into the twentieth-century, I disagree that it merely paled, functioned as merely decorative, or lacked conviction. I concur that the canonical understanding of Pre-Raphaelitism would support the argument that later generations of the PRB were successfully active in the 1880s. However, I do not believe that the trajectory / incarnation of Pre-Raphaelitism ended in the last decades of the nineteenth-century. Instead, as this dissertation will posit, the artists whom I am calling "Neo-Pre-Raphaelite" were very aware of their

[9] Frances Spalding, *Magnificent Dreams: Burne-Jones and the late* Victorians (New York: Dutton, 1978), 34.
[10] Ibid, 78.

relationship to the style of the original PRB and were very purposeful in the subject and stylistic choices that they made. It is a radically different view from these artists than was presented in Spalding's 1978 publication, but I firmly believe it is one that holds merit and needs to be added to the canon of late Victorianism.

Rex Vicat Cole wrote an indispensible biography about Byam Shaw entitled *The Art and Life of Byam Shaw* (1932). This is not a scholarly publication but it does provide firsthand accounts of the artist that prove essential as primary source material.

Additionally, the 1974 exhibition dedicated to the work of Edwin Austin Abbey organized by the Yale University Art Gallery aimed to restore Abbey

> to his rightful place as one of the most talented illustrators of the 19th century and a dazzling story-telling painter. Abbey in many ways is the last of the great Anglo-American history painter in the tradition of Sir Joshua Reynolds, John Singleton Copley, and Washington Allston. He has a broad knowledge of antiquity and the Middle Ages, of costume, architecture, and history of Europe caused him to leave his native land; however, he remained "American" both in terms of personal inclination and in the realistic, linear, colorful style of his art.[11]

Abbey turns out to be an interesting figure in this dissertation. Several of the artists whom I will argue are Neo-Pre-Raphaelite in style, subject, intention (in that they have left documentation which expresses their alignment with one or more of the original PRB) produced compositions which bear a striking resemblance to the work of Abbey. That poses the question, then, of whether or not Abbey himself is Neo-Pre-Raphaelite. I would argue that he is not in the strictest of terms, but instead that he is an essential link to bridge the gap. His importance to these later artists who are working in the PRB style lies in his influence and connections. Many of these artists were associated with Abbey, who thus acts then as another personal and professional connection between them and the original PRB of the mid nineteenth-century.

[11] Alan Shestack, "Introduction," in *Edwin Austin Abbey* (New Haven: Yale University Art Gallery, 1973), iij.

The Yale catalogue on Abbey furthermore includes insightful essays that not only discuss Abbey, his paintings and illustrations, but also provide many illustrations and accompanying entries. As a whole, the selected works for this exhibition provide a more complete picture of Abbey's oeuvre—and thus reinforce why he appealed to Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism.

Cadogan Cowper was the subject of my MA thesis (2008), the first scholarship dedicated exclusively to the artist. Even in the past thirty years of revisionist academic literature in Pre-Raphaelitism, Cadogan Cowper's work had been primarily discussed in passing in footnotes, auction catalogues, and general survey material on late nineteenth century British art. I explored his background, career, works, and the varying influences, producing not a definitive monograph of his accomplishments but a long overdue analysis of his oeuvre.

The crux of the argument which will be presented in this opus is that Edwin Austin Abbey had a significant impact on several of these artists, though no previous scholarship has addressed this. The most obvious and perhaps easiest connection to draw, however, comes from his nomination of Byam Shaw and Cadogan Cowper to produce two of the six panels for the East Corridor of the House of Commons. E.V. Lucas' 1921 work, *Edwin Austin Abbey: Royal Academician*, while dedicated to discussing Abbey, lends itself to a study of both Shaw and Cowper because Abbey was familiar with both of them and oversaw their progress on the murals.

Abbey, moreover, was Cowper's mentor, and the men's relationship is sporadically mentioned in this text. Though CC only worked in Abbey's workshop for a short time, it was an advantageous relationship on both a personal and professional level. It was through Abbey's connections at the Royal Academy that CC's art was first considered, appreciated, and accepted by powerful men—collectors, colleagues, and critics-- in the art community. Abbey's tutelage furthered CC's career and the artistic mentoring was influential on his creative style. Lucas'

aforementioned biography of Abbey, moreover, with its inclusion of letters written by Cowper describing Abbey enables the reader to know and understand the relationship between the two. In my dissertation, I will supplement and discuss later letters and archival material that is housed in the United Kingdom.

Another key artist to be examined is Thomas Cooper Gotch, for whom the main publication detailing his life and work is *The Golden Dream: a Biography of Thomas Cooper Gotch* (Lomax, 2004). The first full-length study of the artist, this book gives an in-depth view to the man and his life. However, the limits of the publication reside in the lack of thorough discussion of Gotch's art. As the title indicates, this is a biographical approach to the Newlyn artist, not a monographic one devoted to artistic style or content.

A genealogical approach to the artist, his life and selected images can be found in the private publication *Gotch Family of Kettering 1755-1964* (2000, updated 2011); it was printed by members of the family and made available to the community. The book is about the entire ancestry of the Gotch family and their influence on the hometown of Kettering. Nine chapters are dedicated specifically to Thomas Cooper Gotch and include: personal recollections, family photographs, commentary about his art, as well as how the fact that travel, friends and family, and different artistic circles influenced his canvases. While any art-related discussion is not supported by academic scholarship or interpretation, the book proves useful as primary source material, with personal details and first-hand accounts that would be otherwise unavailable.

There are two publications which are particularly useful when researching Evelyn Pickering de Morgan: *Evelyn Pickering de Morgan: oil paintings* (Gordon, 1996) and *Evelyn Pickering de Morgan and the allegorical body* (Smith, 2002). The Gordon book provides a large collection of images in conjunction with numerous scholarly essays; Smith's publication

includes eighty examples of the artist's work and fifty comparative images by contemporary artists. Unlike the monographic *Oil Paintings*, the focus of *The Allegorical Body* is an exploration of de Morgan's mythological, literary, and allegorical imagery in relation to her involvement within the Spiritualist movement and the automatic writing passages by both the artist and her husband.

CHAPTER DESCRIPTIONS

In terms of overall organization, this dissertation is divided by artist: Cowper, Shaw, Fortescue-Brickdale, Waterhouse, and Gotch. As these individual chapters consider mainly their oeuvres in terms of oil painting, the last chapter will address the aforementioned outliers, consisting of Spartali Stillman, Bunce, Meteyard, Strudwick and Pickering de Morgan.

This introductory chapter will establish the state of the question I pose in Victorian art and scholarship and provide a review of current literature on Pre-Raphaelitism. It will endeavor to explain exactly how this topic of Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism will contribute to the field of late 19th to early 20th century British art history. Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism, as a term, will moreover be defined as well as parameters established to explain which artists will/ will not or why/ why not be examined in the scope of this work. This dissertation is not meant to include every artist with Pre-Raphaelite tendencies, but will provide a substantial first look as to the categorization of these Neo-Pre-Raphaelite artists. It is furthermore important to note that not every work in these artists' oeuvres may necessarily fall neatly into this Neo-Victorian sub-category.

Chapter 1 explores the historiography of the term Pre-Raphaelitism. It is a word which academic scholars have not been able to definitively define or come to an art historical consensus within the past thirty-five years. The automatic assumption of "Pre-Raphaelitism" is the Pre-

Raphaelite Brotherhood which existed as a cohesive group from 1848-1853. Unfortunately, Victorianists in the discipline are at odds when having to determine what happened after the early 1850s. Questions such as: did the movement end; did it morph into additional phases; does it fit within the canon of modern art and what happens with the approach of the fin-de-siécle arise. The chapter will address all of these issues, as well as explaining why the usage of the term Neo-Pre-Raphaelite solves many of the uncertainties surrounding the broader concept of Pre-Raphaelitism.

Chapter 2 will focus on the Anglo-American artist Edwin Austin Abbey. No one has ever forged a link between Abbey and Pre-Raphaelite adherents, so this I deem a singular contribution of my dissertation. Abbey was very influential in the artistic development of both Shaw and Cowper and the subsequent artists discussed are often compositionally similar to them. Not only were these artists, then, actively echoing Cowper and Shaw, so too were they mimicking compositions they had seen by Abbey as well as actual Pre-Raphaelite practitioners. I will not argue that Abbey was himself a Pre-Raphaelite in his choice of theme or style, rather that he inadvertently acts as a conduit between the original PRB and their subsequent Neo-Pre-Raphaelite successors. I choose to begin with him and his oeuvre at the turn of the century because his work and interpersonal relationships provide a solid foundation for the basis of this argument.

Chapter 3 is also dedicated to Edwin Austin Abbey and reinforces the notion that he is a conduit between the PRB and the NPR. The specific focus of this chapter is imagery comparisons between Abbey, Millais, Rossetti. The selected oils are considered some of his more eminent works: *Fair is my love* (1900); *King Lear* (1898); *Richard, Duke of Gloucester and the Lady Anne* (1896) and *Hamlet: the play scene* (1897). While there are certainly other objects

to reinforce the bond between Abbey and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, these serve as solid examples of this visual indebtedness. Additionally, the works are also compositionally compared to works by his Neo-Pre-Raphaelite "followers" to illustrate that he is an artistic connection between the two groups.

Chapter 4 is dedicated to the 1908-1910 Parliament Murals program in the East Corridor, House of Commons. First Commissioner of Works Lewis Harcourt asked to be the artistic advisor for the commission. Abbey was henceforth tasked with selecting the individual artists to produce each of the six murals, as well as keeping compositional unity between each panel and the overall decorative scheme. This chapter will investigate the relationships between Abbey and the muralists, briefly examine the historical precedent to the Parliament murals; consider each panel from a visual, historical and political perspective of the first decade of the twentieth-century; and evaluate patterns of indebtedness of certain murals to works by Abbey and others. As Cadogan Cowper and Byam Shaw are specifically two of the Neo-Pre-Raphaelites on which this dissertation will focus, their murals will be considered more closely.

Chapter 5 will discuss Frank Cadogan Cowper and is considerably heavier with Pre-Raphaelite comparisons than Cowper's work in Parliament (Chapter 4). As an artist, his place within the late nineteenth and early twentieth-centuries will be established, as well as its fit within the larger scope of Pre-Raphaelitism. As has been previously argued, Cowper was the last of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. Links to members of the PRB, specifically Millais and Rossetti, will be established and reinforced through correspondence written by the artist as well as compositional indebtedness. The relationship he had with Abbey and consequently, its effect on his career will be explored. A brief selection of his subject works will be examined: *St. Agnes* (1905)*; Lucretia Borgia reigns in the absence of Pope Alexander VI* (1908-14); *Vanity* (1907);

The Damsel of the Lake, called Nimüe the Enchantress (1924) and lastly, *The Four Queen Find Lancelot Sleeping* (1954). These images will be compared thematically with examples of other Pre-Raphaelites. As arguably the last of the Pre-Raphaelites, these paintings reveal that throughout his life, particularly into the twentieth-century, he was still producing works that harken back to the themes and styles of the PRB.

Chapter 6 will focus on John Liston Byam Shaw. He was a student at the Royal Academy like Cowper, although their enrollment did not overlap. Shaw left the RA in 1895 and Cowper was not admitted until 1897. However, when Cowper was a student and exhibiting work, he was very familiar with Shaw, who was also working and exhibiting pieces simultaneously. By CC's own account, he considered Shaw to be a "conceited sort of chap."[12] Whatever Shaw's temperament, in 1908, the two were asked to participate in the mural scheme for the Houses of Parliament, both contributing one of six panels. There is ample evidence to suggest that they were familiar with one another's work from early on in their respective careers. While Shaw was a prolific illustrator who opened his own art school, an analysis of some of his paintings reveals a similarity in composition to that of Millais, Rossetti, Hunt and Waterhouse.

Chapter 7 considers Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale, the only artist to be discussed with two familial relationships with John Ruskin. The artist was a student at the Royal Academy at the same time as Cowper as well as Shaw, and ultimately took a position of instructor at Shaw's art school. She was a success from the start and used a variety of media. Brickdale paid meticulous attention to detail, much like that of the first phase of Pre-Raphaelitism. The selected images discussed come from literary sources, even if the moments portrayed do not exist in the original narrative. She shows thematic indebtedness to Abbey, Cowper, and Waterhouse. Scholarly literature insists that Byam Shaw, by the mere fact he was a man and she worked for him, was an

[12] Royal Academy Archives, COW/1/3

influence on her. Instead, I speculate that it was *because* they attended school together and had a lengthy professional relationship that their work is compositionally, stylistically, and thematically related.

Chapter 8 examines John William Waterhouse's pivotal work *The Lady of Shalott* (1888). This oil was instrumental to his career, as it marked a subsequent shift between his early works, influenced by Lawrence Alma-Tadema, to his new, vested interest in Pre-Raphaelitism and its corresponding themes. The newest literature on Waterhouse will be considered, and supported with a selection of *The Lady of Shalott* imagery treated by Pre-Raphaelites and Neo-Pre-Raphaelites alike. These examples reinforce the ideas presented in the publication, *John William Waterhouse: Modern Pre-Raphaelite,* compelling scholarship that makes for a captivating argument.

Chapter 9 discusses Thomas Cooper Gotch to whom academic literature has deemed to be a member of the Newlyn, Symbolist, and "Imaginative Symbolist / Decorative" schools. His education, connections, and use of Newlyn painting techniques provided a foundation for his desired representation of truthfulness to nature, but not necessarily to the same extent of the Pre-Raphaelites Brotherhood. A selection of works focusing on children and the glorification of young girls will be examined. His compositions echo those of Abbey and Cowper, while thematically, there is a similarity to Rossetti, Brown and Millais. These works also incorporate the rites of passage as the young girls transition from childhood to adulthood.

Chapter 10 presents an alternative grouping of Neo-Pre-Raphaelites. Instead of being influenced by and associated with Abbey, these artists (Marie Spartali Stillman, Kate Bunce, Sidney Meteyard, J.M. Strudwick and Evelyn Pickering de Morgan) are primarily thematically indebted to Burne-Jones and Rossetti. The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate that this

burgeoning study on Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism does not revolve strictly around one person; that there can be alternative "circles" that fall within certain parameters. For image comparisons, there is great indebtedness particularly to Rossetti and Burne-Jones, as well as Millais and Hunt, and established contemporary Neo-Pre-Raphaelites Cowper, Shaw, Brickdale, and Waterhouse.

Chapter 11 will offer concluding thoughts. By its end, this dissertation will hopefully have revealed the enduring significance of the original Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. While admittedly a short-lived movement, their ideals, style, thematic interests, etc. survived into the twentieth-century as demonstrated through the oeuvres and purposeful choices made by the Neo-Pre-Raphaelites. These twentieth century artists are a reincarnation and hybrid of modernization of the earlier PRB. This study provides the first installment of much needed scholarship on Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism to further understand the intricacies of Neo-Victorianism.

Thus, this dissertation endeavors to examine what happens after what academic literature refers to as "the second generation of Pre-Raphaelitism." My contribution to the discipline of art history is to explore a plausible solution to what the experts have yet to definitively categorize or define within acceptable nomenclature. The term "Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism" is meant to act as a smaller scope within the larger context of either Victorian art or even Pre-Raphaelitism. It is therefore my desire that by establishing a scenario of (young) later Victorian artists who are somehow connected to the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood and the late nineteenth- / early twentieth-century, it may shed some light on alternative groupings of artists and the transformations which have inevitably evolved from the late 1840s movement.

Chapter 1:
Pre-Raphaelitism and Beyond

"It was in the beginning of the year 1848," says Mr. Holman Hunt, "that [John Everett Millais] and I determined to adopt a style of absolute independence as to art-dogma and convention: this we *called 'Pre-Raphaelitism.' D.G. Rossetti was already my pupil, and it seemed certain that he also,* in time*, would work on the same principles. He had declared his intention of doing so, although in fact some were only in the most primitive stages of art, such as William Rossetti, who was not even a student."*
– William Holman Hunt [1]

Art historical lore concerning the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood has supported a canon that this group consisted of seven men who joined forces in 1848 to challenge mid-Victorian art, artists, and theories. But scholars agree now that by the mid-1850s, the PRB had effectively disbanded, with its members thereafter pursuing different directions. However, scholarship has not yet given a name to what happened after this development. Most experts agree Pre-Raphaelitism morphed into something altogether new with the next generation led and inspired by Edward Burne-Jones, but thereafter categories and nomenclature remain confusing and inconclusive.

Certain questions arise from this lack of agreed upon distinctions. What *is* Pre-Raphaelitism? Where does it begin, where does it end, and what all does it encompass? Was the second wave of Pre-Raphaelitism merely late Victorian art, or was it something more? Surprisingly, scholars of the past thirty-five years have not come to a consensus on many of these issues, which in turn leaves the term "Pre-Raphaelitism" to be fraught with complications. This chapter will "unpack" the term, thereby establishing a workable definition of Pre-Raphaelitism (especially what happens after the dissolution of the original Brotherhood) and attempt to explain what happens after the second generation, most usually associated with the aesthetic imagery of Dante Gabriel Rossetti and Edward Burne-Jones. Finally, since this notion is vital for the material to be discussed in this dissertation, I will posit a new term, "neo-Pre-Raphaelitism" which I believe to fit artists who were working in a Pre-Raphaelite style from the 1890s well into

---

[1] John Guille Millais, *The Life and Letters of Sir John Everett Millais* (London: Methuen & Co., 1899), vol. 1, 49.

the twentieth century. The parameters of this particular group of artists, restricted due to the scope of this dissertation, will be explained, as well as reasons proffered for why certain canonical names have been omitted from this discussion.

It is necessary to establish that there is a subtle distinction between what is known as *the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood* (which includes designations as "Pre-Raphaelites" and the abbreviated form "PRB") and the broader, more vague concept of *Pre-Raphaelitism.* The Pre-Raphaelites, themselves, were very clear in their goals, aims, and techniques, famously documented in *the Germ* and other writings by its members; and as it turns out, scholars of the twentieth century are in agreement and acceptance of this narrative. According to *The Life and Letters of Sir John Everett Millais*, [written by his son John Guille Millais in **(**1899**)],** he and William Holman Hunt, used Nature "as their only guide… would go to her, and her alone for inspiration; and hoping that others would be tempted to join in their crusade against conventionality, they selected as their distinctive title the term "Pre-Raphaelites."[2] Holman Hunt further claimed that Dante Gabriel Rossetti "amended [my] previous suggestion by adding to our title of "Pre-Raphaelite" the word "Brotherhood." Even their champion, John Ruskin, who fervently proclaimed in his *Modern Painters* to "reject nothing, select nothing, scorn nothing" understood and supported their intentions:

> They have called themselves Pre-Raphaelite. If they adhere to their principles and paint nature as it is around them, with the help of modern science, with the earnestness of the men of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, they will, as I said, found a new and noble school of England.[3]

Rather interestingly, a search through academic literature from about 1980 to the present (including but not limited to: Tim Barringer, Jason Rosenfeld, Alison Smith, Elizabeth Prettejohn, Frances Spalding, Christopher Wood, John Christian, Leslie Parris, Andrew Wilton,

---

[2] John Ruskin, *The Complete works of John Ruskin*, (New York: T.Y. Crowell & Company, 1885), 135.
[3] Ibid., 187.

Robert Upstone, Jan Marsh, Pamela Garrish Nunn, Lionel Lambourne, and Marcia Pointon) revealed that Victorian scholars are in agreement about the origin of the short-lived artistic movement (1848 to roughly 1852/53), while simultaneously acknowledging that the term *Pre-Raphaelitism* is vague, ambiguous and hard to specify. As Timothy Hilton affirmed, "Pre-Raphaelitism cannot be defined; it was too various"[4] and Christopher Wood asserted "Pre-Raphaelitism was not easy to define, as it was as much a state of mind as an actual artistic movement."[5]

In Hilton's *The Pre-Raphaelites* (1970, reprinted 2010), he argued that many of the paintings designated as "Pre-Raphaelite" were stylistically different and do not have a "common denominator."[6] While a logical counter-argument that the early works by the PRB employ the same techniques, Hilton continues:

> And to look for a common purpose in the Pre-Raphaelite painters, their admirers and followers, is to look in vain. They were thoroughly individual, and generally kept their own individuality. One would never mistake the work of one member of the Brotherhood for that of another. Pre-Raphaelitism cannot be defined; it was too various…It is not a self-contained movement; it not only has ragged edges, but does not start or finish at a definite place. It was part of a continuing process of changes in art…[7]

Like Hilton, Tim Barringer also contends that there was never a "single, identifiable Pre-Raphaelite style" in his 1999 publication *Reading the Pre-Raphaelites*. Barringer explains that while the group's aim was to revive aspects of art before Raphael and to reform British painting, the

---

[4] Timothy Hilton, *The Pre-Raphaelites* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1993), 9.
[5] Christopher Wood, *Burne-Jones: The Life and Works of Sir Edward Burne-Jones* (New York: Stewart, Tabori & Change, 1998), 146.
[6] Hilton, 9.; Hilton concludes that the "minor followers of Pre-Raphaelitism" deserve a brief mention, as they looked back to an earlier Pre-Raphaelite style. These followers, to whom Hilton refers as "imitators," include: Strudwick, Prinsep, Evelyn Pickering de Morgan and Byam Shaw (202).
[7] Ibid., 9-10

"members of the Brotherhood promoted notions of the artist-as-genius themselves."[8] He stipulates that Pre-Raphaelite work was inconsistent—

> a paradox of historicism and modernity, revivalism and realism, was resolved by the Brothers through the belief that early Italian painters had themselves observed the natural world rather than merely repeating conventional forms like their successors.[9]

This "revivalist movement," as Barringer calls it, produced imagery of real life and the modern world. As many of the selected subjects had a historical or literary basis, however, the resulting production combined a yearning for the past mixed with an intense modernity and realism, most obviously expressed by the execution of precise detail and Ruskinian naturalism.[10]

This "elusive phenomenon" of Pre-Raphaelitism, as the author claims, grew out of an interest in medievalism, a characteristic also found in Romanticism, "a cultural movement which had dominated European thought in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, valued individual feelings and identities more highly than rationality and the following of rules, and places the artist as an outsider and rebel…"[11] Barringer proposes that the present (c. 1850s) for the PRB "contrasted unfavorably" with the medieval past—a time which "seemed to enshrine a lost spirituality and beauty: rejecting the realities of an increasingly industrialized Europe…"[12]

Barringer maintains that Pre-Raphaelitism embodies the Pre-Raphaelite truth to nature, as promoted by the "realist aspects" of John Ruskin. As for anything that happened after the end of the PRB, the author explains that by the 1860s, Rossetti had abandoned the Pre-Raphaelite style (although Barringer has already argued that there never was a single, cohesive style) and became the leader of an avant-garde circle, including the likes of William and Jane Morris, Edward Burne-Jones, Elizabeth Siddal, Frederick Sandys and Simeon Solomon. So-called "later phases of Pre-

---

[8] Timothy Barringer, *Reading the Pre-Raphaelites* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 14.
[9] Ibid., 10.
[10] Paraphrased from Ibid., 19, 60.
[11] Ibid., 21.
[12] Ibid., 21.

Raphaelitism" are distinguished by the "increased concentration on the values of form and color, as against the Hogarthian virtues of description and storytelling."[13]

Alternately, Elizabeth Prettejohn's *Art of the Pre-Raphaelites* (2000), which builds upon the 1984 Tate Exhibition of the Pre Raphaelites, suggests that there has been a tendency to categorize the PRB as a social grouping. She proposes that the Pre-Raphaelites were by all considerations a modern art movement, an argument which was further substantiated in one of the most recent exhibitions, the 2013 *Pre-Raphaelite: Victorian Avant-Garde* (also called *Pre-Raphaelites: Victorian Art and Design 1848-1900*.) This first major new survey of Pre-Raphaelite art in the United States and the UK revealed that they were one of the first avant-garde movements in Britain, situating the PRB among one of the earliest of the historical avant-garde and the first modern movement in which the artists worked across a wide range of media.[14]

In Prettejohn's *Art of the Pre-Raphaelites*, she states that pinpointing a beginning of the Pre-Raphaelite movement is difficult and trivial when attempting to locate an end to it. She suggests that on the

> narrowest interpretation we might stop at the point when the Brotherhood ceased to meet regularly, perhaps as early as 1850. On the broadest we might trace the survival of Pre-Raphaelitism well into the twentieth century… We might extend geographical boundaries, too, to explore the repercussions of Pre-Raphaelite art in the work of the continental Symbolists… or Surrealists.[15]

There is no consensus on what falls under the label of Pre-Raphaelitism (or "later Pre-Raphaelitism" for that matter) and it is not usually given a significant role in the history of modern art. Prettejohn

---

[13] Ibid., 138; Barringer uses Millais' *Spring (Apple Blossoms)* to explain this point.

[14] Timothy Barringer & Jason Rosenfeld, "Victorian Avant-Garde," in *Pre-Raphaelites: Victorian Avant-Garde*, ed. Timothy Barringer et al. (London, Tate Publishing; 2012), 9. "The term avant-garde describes an organized grouping with self-conscious, radical, collective project of overturning current orthodoxies in art and replacing them with new, critical practices often directly engaged directly with the contemporary world." See footnote 2 in this source for additional historiography and bibliographic details for the term "avant-garde."

[15] Elizabeth Prettejohn, *Art of the Pre-Raphaelites* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), 87. The author uses *Little Foot Page* by Eleanor Fortescue Brickdale as an example of Pre-Raphaelitism extending into the twentieth century.

argues the need for a "new history of Pre-Raphaelitism, one no longer premised on its difference from the modernist mainstream, rather one that locates it as a significant practice… in modern art."[16]

Like other scholars, Prettejohn recognizes the "second phase" of Pre-Raphaelitism, as well as Burne-Jones' (and William Morris') participation in it. By 1856, as she points out, they were introduced to Rossetti and worked together on mural decorations in the new building of the Oxford Union Debating Society. For Lionel Lambourne, the painting of these frescoes was the defining moment for the second wave of Pre-Raphaelitism.[17]

By 1877, Burne-Jones was exhibiting at the Grosvenor Gallery and seemed to be the leader of a new school (as Prettejohn refers to it), which she says included artists like Walter Crane, John Roddam Spencer Stanhope, Evelyn Pickering (de Morgan), and John Melhuish Strudwick. Though Prettejohn does not give a name to this later incarnation of artists—perhaps the third phase according to her designations—contemporary (nineteenth century) critics agreed that this school was "unified by a common interest in early Italian art; more than one review described them as 'neo-Italian'." This new school, the so-called "Grosvenor Gallery Group", was reviewed by *The Times* critic, Tom Taylor, who "stressed rupture rather than community: "There is the greatest possible difference between this, which we may call the Quattrocentisi school, in its present development, and the original Pre-Raffaelites [sic]."[18] By contrast, original PRB member, F.G. Stephens, while writing for the *Athenaeum*, "made no direct reference to early Pre-Raphaelitism, but he described the new school in terms that stressed its difference from the PRB project. Indeed he criticized it as an 'arrest of development,' a revivalist project that failed to go beyond archaism."[19]

---

[16] Ibid., 88.
[17] Lionel Lambourne, *Victorian Painting* (London: Phaidon Press, 1999), 253.
[18] Quoted in Prettejohn, *Pre-Raphaelites,* 125.
[19] Ibid., 125

Stephens believed the Grosvenor Gallery Group to be imitating particular prototypes of early Italian art, mainly that of Mantegna, Botticelli and Piero della Francesca. These artists, as Prettejohn points out, were "exploring artistic styles that appeared startlingly novel and unconventional, even though they dated from centuries ago."[20] She concludes that as the PRB may have helped to "stimulate interest in early Renaissance art in general, the Grosvenor artists' explorations of particular artists of the fifteenth century may have had an important impact on the taste of later generations."[21]

Further "revivals" (according to Prettejohn) of Pre-Raphaelitism continued to appear with Kate Bunce (to be discussed in Chapter 10), as well as artists working around 1900 like Frank Cadogan Cowper and John Byam Shaw. Examples by these artists were used by Prettejohn to demonstrate that twentieth-century artists were making works similar to the early PRB. The legacy of Pre-Raphaelitism to the twentieth-century, the scholar concludes, are the "Neo-Romantics" of the 1940s and 1950s who stressed the "English/British associations of their work against the grain of French-inspired modern styles."[22]

The aforementioned 2013 exhibition, *Pre-Raphaelite: Victorian Avant-Garde,* with essays by Tim Barringer, Jason Rosenfeld and Alison Smith, reinforces Prettejohn's assertions that the PRB has been classified by art history as a social grouping as well as its designation as a modern art movement. In their essay *Victorian Avant-Garde*, Barringer and Rosenfeld acknowledge that the Pre-Raphaelites were radical in their refusal to accept the conventions revered by their teachers at the Royal Academy and society, as well as the group's intention to "sow the seeds of reform of society through the advancement of art and design."[23] The authors also state that in the 1850s, a new group converged around Rossetti, namely Morris, Burne-Jones, Siddal, and Solomon, which

---

[20] Ibid., 125.
[21] Ibid., 126.
[22] Ibid., 129; She makes the same claim in her essay "The Pre-Raphaelite Legacy" in *Pre-Raphaelites: Victorian Avant-Garde*.
[23] Barringer and Rosenfeld, 9.

explored the relationship between art and poetry, as well as art and music.[24] Unlike Prettejohn, Barringer and Rosenfeld claim that the "second generation" of Pre-Raphaelitism didn't occur until the 1890s and was led by Burne-Jones (Rossetti having died in 1882). It was in this last decade of the nineteenth-century, then, that the artists "created new forms of history painting in a mythic visual language appropriate to the changing psychological and social conditions of the *fin de siècle.*"[25] Like Prettejohn's earlier publication, this essay agrees that the "brazenly unconventional Pre-Raphaelites paralleled these radically revivalist strains in writing and design by producing pictures that scandalized the Victorian art world for several years after their debut in 1849."[26] It is not surprising, either, that as with Barringer's above-mentioned *Reading the Pre-Raphaelites*, the authors concur that Pre-Raphaelitism is a contradictory term, for it is both a revivalist and realist movement. While the name "Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood" connects the artists to a distant past, the group also believed that "art should make a direct and critical engagement with contemporary society."[27] Barringer and Rosenfeld's essay further draws the conclusion that the sphere of influence, though wide, encompassed (only) two generations of British artists.[28] Such an implication presupposes that the PRB influence did not continue into the twentieth-century and had a definitive end at the turn-of-the-century.

Meanwhile, the focus of Christopher Wood's *Victorian Painting* (2000) was the thematic choices of the Pre-Raphaelites. This book addressed subject matter, most of which came from romantic poetry, Shakespeare and the Middle Ages. Wood pointed out that such scenes allowed the

[24] This group, they argue, also embraced the design of furniture and textiles. William Morris participated in this.
[25] Ibid., 9.
[26] Ibid., 10.
[27] Ibid., 10.
[28] Ibid., 12.

artists—and viewers—to escape from the Industrial Revolution to the past.[29] These ideas reinforce those previously discussed by other authors.

Tantalizingly, it seems that the term "Pre-Raphaelitism" remains an enigma. Scholars agree that the first phase (early) Pre-Raphaelitism was embodied in works by the Brotherhood, especially the Millais—Hunt—Rossetti triumvirate. However, the starting point of the second phase varies according to each art historian: for Lambourne, and echoed by Leslie Parris' 1984 Tate Exhibition, *The Pre-Raphaelites*, it was in 1858 with the Oxford frescoes; for Marsh and Nunn (to be discussed shortly), it spans from 1865-80; for Barringer and Hilton, it is marked by the leadership of Burne-Jones in the 1890s; and for Prettejohn, it is indicated by the collaboration between Burne-Jones and Morris, and immediately followed by their acquaintance with Hughes, Spencer Stanhope, and Prinsep, though she does not offer a chronological timespan.

There are, however, some secondary sources which attempt to offer more concrete divisions of Pre-Raphaelitism, its influence, and its placement within the late nineteenth and early twentieth-centuries. For example, Jan Marsh and Pamela Gerrish Nunn, in their *Women Artists and the Pre-Raphaelite Movement* (1989) argue that the term "Pre-Raphaelite" was not a style or period but rather "a specific female look… a Pre Raphaelite picture depicting a woman."[30] Moreover, they posit that the term "Pre-Raphaelite" has come to describe a style (rather than the previous arguments about Pre-Raphaelitism being a school or group) and "its uneven and sometimes contradictory qualities are explained in terms both of its variety of painters and longevity, as over fifty years the style was adopted and adapted by succeeding generations of artists."[31] The authors continued that Pre-Raphaelitism was a combination of the Pre Raphaelite Brotherhood plus the so-called "sons and

[29] Christopher Wood, *Victorian Painting* (Boston; New York; London: Bulfinch Press, 1999), 92.
[30] Jan Marsh and Pamela Gerrish Nunn, *Women Artists and the Pre-Raphaelite Movement* (London: Virago, 1989), 6.
[31] Ibid., 13.

heirs of Pre-Raphaelitism," including male artists like Burne-Jones, John Byam Shaw, William Morris, and J.M. Strudwick.[32] What is pertinent in this dissertation as an attempted definition of Pre-Raphaelitism is that Marsh and Nunn write that it is a "continuing dispute … over what is to be included under the Pre-Raphaelite umbrella, and how widely the definition can be applied both in terms of artists and dates."[33] Marsh and Nunn, unlike previously mentioned scholars, recognize that work in a "Pre-Raphaelite mode" was still being produced in the early years of the twentieth century by the "last generation of the movement, artists born in the 1870s. And we identify two earlier generations, the first beginning Pre-Raphaelitism is the mid-century, the second continuing it through the 1860s and 1870s."[34]

Prettejohn's *After the Pre-Raphaelites: Art and Aestheticism in Victorian England* (1999) also reminds the reader that there ought to be a term to describe the developments of art after the Pre-Raphaelites (or rather, after the first phase of the movement). Art history has taken the position, she claims, that Aestheticism is the direct descendent of Pre-Raphaelitism.

Nunn and Marsh bring a solution to Prettejohn's quandary by breaking up the remainder of the nineteenth century into generations / incarnations of Pre-Raphaelitism. They propose that the Second Generation of "Pre-Raphaelitism", which they arbitrarily date from 1865-1880, coincides with "Aestheticism" and was spearheaded by artists like Edward Burne-Jones, D.G. Rossetti, Frederick Sandys and Simeon Solomon, who created dreamier visions of the past, based mostly on legend and fantasy.[35] Marsh and Nunn argue that this phase of Pre-Raphaelitism,

---

[32] Ibid., 13.
[33] Ibid., 13.
[34] Ibid., 14.
[35] Ibid., 19. To Marsh and Nunn, the chapter on the first generation (1848-1865) closes with the death of Elizabeth Siddal in 1862 and the comment that it "marked the closing of the first, intense, naïve and perhaps most adventurous phase of the Pre-Raphaelite movement." (73). Moreover, at the start of chapter three in their book (the Second Generation, 1865-1880), the year 1865 becomes important because it coincides with the "reorient[ation]" of the Society of Female Artists (established 1857) from an "exhibiting body with an annual show based on jury selection and commissions on sales, to a quasi-charitable institution with patrons and patronesses who could guarantee

including artists such as Burne-Jones, Morris, Sandys and Soloman "altered the Pre-Raphaelite aesthetic to create a dreamier vision of the past, based on legend and fantasy. [It] contained more characters and less landscape, more imagination and less fact, more decoration and less piety.[36] They speculate that artists recalled Arthurian and medieval romances, preferred the spiritual to the natural, and the imagined reality was favored over the Ruskinian ideal of observed reality.

Marsh and Nunn also advocate for the existence of a third generation of Pre-Raphaelitism, spanning roughly 1880-1910. This designation includes artists Kate Bunce and Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale among others, who began exhibiting in the 1880s and 1890s. For these artists, Rossetti, having died in 1882, was a "newly revealed hero," as his pictures were shown in retrospective exhibitions for the first time. Biographies were written and his brother, William Michael, began to publish Dante Gabriel's poetry and correspondence. Ruskin's artistic influence began to wane and Burne-Jones became the "main living influence or leader of Pre-Raphaelitism."[37]

In Marsh's *The Pre-Raphaelite Circle* (2005), she argues that while the aforementioned artists (Rossetti, Burne-Jones, Sandys, Solomon) were all important to this second wave of Pre-Raphaelitism, it was actually Burne-Jones who was the primary leader with his "imaginative, romantic scenes painted in glowing color, harmonies, to the end of his life, Burne-Jones remembered his worship of Dante Gabriel Rossetti, "I was with him every day from morning till

---

financial survival." (77). As this book is based on the relationship of women artists and Pre-Raphaelitism, it makes sense that the authors would estimate the starting and ending points of each phase of the movement in this way.

[36] Ibid., 19.

[37] Ibid., 19-20.

it was morning again, and at three and twenty-one needs no sleep. His talk and his looks and his kindness. I loved him and I thought him the biggest and I think so still!'"[38]

Wood's *Victorian Painting* attempted to break down Pre-Raphaelitism and locate it within the second half of the nineteenth-century. After establishing that the "Pre-Raphaelite movement was a blend of romanticism, idealism, scientific rationalism and morality, a typically mid Victorian mix—full of paradox",[39] he determined that the Aesthetic movement was a reaction against the Pre-Raphaelites, especially with the highly moral and didactic imagery of the 1850s.[40] The 1860s, according to Wood, were filled with neither moral nor narrative imagery, just beauty. Under the emergence of Aestheticism and in opposition to Pre-Raphaelitism and Burne-Jones' brand of Romanticism, was the Classical revival, most obviously seen in works by Leighton, Watts, Poynter, Moore, and Alma-Tadema. Yet Wood slightly backtracks and catalogues all of these minor categories under the larger art historical classification of Late Victorian Art—ultimately maintaining that pertinent sub-genres include: Pre-Raphaelitism, Classicism, Aestheticism, and Symbolism. His final argument is that they are all fused to a varying degree and that to analyze or separate them is hard.

John Christian's *Last Romantics* (1989) and Lionel Lambourne's *Victorian Painting* (1999) concur that with the decline of the Pre-Raphaelites came later phases of Pre-Raphaelitism, the latter insisting that starting in the 1860s, art production with a Pre-Raphaelite influence, was described by critics as Aesthetic, Symbolist, or Decadent. Christian believed Burne-Jones to be the last of the *great* Pre-Raphaelites and believed him to embody a romantic, poetic and spiritual nature inspired by the earlier Romantic movement. To Christian, these so-called "Last Romantics" -- like Edwin Austin Abbey, Thomas Cooper Gotch, John Byam Shaw, Frank

---

[38] Jan Marsh, *The Pre-Raphaelite Circle* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2005), 91.
[39] Wood, *Painting*, 94.
[40] Such a claim is in direct contrast to Prettejohn's belief that Aestheticism was a "descendant" of Pre-Raphaelitism.

Cadogan Cowper and Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale—many of whom worked well into the twentieth-century—continued the late Pre-Raphaelite tradition from an academic standpoint. This is a particularly important notion in relationship to this dissertation. Christian argues that these younger contemporaries were seen as "living traditions" who returned to the early work of Millais and Rossetti and reinterpreted their oeuvres in an academic spirit. Christian puts forth the notion of a "Last Romantic Syndrome" in which, he writes, there is "an acute sense of alienation induced by the march of modernism, and of fighting a rearguard action on behalf of an older, richer, hopelessly doomed culture."[41]

Christian, Lambourne and Wood's writings, therefore, bring to light the fact that works of art with Pre-Raphaelite elements have made their way into the twentieth-century. As Percy Bates determined under the heading "Pre-Raphaelitism Today" in 1899 as part of his history of *The English Pre-Raphaelite painters, their Associates and Successors,* there were still

> a large number of contemporary artists, and concluded that the movement was still full of vigour [sic], since the 'principles of Pre-Raphaelitism remain as essentially true as when first promulgated, and work equally good ought to be the result of an honest acceptance of them.[42]

If twentieth- and twenty-first-century academics found it difficult to articulate the term Pre-Raphaelitism, how were they then to address the issue that artists like Cowper, Brickdale, Shaw and others actively applied Pre-Raphaelite styles and content in their work up until the mid 1950s? As such artistic practice existed, it followed that Pre-Raphaelitism, despite its lack of formal scholarly definition, never really ended—or rather, did not end with the dissolution of the PRB (c. 1853), Rossetti's death (c. 1882), or the nineteenth-century itself (c. 1899). Therefore, as the Brotherhood ceased to exist by the early 1850s, and by 1900, the founding members

---

[41] John Christian, *The Last Romantics: The Romantic Tradition in British Art: Burne-Jones to Stanley Spencer* (London: Lund Humphies in association with Barbican Art Gallery, 1989), 20.
[42] Quoted in Marsh and Nunn, *Women Artists*, 14.

(survived only by Holman Hunt), as well as Edward Burne-Jones, William Morris, and John Ruskin had all died, the turn of the century, for all intents and purposes, seemed to mark an end of a predominantly Pre-Raphaelite era.[43]

When considered as a whole, scholarship on the subject of Pre-Raphaelitism from 1970s until the most recent exhibitions in 2013 (*Victorian Avant-Garde* and *Edwardian Opulence: British Art in the Dawn of the Twentieth Century*)[44], does not acknowledge an impact by the original Pre-Raphaelites further than the influence of Burne-Jones. Indeed, the term “Pre-Raphaelitism” still remains ambiguous, as well as the distinctions between succeeding Pre-Raphaelite generations and their respective classifications. As discussed, most academics insist that there were only two phases of the movement. For those who attempt to advance the organization of later artists who were influenced by the PRB, the categories of: later Pre-Raphaelitism; neo-Italianism; revivals; neo-Romantics; Aestheticism; late Victorian art or even the last Romantics have been applied. In addition to the artists to be specifically discussed in this dissertation, the inclusion of Sandys (d. 1904), Solomon (d. 1905), Stanhope (d. 1908), Strudwick (d. 1937), Siddal (d. 1862) and Prinsep (d. 1904) are continually mentioned in the discourse on Pre-Raphaelitism. With the exception of Strudwick, all of these artists were dead by the first decade of the twentieth century, adding credence, perhaps, to the claim made by

[43] Pre-Raphaelitism and Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism are both terms that have not been defined in relevant scholarship. This falls within a larger, also ambiguous, context of Neo-Victorianism. While a discussion of Neo-Victorianism is too large for the purview and purpose of this dissertation, it is interesting to note that in the recent essay, “Rethinking the Victorians,” Kelly Boyd and Rohan McWilliams write, “The term ‘Victorian’ gathered strength after 1901, as it was called upon to evoke an historical period, a series of styles in fashion and architecture, a movement when the novel flourished and a lavish empire continued to grow, but, perhaps most of all, a state of mind… It meant St. Pancras Station, the Great Exhibition and the paintings of the pre-Raphaelites… It came to describe a sepia-tinted age that trumpeted high ideals and Christian virtues but presided over an underworld of poverty and prostitution.” Rebecca Munford and Paul Young, “Introduction: Engaging the Victorians,” *Literature Interpretation Theory*, 20: 1-11(2009): 3.

[44] Angus Trumble and Andrea Wolk Ranger, eds., *Edwardian Opulence: British art at the dawn of the twentieth century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013). While this source lists “Pre-Raphaelites and Pre-Raphaelitism” in the index, it never address this subject. Instead, it briefly mentions Burne-Jones and other associates of the PRB.

Marsh and Nunn that the "Pre-Raphaelite movement must be viewed as coming to an end with the close of the nineteenth-century or, at latest, with the First World War."[45]

Consequently, new terminology ought to be introduced to clearly and distinctly account for these twentieth-century artists, like Abbey, Cowper, Shaw, Brickdale, Gotch, and others, who consciously aligned themselves with the Pre-Raphaelites and continued this interest into the Edwardian era and beyond. To that end, I proffer the term *neo-Pre-Raphaelite* which, after much research, has thus far seems to have been used first in an article from the *Morning Leader* (London) dated 28 June 1901 to describe an exhibition of 40 watercolors. Listed under "Art Notes", the critic wrote "the latest adherent to the banks of what may be called Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism is Miss Fortescue-Brickdale." The critic continues with a less than glamorous definition of neo-Pre-Raphaelitism:

> the Neo-Pre-Raphaelites … have no real interest in life. They do not seek to represent human actions and passions, but to make decorative patterns and arrangements of figures, whose elaborate habiliments and accessories far outweigh the significance of the actors.[46]

While my use of the term "neo-Pre-Raphaelitism" may differ from that of the critic of 1901, this excerpt is still a valuable piece of primary source material to show that in the early twentieth-century, the classification was colloquial, even if it has not become part of the standard art historical jargon.[47] Like the term "Pre-Raphaelitism," *neo-Pre-Raphaelitism* also has been used in literature without actually being clearly defined. For example, the *Ashmolean Museum Complete Illustrated Catalogue of Paintings* (2004) notes that Fortescue-Brickdale "was described as a 'Neo-Pre-Raphaelite'", though there are no footnotes to delineate a source of

---

[45] Marsh and Nunn, *Women Artists,* 143.; Ironically, after this statement, Marsh and Nunn continue with a discussion of Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale and acknowledge that she continued working in a Pre-Raphaelite style well into the 1920s.

[46] H., "Art Notes," *Morning Leader,* 28 June 1901.

[47] Some sources, like *Mural Painting*, assert that German critic Muthesias used this term in his 1902 article ("Kunst and Leben in England,"). However, a review of said article does not indicate the inclusion of such terminology.

origin for the title. She is also described by Nunn in *A Pre-Raphaelite Journey: the Art of Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale* as one who can be "grouped with many contemporaries of varying reputation: with the late or neo-Pre-Raphaelites who emerged in the wake of Edward Burne-Jones…"[48] Additionally, there is also an undated catalogue from the Campbell-Wilson Gallery (no longer in business) in England, entitled *Pre-Raphaelite, Neo-Pre-Raphaelite, Post-Pre-Raphaelite*. There are no explanations for what distinguishes a neo- or post Pre-Raphaelite, but included in this gallery's exhibition are examples of works by Byam Shaw, Spencer-Stanhope, Solomon, Burne-Jones, (Ford) Madox Brown, Rossetti, and Waterhouse among others.[49] In 1902, the German critic Hermann Muthesias supposedly dubbed the artists working on the Parliamentary murals (Cowper, Earnest Board, Henry Payne, Byam Shaw, Denis Eden, and Frank Salisbury) as "neo-Pre-Raphaelite." Though he did not elaborate on his selection of terminology, it was believed that he saw them as "a promising hope for the revival of decorative art in Britain."[50] Moreover, Rupert Maas described Thomas Cooper Gotch as a "romantic painter in the late-Pre-Raphaelite manner."[51] Finally, the Tate Museum distinguishes Cowper as "neo-Pre-Raphaelite," again with no explanation of this term.[52]

The term "neo-Pre-Raphaelitism" is used in this dissertation to apply to a group of artists who actively considered themselves followers of the original Brotherhood, and continued the tradition significantly into the twentieth-century. Many had direct connections with the PRB:

---

[48] Pamela Gerrish Nunn, *A Pre-Raphaelite Journey*, 11.
[49] The catalogue includes a reference to Muthesias having "dubbed some of them 'the Neo-Pre-Raphaelites'" as well as indicating that at the Royal Academy, a "new set of artists sought to break free from the rules and regulations imposed by the Academy." (6) The Muthesias quote—most likely referenced from the Willsdon book—does not include any source citation.
[50] Campbell-Wilson Gallery, *Frank Cadogan Cowper and Arthur Joseph Gaskin: Summer Exhibition at Wilson Fine Art* (Hove: Campbell Wilson Fine Art, 2004), 6; Also found in Willsdon, *Mural painting*, as discussed in chapter 4 (see above).
[51] Victorian Web. http://www.victorianweb.org/painting/gotch/index.html (accessed 6 May 2015).
[52] Tate website http://www.tate.org.uk/search/neo-pre-raphaelite accessed 6 May 2015; John Young-Hunter (1874-1955) is also listed as a neo-Pre-Raphaelite.

Byam Shaw was recommended (at the age of fifteen) by Millais for admittance to St. John's Wood; Brickdale enjoyed a familial connection to Ruskin and a lifelong friendship with Byam Shaw; and Cowper saw himself superior in knowledge to the PRB when he wrote "Certainly…I understand the theory of Pre-Raphaelitism perfectly now, and as far as the method of painting is concerned [I] understand it better than all the P.R.B. … did themselves…[53] While these artists align themselves primarily with Millais and the early phase of Pre-Raphaelitism, there are strong parallels (as will be seen) with the work by Burne-Jones, effectively culminating in what the academics have been debating the essence of Pre-Raphaelitism to *be* for the past thirty-five years.

The flaw, then, in the historiography is that there was a desire to establish a solid end point to the broader concept of Pre-Raphaelitism. As evidenced, such an objective is futile. However, by allowing for the notion of *neo-Pre-Raphaelitism*, this term takes into account that the Pre-Raphaelite influence continued, regardless of the transformation it made, within a longer timespan than previously articulated. Various incarnations, therefore, stemmed from the original movement and a pattern of indebtedness can be traced back to the origins of Pre-Raphaelitism.

Yet there is still a need to address the issue of "the last Pre-Raphaelite." Such a concept found its beginnings in literature with the writings of Ford Madox Ford, born Ford Hermann Hueffer, grandson of the Pre-Raphaelite associate Ford Madox Brown and nephew (by marriage) to the Rossetti family. This title, according to Ford, was to be bestowed to him, as he considered genealogy to be the only appropriate designator. As an early twentieth-century writer, Ford enjoyed the title and literary distinction for appointment as the "last Pre-Raphaelite," but this appellation is arguably misused for a merit devoted to a visual artist. He began his literary career "as a serious reviewer of Pre-Raphaelitism, eager to emphasize his family connections with the

[53] Royal Academy Archives, COW/2/1.

Pre-Raphaelite artists and writers."[54] Considered an authority on Pre-Raphaelitism, he was one of their chief reviewers: supplying introductory notes to exhibitions of Ford Madox Brown's work in 1896 and 1909; reviewing exhibitions of Millais and Rossetti in 1896; and writing the obituaries for Burne-Jones (1898) and Holman Hunt (1910).[55] As Ford scholar Pamela Bickley declares,

> In all of these writings, Ford presupposes the significance of Pre-Raphaelitism. While he deplores the affectations of *fin-de-siécle* aestheticism, he consistently asserts that the Pre-Raphaelites were authentically revolutionary spirits who 'cleared away from the whole side of human life a mass of hideous shams and conventions.' At the same time, Ford's chief objection to Pre-Raphaelite art is always that it fails to engage successfully with the contemporary world… By contrast, his own aim… was 'to register my own times in terms of my own time.'[56]

This is a peculiar, even contradictory, stance to take, as his identity is fixed by a Pre-Raphaelite genealogy, considering he "clearly exploited to the full his role as 'the greatest living expert' on Pre-Raphaelitism."[57] Yet, he is recorded as saying "I have been too much hammered by the Pre-Raphaelites. So that my troubled mind took refuge in an almost passionate desire for self-effacement."[58] Ironically, when in 1935 his daughter Julia protested that she "detested" the group, Ford

> countered that her Pre-Raphaelite ancestry would prove unavoidable and valuable artistic inheritance: … you were speaking to one who passes for the greatest living expert in that particular matter. I am indeed usually called the last of the Pre-Raffaelites [sic] and you, if you practice any of the arts… will inevitably in time inherit that sobriquet.[59]

Besides Ford, Edward Burne-Jones has been named as the inheritor, and even Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale was posthumously declared the "last" Pre-Raphaelite. Byam Shaw's obituary in 1919 insisted that he "was not 'modern' as the word is now understood, but belonged

---

[54] Pamela Bickley, "Ford and Pre-Raphaelitism," in *Ford Madox Ford: A Reappraisal,* eds. Robert Hampson and W.A. Davenport (New York: The Ford Madox Ford Society, 2002), 59.
[55] Ibid., 59.
[56] Ibid., 59-60.
[57] Ibid., 63.
[58] Ibid., 62.
[59] Quoted in ibid., 62-63.

by temperament and taste to the Pre-Raphaelite period."[60] However, I posit that Cadogan Cowper, dying in 1958, chronologically establishes him as the final proponent of these particular incarnations of Pre-Raphaelitism. His oeuvre shows considerate indebtedness, even imitation of Millais, Rossetti, Hunt and even Burne-Jones to reveal a deep and abiding respect for Pre-Raphaelite art. He was a Victorian Pre-Raphaelite in a modern world, but one who never forgot his traditional upbringing or his abiding admiration for the Brotherhood.

Pre-Raphaelitism and all its facets remain a problem for art historians. While scholars agree as to its existence, the points of conflict remain: the different phases / generations and the label given each, timespan and possible overlap. Those artists who will be discussed in this dissertation provide a compelling argument into an otherwise un-researched topic —ranging from those who had a direct or peripheral friendship with Abbey (Cowper, Shaw, Brickdale, Waterhouse, Gotch). Additionally, there were outliers, those whose work is also strikingly indebted to that of second generation Pre-Raphaelite Burne-Jones, such as Marie Spartali Stillman, Kate Bunce, Evelyn Pickering de Morgan, Sidney Meteyard and John Melhuish Strudwick. These artists, now having the same relationship to Abbey, have been included to demonstrate that there is the possibility of grouping late Victorian painters as having stylistic similarities to an associate of the PRB.

These selected artists, then, did not work collaboratively, like the original Brotherhood. Instead, in the dissertation they are grouped together by their mutual associations – with Abbey and/or each other—as well as their use of deliberate quotations from earlier Pre-Raphaelite works. The mere act of assembling such a group of neo-Pre-Raphaelite artists working through the first half of the twentieth-century is unprecedented, yet proves to be a fruitful challenge and much needed contribution to the existing literature on Pre-Raphaelitism.

Chapter 2:
Edwin Austin Abbey (1852-1911)

"I must write a line to say what pleasure your work has given me. For years I have seen and admired your beautiful illustrations, and congratulate you on this larger undertaking."
----- *John Everett Millais to Edwin Austin Abbey* (Holy Grail Exhibition), 1895[1]

As noted in Chapter 1, Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism has still not been addressed by the canon of art history. Scholars have yet to classify a twentieth-century school, group, movement, or even collection of artists who work in a style compositionally and stylistically similar to the nineteenth-century Pre-Raphaelites. Individual artists working in England in the early twentieth century, to whom I shall refer to as "Neo-Pre-Raphaelite", such as Cadogan Cowper, Fortescue-Brickdale, Byam Shaw, and others, have indeed remained visible through their inclusion in international exhibitions and accompanying catalogues. Now in the twenty-first century, Victorian art is experiencing a revitalization; to that end, some signage and catalogue entries (e.g. *Pre-Raphaelite: Victorian Avant-Garde*, 2013) are explicitly pointing out the compositional similarities between these later artists and the nineteenth-century PRB.

The question remains, then, how to categorize the artists in my MA thesis as Neo-Pre-Raphaelite. This dissertation argues ultimately that Cowper, Shaw, Fortescue-Brickdale, Waterhouse, and Gotch can be classified in this way. While they all have specific artistic ties to members of the original Brotherhood, I will examine how this particular grouping was in large part moreover linked by a hitherto unacknowledged influence, namely that of a relationship with the American ex-patriate, Edwin Austin Abbey.

---

[1] Quoted in Edward Verrall Lucas, *Edwin Austin Abbey, Royal Academician: The Record of His Life and Work*, vol.2 (New York: Charles Scriberner's Sons, 1921), 281.

The inclusion of Abbey in this discussion of British Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism is perhaps unexpectedly crucial. This chapter will therefore focus not only on Abbey's role in the artistic advancement of Cowper, Shaw, and Brickdale in particular, but also on his position as cornerstone, transitional figure, and hybrid artist connecting Pre-Raphaelitism and Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism. Whereas the original Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood was indebted to John Ruskin for support and artistic theory, I believe that Abbey acted in a similar way for the Neo-Pre-Raphaelites. He, too, championed them, not as a critic but often actually employing them to assist with his murals or canvases. There is thus an argument to be made that a strong parallel exists between Abbey and Ruskin and their respective roles in the aesthetics and professional development of their adherents.

ABBEY AND SOURCE MATERIAL

It is my contention that Abbey was singularly able to accomplish this role as transitional link for the last incarnation of the Pre-Raphaelite movement because of his direct connection to the PRB and his placement within the Royal Academy at the end of the nineteenth-century. This argument for Abbey's intimate relationship with the NPR has not been made in previous scholarship on the artist.[2] *Edwardian Opulence* (2013) – the most recent scholarship on Abbey--includes an essay by Imogen Hart entitled "History Painting, Spectacle, and Performance" that discusses Abbey's work in terms of Edwardian history painting, issues of performance, and what as Hart articulates as "participatory spectatorship" in the role of the viewer.[3] The 1974 Yale exhibition catalogue, arguably the first scholarly publication to consider the artist in depth featured essays about Abbey's paintings and illustrations, providing a more complete "picture"

---

[2] For a discussion on Abbey in terms of art historical scholarship, see the Introduction.
[3] This sounds similar to what Susan Casteras argued in *The Defining Moment: Victorian Narrative Paintings from The Forbes Magazine Collection*, (Charlotte, NC: Mint Museum of Art, 1999).

of the artist's oeuvre. It reinforced the appeal he had for the NPR as well as suggested Abbey's own hybridization between the two movements.[4]

Such secondary sources, as these few complement primary source material—most often found in the form of personal correspondence between the artist and his family, friends and associates. The main collection of letters written by and about Abbey can be found in E.V. Lucas' 1919 (reprinted 1921) two-volume work *Edwin Austin Abbey: Royal Academician: The Record of his life and work*. As Lucas expresses in the preface:

> The purpose of this book—to record as simply and directly and happily as possible the progress and achievement of one of the simplest, most direct and happiest of artists… No biographer probably was ever so well provided with material, nor could material for a biography ever have been so complete or in such perfect arrangement.[5]

In addition to this compendium, there are other institutions and archives which have related material, including but not limited to: correspondence between Abbey and Whistler archived in the University of Glasgow's "Correspondence of J.M. Whistler"; memoranda and correspondence regarding the artist, his wife, as well as papers related to the Edwin Austin Abbey Memorial Trust Fund at the Royal Academy Archives (London); the Edwin Austin Abbey Fund Papers at the National Academy of Design (New York); and letters at the Smithsonian Archives of American Art.[6] Without a doubt, however, the largest single collection of objects by Edwin Austin Abbey is stored at the Yale Art Gallery, the result of a bequest by Abbey's widow. To date, this Memorial Collection is the most sizeable assembly of

---

[4] Selected work by Abbey is usually included in catalogues as part of larger exhibits or circles. Publications dedicated solely to Abbey are scarce. As of July 2014, members of the curatorial departments at the Yale Art Gallery express an interest in organizing another Edwin Austin Abbey exhibit, specifically because the last dedicated Abbey scholarship / exhibition was the 1974 Yale show.

[5] Lucas, Preface, iii.

[6] I remind the reader that because of the scope of Abbey's influence with the chosen artists, I have purposefully restricted the selection of works to be discussed. I am not addressing his murals at the Boston Public Library or the Harrisburg State Capitol. However, the Boston Public Library Archives contains detailed accounts of the planning, design and installation of the murals (by Abbey and Sargent). Additionally, there are numerous books dedicated to the murals in both of these locations.

works, numbering nearly 3,000 objects, and including studies, paintings, prints, watercolors, drawings, and sketchbooks.

For this chapter on Abbey and his linkage to first and last stage Pre-Raphaelitism, the most useful primary source for Abbey correspondence has been the aforementioned E. V. Lucas book. An inquiry to the Yale Art Gallery revealed that part of the inventory of the Abbey Estate included a

> large packing case of Mrs. Abbey's personal papers… [and] contain[ed] Mrs. Abbey's diaries and a series of letters to and from Mr. and Mrs. Abbey's personal friends, which included many of the most prominent artists a generation ago. It is obvious that the documents were of considerable importance to the art historian.[7]

Unfortunately, this trunk was lost. According to a memorandum dated 9 November 1937, gallery officials concluded that the

> packing case had been kept [in a cellar] since the previous June. The case could not be found… a thorough search of the building was later carried on by the Trust Company revealing no trace of the case or its contents. None of the porters had any recollection of its having been moved from the waste paper collection room. Since this room also contained a waste paper compressor, it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that the contents of the case were disposed of during the several months in which the box remained open in this room.[8]

The outcome of this particular packing case is a great loss to Abbey scholarship. It would have been interesting to know what Abbey's contemporaries were writing to him and whether or not *they* linked him with the original PRB movement and the up-and-coming artists he was mentoring at the turn of the century. Nonetheless, the feasibility of such a claim can still be considered by examining a selection of his works and comparing them both with those by Millais,

---

[7] Yale Manuscripts and Archives, Sterling Memorial Library, secretary's papers RU49, Series III, box 147F109. This memorandum was written 9 November 1937 by Theodore Sizer, Associate Director of the Yale University Art Gallery, to Mr. Carl A. Lohmann. It has been suggested that a fund for the care of the Abbey collection may have been negotiated as a result of this correspondence.

[8] Ibid.

Rossetti and Hunt (representative of the original Brotherhood) as well as later artists Cadogan Cowper, Byam Shaw, Fortescue-Brickdale, and Gotch.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE PRB

Abbey was born in 1852, the same year as Holman Hunt's *Hireling Shepherd* and Millais' *Ophelia* were exhibited at the Royal Academy. He was a prolific painter, watercolorist, draughtsman, and illustrator, contributing often to *Harper's Weekly* (1871-87) and *Scribner's Magazine*.[9] In *The Life and Letters of Sir John Everett Millais,* Millais' son (John Guille Millais) wrote that

> as to Edwin Abbey's illustrations in *Harper's Magazine* of the old English songs and the plays of Shakespeare, his [John Everett Millais] admiration knew no bounds. I think I may say that he frequently urged on the Academicians Abbey's right to become an Associate even on the merits of these drawings alone.[10]

Besides, Abbey also enjoyed being a member of the RWS (Royal Society of Painters in Watercolors), RI (Royal Institute of Painters in Watercolors) and the PS (Pastel Society).[11] Long an admirer of Millais, Hunt and Rossetti, he was inspired by the Brotherhood, which one early writer suggests held a "powerful influence" over him:

> Abbey's conversations were in large part about the Pre-Raphaelite school and the leaders in England. The movement there had gained great momentum, and in the whirlpool of discussion Holman Hunt and Rossetti were the vortices of interest. This circumstance drew him to their cause: he was in full accord with their doctrines. Hunt, Rossetti and Millais were names he mentioned constantly, but when he spoke of Rossetti, it was always Dante Gabriel Rossetti, in full—of his great power and the unconventional treatment of his compositions. To a large degree the romantic element in his writings had a very deep influence, and nearly everything that Rossetti wrote he accepted without reservation.[12]

---

[9] E. Benezit et. al, *Dictionary of Artists*, vol. 1, (Paris: Gründ, 2006), 30.
[10] John Guille Millais, *The Life and Letters of Sir John Everett Millais: President of the Royal Academy*, vol. 2 (London: Methuen & Co., 1899) 233.; Also quoted in Lucas, vol 2., 291.
[11] Jane Johnson A. Greutzner, *Dictionary of British Artists 1880-1940*, (Suffolk, Eng.: Antique Collector's Club, 1976).
[12] Quoted in Lucas, vol. 1, 14; As told by Willard P. Snyder, friend and contemporary of Abbey. Snyder's father owned the Philadelphia publishing firm where Abbey worked as an apprentice and draughtsman.

In the PRB triumvirate, Abbey was arguably most impacted by Millais. It is well documented in Lucas' 1919 book *Edwin Austin Abbey, Royal Academician* in correspondence with and by the artist, that he had significant contact with Millais. According to Lucas, they even attended the same parties, including one hosted by Alma-Tadema with Leighton, Millais, and Poynter in attendance. They also had several mutual acquaintances and were in personal contact with one another.[13] Indeed, one of Abbey's most prized possessions was a Dalziel edition of *Arabian Nights* with drawings by both Millais and Arthur Boyd Houghton.[14] Abbey wrote that he planned to ask Millais if he might use the same costume—assuming it fit his model—that the artist (Millais) used for his *Princes in the tower* (c. 1878; fig. 1).[15] Furthermore, Millais expressed his praise of and support for the young artist throughout the course of the latter's career. This direct contact with one of the original members of the PRB further legitimizes the claim that Abbey enjoyed a direct link to the first wave of Pre-Raphaelitism.

RELATIONSHIPS: RUSKIN

Ultimately, Abbey agreed with Ruskin's artistic ideology encouraging artists to paint directly from nature, a philosophy which resulted, according to Ruskin, in "rejecting nothing, selecting nothing, scorning nothing."[16] The Pre-Raphaelites, at least the first wave in the 1850s specifically, filled their canvases with the minutiae of nature. Abbey too had a penchant for this hyper-realistic, close attention to detail, though he became more focused on garments and

[13] Party reference in Lucas, 111. The letter was dated 14 April 1881; Abbey was 29 years old.
[14] Lucas, vol. 1, 110.
[15] Ibid., 85; there is no follow up (that I have found) indicating whether or not Millais lent the garment. It is my understanding that the image is based on a ballad of Sir Richard Whittington. I have yet to find this image, assuming it was completed.
[16] John Ruskin, *Modern Painters*, Vol. I., Part II., Sec. 6, Chap. 3, § 21.

accouterments appropriate for the period of each painting.[17] Yet as much as Abbey was putting into practice Ruskin's aesthetic, he did not care much for the elder critic. In 1889, at the age of thirty-seven, Abbey wrote of a recent article he had read about Ruskin,

> I don't believe Ruskin will be thought even that much of after his death. I think him an overrated, windy person, with no knowledge of the subject he chooses to write most of, but a wonderful power of phrase making, and a most enviable directness of style. His matter, which, after all, is the main thing, seems to me pernicious and misleading to the last degree…[18]

Abbey's importance in the current chapter, as both an authoritative and hybrid figure for the Neo-Pre-Raphaelites, begins roughly around 1890. Even so, the artist was aware he had followers and imitators, as early as the previous year (1889):

> I may say without false modesty, or anything else, that I have raised the level of my particular art in my own country, and have had a good many followers, of one sort and another. Do you think I ought *not* be encouraged by this! I don't very often think of it. The followers have not followed the thing in my work that I have really cared most for; like most imitators they have imitated the weaknesses. But I feel a strength at the back of it and I see things that may be done—that never have been done.[19]

In 1889, he was elected Royal Academician and as such, would become aware of a group of young students whose link to him will ultimately legitimize their own para-Pre-Raphaelitic inclinations. It seems fitting, then, that Abbey was already remarking on his followers. He asserts that he did his best when he was "encouraged to do somebody else's best"; likewise, these Abbey devotees were imitating what he understood to be his own weaknesses. As the letter suggests, this exercise allowed him the opportunity to remedy those imperfections. His words indicate he may have felt an obligation to this younger generation, and while he is not

---

[17] This action aligns him with the PRB, but could also be said of Millais et. al.
[18] Lucas, vol. 1, 189.
[19] Ibid., 189.

specific about the "things that may be done—that have never been done"[20], it is clear that it impacted his own art.

RELATIONSHIPS: ROYAL ACADEMY

The year 1890 marked the exhibition of Abbey's first major oil painting, *May-Day Morning* (fig. 2), at the Royal Academy. This picture "was proving itself … very popular… Not only did it attract the public, but one famous painter, at any rate, found it to his mind."[21] As described by J.P. Beadle in a letter written to Abbey, dated 1890, "Millais was jawing [sic] nineteen to the dozen the other day to me in favor of your picture. It evidently took his eye more than anything else."[22]

The 1890s were fraught with changes to the phenomenon beyond the first wave of Pre-Raphaelitism. The original Brotherhood had disbanded by the mid to late 1850s, though Rossetti (d. 1882) and Edward Burne-Jones (d. 1898) had embarked on a second phase of Pre-Raphaelitism, which Prettejohn has termed Aesthetic Pre-Raphaelitism.

Though he spent the next several years after *May Day Morning* working on the *Quest of the Holy Grail* mural cycle with fellow American expatriate John Singer Sargent (1890-1901), Abbey returned to exhibiting regularly at the RA in 1894 with *Fiammetta's Song* (fig. 3), a theme also illustrated by Rossetti (1878; fig. 4). At this time, his path crossed early with two students at the Royal Academy School—Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale was admitted in January of 1895, while Byam Shaw's instruction ended in July of that year.[23] Interestingly enough, the friendship between Brickdale and Shaw continued throughout their lifetimes, with Brickdale

---

[20] Ibid, 189.
[21] Ibid., vol 1, 238.
[22] Quoted in ibid., 238.
[23] RA Archives, Class Registers

teaching at an art school founded by Shaw and Rex Vicat Cole. While it is not documented that Abbey maintained a personal friendship with Brickdale, it is known that he maintained a professional interest in Shaw—"in 1899, he recommended Shaw to design the costumes for Herbert Beerbohm Tree's production of *King John*; Shaw did not receive the commission, but later worked on Tree's *Much Ado About Nothing* in 1905."[24]

The year 1896 starts a particularly important series of events and a chain reaction that not only result in the transition between Pre-Raphaelitism and Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism, but also the link between Victorian and Edwardian eras. These incidents ensured Abbey's importance as well as placed him in a prime position for the advent of the twentieth-century.

Fortescue-Brickdale entered the RA School in 1895, and first exhibited there in 1896. Two years later (1898) Abbey is elected Associate Royal Academician (ARA) and exhibits three works: *Richard, Duke of Gloucester, and the Lady Anne; Lorenzo and Jessica;* and *"Sweet Nelly, My Heart's Delight"*. Leighton, the President of the Royal Academy (PRA) dies and Millais is elected in his place. Unfortunately, Millais died shortly thereafter and Abbey took this death very hard. The artist was buried with "full pomp"[25] at St. Paul's. Abbey was one of the mourners; he described the ceremony in a lengthy letter to his wife, the text suggesting that he was one of the pallbearers:

> I went round early (to the R.A.) … one by one the company assembled… We joined the procession as it came from Kensington. The streets crammed with people… The big west door [of St. Paul's] was open, and we filed in behind the procession of people who had come…The crowd of familiar faces…the music, and the big solemn place were too much for me [but] we filed to the right and left of the coffin, which I now saw for the first

---

[24] Quoted in Lucy Oakley, *Unfaded Pageant: Edwin Austin Abbey's Shakespearean Subjects from the Yale University Art Gallery and Other Collections* (New York: Miriam & Ira D. Wallach Art Gallery, Columbia, Columbia University, 1994), 60.; See also Gerard Taylor's exhibition catalogue on *Byam Shaw* for the Ashmolean Museum catalogue.

[25] Lucas, vol. 2, 300.

> time, in the centre of the space under the dome. I was just behind the family, and the four pall-bearers on my side were Holman Hunt, Irving, Lord Wolseley, and Lord Carlisle.[26]

Abbey continues:

> It was not until I looked up and saw the old palette and bunch of brushes and mahlstick tied with crape that I couldn't seem to stand it anymore—and I can't now when I think of it—and the music and all—and all those representatives of whatever stands for greatness in the world gathered there to do all that was to be done to honour his memory.[27]

It would seem, then, that Millais and Abbey were close and that the young artist was much affected personally by the loss. Not only did this occasion mark the death of another of the original members of the PRB, but it also signaled the loss of Abbey's colleague, mentor and champion. Several months after Millais' death, Abbey recalls how this grave event spurred him to action:

> I think perhaps it was the sensation at that funeral that started me, partly—not altogether maybe—but I think one should get a big stirring sensation once in a while. One gets so *blasé* that it is difficult, unless your feelings are very much touched indeed… I didn't know him so well [Millais] as I did Leighton, but his hearty clap on the back and his 'I like your picture' are things one will miss.[28]

The following year (1897) marked the sixtieth anniversary or the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria's reign. Abbey exhibited three works at the RA, notably the "*Play scene from Hamlet*" (see figure 5, to be discussed in Chapter 3). At the same time, the future Neo-Pre-Raphaelite artists continued their studies and successes at the Royal Academy Schools: Cadogan Cowper was admitted as a student and Fortescue-Brickdale won a £40 prize for her design of a mural decoration.[29]

---

[26] Ibid., 300; I suspect that pall-bearer Lord Carlisle was the same Lord Carlisle who was involved with the Parliament murals in 1908 (he commissioned the panel by Frank Cadogan Cowper.) If so, then this provides an acquaintance between Abbey and Carlisle.
[27] Ibid., 301.
[28] Ibid., 302.
[29] Cadogan Cowper's admittance into the RA Schools is part of the RA Class Register. Fortescue-Brickdale's award was recorded in the chronology displayed in the *Pre-Raphaelite Journey* exhibit as well as mentioned in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Malcolm Warner, 'Brickdale, (Mary) Eleanor Fortescue- (1872–1945)', *Oxford*

In 1898, Abbey continued to exhibit regularly at the RA and was elected full Royal Academician, producing his Diploma work *A Lute Player*. While the artist continued to rise in the Academy, so too did the future Neo-Pre-Raphaelites in their pursuits. However, in June of that year, Edward Burne-Jones, the major Pre-Raphaelite exponent of the second generation died. As Rossetti died in the early 1880s and Morris in 1896, Burne-Jones was arguably the last leader of that particular incarnation of Pre-Raphaelitism.

The death of John Ruskin in 1900 appeared to mark the end to the original movement which had begun nearly fifty years earlier. Ruskin had, of course, been their primary champion, patron, and it was to his visual theories they were most indebted. His death definitely marked the end of an era, and some might suppose that it followed, the expiration of anything that resembled the Pre-Raphaelites. Yet with Abbey's interest in the PRB as well as the up-and-coming artists whom I ultimately group as Neo-Pre-Raphaelite, it was not the death of this movement at all.

While it is true that with Ruskin, Millais, Rossetti, and Burne-Jones gone, the first two phases of Pre-Raphaelitism were finished, it stands to reason that there could be artists of the twentieth century who would take inspiration from this earlier movement. As it happened, for another coherent stage of Pre-Raphaelitism to occur, there was a single individual, who, like Ruskin for Millais, Rossetti and Holman Hunt, could act as critic, support, and aesthetic advisor. Although never before acknowledged by scholars, Abbey was in this singular position to act as this leader and keystone for the third phase of Pre-Raphaelitism, one reason being his placement in the Royal Academy and interaction with the current students at the RA Schools. As Lucy Oakley stipulates in her essay [on Abbey's] *Paintings at the Royal Academy*, "Abbey's influence

---

Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/55176, accessed 18 Nov 2013]

upon younger artists was further consolidated through his role as a Visitor at the Royal Academy Schools…as well as his supervision from 1908 to 1910 of a group of young artists painting six panels for the East Corridor in the Palace of Westminster…(to be discussed in Chapter 4)."[30]

This is not to suggest that without Abbey, this particular circle of Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism would have never occurred. Rather, during their training and production in their time at the Royal Academy, as well as correspondence they wrote, it is easy to recognize that Shaw, Cowper and Brickdale especially were already looking to the work of Millais, Rossetti, Hunt and Burne-Jones for inspiration and influence. In the 1890s they emerged as individual artists, yet consciously or not shared certain Pre-Raphaelite traits.

Queen Victoria's death in 1901 marked the official finale to the Victorian period and ushered in the Edwardian era. It was in this year that

> Abbey was elected to the Associateship of the American Academy of Design. In this year he was also chosen as President of the Royal Birmingham Society of Artists, thus becoming the fifteenth President, in succession to Sir Martin Archer Shee, PRA (elected in 1842), Eastlake, Grant, Leighton, Millais, Tadema, Burne-Jones, Watts, Orchardson, Herkomer, Edward J. Poynter, and W.B. Richmond. In 1902, Abbey was re-elected for a second year.[31]

The change of monarchy at the start of the twentieth-century ultimately solidified Abbey's position and ensured his influential presence to the Neo-Pre-Raphaelites. In 1902, Edward VII appointed Abbey as the official court painter of the coronation to be held in Westminster Abbey. The author of the article "Edwin A. Abbey, the American artist who will paint King Edward VII's Coronation" in *The Deseret Evening News* of Saturday, December 21, 1901 wrote

> There is no denying the fact that in selecting Edwin Austin Abbey to paint the official portrait of his coronation, King Edward VII of England did honor to the artist… He of all others [is] the right man to depict the coming coronation. In this scene there will be

---

[30]Oakley, 60; The Parliament Murals, Abbey's role and these young artists will be discussed in Chapter Four.
[31] Lucas, 359.

> introduced as central figures King Edward and Queen Alexandra… All the foreign royalties present will be shown, as well as ambassadors, lords and ladies in waiting, prime ministers, etc., probably swelling the number to above 200 in all. Each personage will be a portrait…and the magnitude of such a scheme…probably 30 or 40 feet by 90 or 100, can only be imagined. It will probably take the artist five or six years to complete his work after all preliminary sketches and studies have been made.[32]

RELATIONSHIPS: ABBEY AND CADOGAN COWPER

As the above article suggests, the *Coronation of King Edward VII, August 9th, 1902* (1902-07; fig.6), measuring to fifteen by nine feet, was an enormous undertaking. Simultaneously, Abbey accepted a commission to decorate the new state capital at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. Such large-scale compositions required Abbey to employ the aid of assistants. Though he remained in his studio to work on the monumentally-sized murals for the American project, he supervised the work that progressed on the *Coronation* painting (to be briefly discussed in Chapters 4 &5). To achieve this, he selected Cadogan Cowper,

> a student of five-and-twenty, just out of the Royal Academy Schools, full of purpose and ambition and not less sincere in his desire for truth than the painter for whom he was to work. Mr. Cowper's engagement began in August, 1902, and lasted until the following spring…those who assisted after Mr. Cowper were Mr. Ernest Board…[33]

Though Cowper was familiar with Abbey's work while attending the St. John's Wood School of Art, it was not until after he and his fellow students, having seen the artist's *Richard, Duke of Gloucester, and the Lady Anne* (to be discussed in Chapter 3) at the Royal Academy exhibit in 1896, that he too became "more or less 'Abbey mad'."[34] Cowper and Abbey did not formally meet until 1902 when Abbey helped to "find a buyer for Mr. Cowper's picture of the graveyard scene in *Hamlet*…and putting some illustrating in his way, Abbey invited him to assist

---

[32] "Edwin A. Abbey, the American Artist who will paint King Edward VII's Coronation", 21 December 1901. http://news.google.com/newspapers?id=6QIvAAAAIBAJ&sjid=s9wFAAAAIBAJ&pg=2607%2C1114381 (accessed October 2013).
[33] Lucas, 369.
[34] Ibid., 370; See also Oakley, 60.

with details of the Coronation."[35] Of their collaboration, Cowper wrote to his mother in May 1902,

> All last week I have been painting the King's Coronation vestments on the lay-figure. Abbey could only get them just now for a short time and as he was busy on other things he set me to paint them! A pretty responsible job!! As they are the most important thing in the picture, except the King's head…I have finished them—so Abbey can't touch what I have done if he wants to—and I shall be able to point out my actual handiwork in the picture when it is finished!!!... Abbey hasn't touched it yet! It is all my work!!![36]

While the Coronation picture will be referenced in future chapters, it is clear that the amicable and professional relationship between Abbey and Cowper was solidified when the latter began assisting Abbey in 1902.

The project of the six murals to decorate the East Corridor of the House of Commons, while a large undertaking for Abbey, assembled several of the "Neo-Pre-Raphaelites" together. Abbey's primary role, aside from assembling the individual artists, was to coordinate and oversee the work. To that end, he ensured

> harmony by setting a common horizon line, figure scale, and color scheme…All of the East Corridor murals play variations on Abbeyesque combinations of detailed historical reconstruction, tightly framed compositions, compressed perspective, highly decorative surface patterns, and a dominant color chord of black, white, red, and gold.[37]

The murals were finished in October of 1910; there was no formal ceremonial opening, but there was a press view on October 1, 1910.[38] Though the project was begun under the reign of Edward VII, he died in May, and George V succeeded him to the throne.

---

[35] Ibid., 370.
[36] RA Letters, COW 1/5/1
[37]Oakley, 60; See also: Willsdon, *Mural Painting in Britain*; and Malcolm Hay and Jacqueline Riding, *Art in Parliament: the Permanent Collection of the House of Commons* (Norwich: The Palace of Westminster and Jarrold Publishing, 1996); as well as excerpts from Lucas.
[38] Melanie Unwin (Deputy Curator for Parliamentary Art Collection), e-mail message to author, Jan 16, 2014: "Re the unveiling, Walker (A Catalogue of paintings, drawings, engravings and sculpture in the Palace of Westminster compiled during 1959-77 by R J B Walker, PSA 1988) says '... the work was finished in October 1910 (PRO file - Works 11/12). Apart from a Press view on 1st October there was no ceremonial opening. (The Times 22 September 1910, 10c and 18 October 1910 8ab. Art-Journal, 1910 p.371. The whole series was reproduced in The Illustrated London News under the heading 'Coals of Fire. Gift from Lords to Commons' (ILN 5 November 1910, p.699))."

RELATIONSHIPS: RUSKIN'S THEORIES AND THE PRB

As Marcia Werner argues in *Pre-Raphaelite Painting and Nineteenth Century Realism*,

> Although the writings of the artists themselves are often dismissed as inconsequential, Ruskin's works have been taken seriously and, since the publication of his pamphlet *Pre-Raphaelitism* in 1851, have been considered basic to the evolution of their art… it is now almost always assumed in Pre-Raphaelite studies that Ruskin's *Modern Painters* provided whatever theoretical base the Pre-Raphaelites had and was the source of their predilection for a highly defined naturalism.[39]

Werner addresses the second volume of *Modern Painters* (*II: The Theoretic Faculty*) and its concern with Ruskin's ideas of beauty—"that is, with defining beauty, setting forth its sources and instructing both artists and viewers in the proper understanding and identification of its attributes."[40] Indeed, Ruskin

> stress[es] that impressions of beauty are in no way sensual or intellectual, but moral and, therefore, the faculty for receiving them is not perceptual, but "theoretic." He is most emphatic on this point: Beauty is not to be considered "aesthetic", for that would degrade it to a mere operation of sense.[41]

In Ruskin's mind, then, representations of the physical world were intrinsically linked with morality, and to that end, he wrote that they were to be derived from "those material sources which are agreeable to our moral nature in its purity and perfection."[42] In the early years, there was a fascination with and insistence for truth to nature and a minutely detailed authenticity in its visual representation. To that end, the PRB (and Abbey nearly forty years later), focused on the advice Ruskin provided in the preface to his 1851 pamphlet *Pre-Raphaelitism,* an oft-quoted

---

[39] Marcia Werner, *Pre-Raphaelite Painting and Nineteenth-Century Realism* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 18. Werner's purpose is to "test" this premise, according to "a systematic examination, specifically with regard to the question of possible influence, of those of his texts what predate or are concurrent with the formative years of the Brotherhood that directly concern Pre-Raphaelite painting, or have been historically linked to the Brotherhood in the literature of the movement." (19-20). For some of the many possible examples of scholars who support the claim that Ruskin's writings were directly related to the PRB execution, see Werner, 19 (footnote 26). This list includes excerpts written by Robin Ironside and John Gere (*Pre-Raphaelite Painters*), Timothy Hilton (*The Pre-Raphaelites*), James Sambrook (*Pre-Raphaelitism: A collection of critical essays*), Tim Barringer (*Reading the Pre-Raphaelites*), among others.

[40] Ibid., 20.

[41] Ibid., 20.

[42] Quoted in Werner, 20; John Ruskin, *Modern Painters*, Vol.1, Part I, Sec. I, Chapt. 6.

excerpt which, as Werner states "[is] most responsible for the prevalent idea that he provided the inspiration for the movement."[43] Ruskin writes:

> Eight years ago, in the close of the first volume of "Modern Painters," I ventured to give the following advice to the young artists of England:
>
> 'They should go to nature in all singleness of heart, and walk with her laboriously and trustingly, having no other thought but how best to penetrate her meaning: rejecting nothing, selecting nothing, and scorning nothing.' Advice which, whether bad or good, involved infinite labor and humiliation in the following of it; and was therefore, for the most part rejected.
>
> It has, however, at last been carried out, to the very letter, by a group of men who, for their reward, have been assailed with the most scurrilous abuse which I ever recollect seeing issue from the public press. I have, therefore, thought it due to them to contradict the directly false statements which have been made respecting their works; and to point out the kind of merit which, however deficient in some respects, those works possess beyond the possibility of dispute.[44]

RELATIONSHIPS: ABBEY APPLIES RUSKIN'S THEORIES

Abbey took to heart the core foundation of Ruskin's artistic inclinations and extended them into his own, Post-Raphaelite time and art. He adhered to the attitude of rejecting, selecting and scorning nothing, but it also may be inferred that he too believed that the

> true duty [of the painter is] the faithful representation of all objects of historical interest, or of natural beauty existent at the period; representation such as might once aid the advance of the sciences, and keep faithful record of every monument of past ages which was likely to be swept away in the approaching eras of revolutionary change.[45]

Like Ruskin before him, Abbey, too, was adamant that art *say* something. In a letter dated 1880, when the Impressionist movement was already well established, he wrote

> It is utterly impossible to do good work straight off, I find. All this 'impressionist' business is well enough in its way, and as far as it goes. *I* like to feel in a man's work that it has hurt him a little, given him a wakeful night or two, and a little headache. The great trouble, it seems to me, at home is that the main idea is 'paint,' no matter what the subject might be, so that it be 'nattily' painted. I must say with all my heart that I believe this to

[43] Ibid., 46.
[44] Quoted in Werner, 46; Ruskin, *Works*, XII, 339.
[45] Partially quoted in Werner, 47; the full quotation can be found in Ruskin, *The Complete Works*, 177.

> be debasing art, as *art*. Paint as well as you please, but do *say* something. The more I find out, the more there seems to be to find…[46]

Part of Abbey's artistic practice and practical approach required strict adherence to truth in nature—be it through garments, accoutrements, furniture, or architecture. In May of 1880 he accordingly writes,

> My maxim in all my work is that if it is worth doing at all, it is worth doing as well as it is possible to do it—in every *minutest* respect. A man who allows himself the habit of being slipshod about little things, will gradually become slipshod about everything. If an illustrator is to show the manner and appearance of the people of the Middle Ages, it seems to me it should fairly *smell* of that time. I am picking up piece by piece a very valuable collection of accessories. I must have at least fifty complete costumes of various periods, mainly of the last two hundred and fifty years. These are nearly all original articles, or are carefully copied from originals which I have borrowed for the purpose.[47]

Abbey continued this penchant for period costume and infused his works with an authenticity that he carefully cultivated. On this very point, Lucas documents the artist's request of Millais to borrow the same costume that Millais used in his *Princes in the tower* (1879). In a similar spirit, Cadogan Cowper wrote in 1902 that Abbey had acquired "costumes of armor" that he put at his young protégé's disposal.[48] Additionally, in that year, when Cowper was aiding Abbey in the completion of the *Coronation* picture, the two worked from the King's actual Coronation vestments as well as a fourteenth-century Persian rug (insured for £1200).[49] Over the course of his career, as modern scholar Lucy Oakley writes in *Unfaded Pageant: Edwin Austin*

---

[46] Lucas, vol 1., 97.
[47] Lucas, vol. 1, 102.; In an earlier excerpt from this same letter, Abbey vents his frustration toward G.W. Curtis who had been making remarks on painting and engraving in February of that year. Abbey writes "Perhaps Mr. Curtis is not aware that one at *least* of his draughtsmen for the engravers takes as much pains with the details of a drawing which appears in his magazine—an inch and a half square in size—as ever any painter did with his most elaborate pictures… I could tell you how 'Julia's Clothes' [in the Herrick series] cost me a week of search among costumes and historical authorities, and how, failing to find what I wanted, I had her dress *made* of black satin from an old print of the time by Hollar at an expense of more than half of what I received for the drawing… I had finished an elaborate drawing of 'Mindwell and his mother' when I discovered that I had made the costume at least twenty years later than the date Mrs. Cooke has set down as that of her story, and although she distinctly describes one of her characters as wearing a costume which was not thought of until *thirty* years at least after her date—*still*, I threw mine out and lost all that work…" (102).
[48] COW/1/5/2
[49] Ibid.

Abbey's Shakespearean Subjects, Abbey "accumulated a large collection of period costumes, housed in an "amazing wardrobe," described by a visitor to his studio at the turn of the century:

> Here, hung in due order, classified with such care, love and pride as an entomologist might display in the arrangement of his specimens, is the vast collection of garments of all periods and styles which Mr. Abbey has collected or had devised, and to which additions are continuously being made. Here they hang, on right and on left, in diminishing perspective, until one might almost imagine one's self in the "property shop" of some great theatre.[50]

Abbey's insistence on faithfully re-creating the veracity of his subject enhanced the Ruskinian notion of truth-to-nature to a more sophisticated level—one which would be realized in his own compositions and by those of his followers. Of course, Millais, Hunt and Rossetti had already demonstrated this love of material objects and textiles in countless works such as *The Huguenot, Awakening Conscience, La Bella Mano,* etc. Indeed, Cowper wrote that Abbey's knowledge was "astonishing" and that the older artist had once advised to:

> 'Always look up three times as much as you will want to put into a picture.' And it is this thoroughness which makes his [Abbey's] work so interesting, whether illustrations or pictures. Most illustrators are content when they have learnt up barely enough of their subject to get them through their drawing… He always said: 'Economise [sic] everywhere else, but don't ever economise [sic] in the studio.'[51]

Abbey's visual representations thus provided a complementary addition to the precedent set forth by the Pre-Raphaelites, their followers and close associates.

Curiously, the artist's education had only included one lesson in oil paining in 1880; it was not until 1889 when he began to paint seriously in oil.[52] During those in-between years, the artist was known for his illustrations, watercolors and drawings. The introduction of working in a new medium to Abbey's repertoire was a source of frustration for him, but it is not surprising

---

[50] Quoted in Oakley, 28.
[51] Ibid., 371.; This quote is also used in Chapter 5 in regards to the relationship between the two artists. I include it here to emphasize Abbey's artistic practice and teachings.
[52] Kathy Foster and Michael Quick, *Edwin Austin Abbey* (New Haven: Yale University Art Gallery, 1973), 1.

that he applied the same detail-oriented precision to these paintings as had been executed in his black and white works, the latter having earned praise by Millais in 1895.

Abbey admired Ruskin's artistic inclinations, and paraphrased them that year according to his understanding (1889):

> [S]omething about the representation of events not as they might be supposed *poetically* to have happened, but as they really might have happened. That is what I'd like to do. It was done by Millais in the early days… I'd like to carry that on. I'd *like* to carry it farther than poor Bastien did in his 'Joan of Arc,' but I'm afraid it's not for me. *This is enough of this!*[53]

This letter expresses the artist's frustration, most likely over his new work with oil rather than with Ruskin's insistence about truth to nature and therefore, the actualization of an event. Ironically, when one considers Abbey's assertion that a subject necessarily informs the size its canvas with the artist's desire that, like Ruskin, it must be represented in such a way as to reflect an event's likelihood, this excerpt ironically confirms his own devotion to Ruskin's core theories.

Like his PRB predecessors, Abbey also employed his own liberties to Ruskin's principles. In general, Abbey preferred large canvases (much larger than a traditional PRB work or even a standard easel painting) and never included the rounded top format found in early Pre-Raphaelite works, such as Millais' *Ophelia* (c. 1851-52), *The Huguenot* (c. 1851-52), or Hunt's *Awakening Conscience* (c. 1853).

ABBEY: STYLISTIC LEGACIES TO THE NEXT GENERATIONS

Abbey's early career was primarily as an illustrator and watercolorist. When he exhibited *May Day Morning* (1890) at the Royal Academy, he also received a commission for mural decorations for the newly built Boston Public Library. As modern scholar Allen Staley writes, this commission

---

[53] Lucas, vol 1., 189.

> would demand a fundamental redirection of his art: a redirection away from the delicacy and refinement of the essentially domestic and private world of his illustrations and watercolors of the preceding decade toward pageantry, theatricality, monumentality, and public display.[54]

Ironically, Abbey had written the year before (1889) that "the imaginative work that appeals to me the most is of a quaint and innocent sort, far removed from the tremendous and grandiose."[55] Of course, by accepting the Boston project, as well as the subsequent larger-scaled murals for the Pennsylvania state capitol in Harrisburg and as well as the Parliamentary murals, Abbey had inadvertently committed himself to what he referred to as the "tremendous and grandiose." Indeed, by the time of the artist's death in 1911, "he was looked upon as the leading practitioner of monumental decorative painting in England" (to which one might add America as well).[56]

In 1895, Abbey agreed to a private viewing of his *Holy Grail* murals in London before they were transferred to America. Given his status as a draughtsman of black-and-white work, these larger mural panels destined for Boston not only "came as a revelation" but also significantly increased his reputation.[57] Millais praised Abbey on these works, and sent the following note: "I must write a line to say what pleasure your work has given me. For years I have seen and admired your beautiful illustrations, and congratulate you on this larger undertaking."[58]

As such a comment confirms, it was a combination of scale and painting ability that now caused Abbey to be in the public eye. As earlier noted, Abbey was not known previously as an oil painter and in 1895, with the display of the *Holy Grail* panels, neither *May Morning* nor *Fiammetta's Song* had yet sold. The former, "although it had been practically sold … was six

---

[54] Allen Staley, "Abbey in England," in Oakley, 17.
[55] Quoted in ibid., 17; Lucas, vol 1., 200.
[56] Staley, 17.
[57] Lucas, vol. 2, 281
[58] Quoted in Lucas, 281.

inches too long for the recess in which it was to hang", and the latter was eight feet long, and as such "demanded too great a wall space for the average house, which made it less saleable for a smaller work."[59] As Lucas declares, "neither now nor afterwards did Abbey yield to pressure to paint pictures of any size other than the subjects seemed to him to demand. He was bent upon delivering his own message in his own language, and this was not the language of the so-called easel picture."[60] Indeed, in his entire oeuvre, he painted only four oils which were smaller than his first two, *May Day Morning* (1890-94, 42 x 68 in.) and *Fiammetta's Song* (1894, 52 x 105 in). These "smaller" sized canvases were produced between 1896-1900 and include *Fair is my love* (1900, 24.6 x 36.1 in; fig.7); *The Bridge* (1898, 40 x 28 in); *Who is Sylvia? What is She, That all the Swains Commend Her?* (1896-99, reworked in 1900—122 x 122 in; fig.8); and his Diploma work for the RA, *The Lute Player* (1899, 77 x 51.5 in; fig.9).

ABBEY'S DEATH AND IMPORTANCE TO PRB & NPR

Five years after the start of the Parliament murals, Abbey died on August 1, 1911. In the winter of 1912, there was a memorial exhibition held at the Royal Academy for the deceased artist.[61] His death too marked an end to a very specific era. Millais, Rossetti, and Ruskin had already died, and Holman Hunt, who stalwartly maintained the techniques and methodologies of early Pre-Raphaelitism throughout his career, died in September of 1910. Abbey, as has been demonstrated, was in a unique position of knowing the members of the original Brotherhood and observing the later Rossettian and Burne-Jonesian manifestations of Pre-Raphaelitism.

---

[59] Lucas, vol. 2, 281.
[60] Ibid., 281.
[61] To see the catalogue for the memorial exhibition, please visit the RA Collections ("Search exhibition catalogues."). The link for this particular catalogue is http://www.racollection.org.uk/ixbin/indexplus?_IXz=2&_IXACTION_=summary&_IXSPFX_=templates%2Fsummary%2F&_IXFPFX_=templates%2Ffull%2F&%24with+v_id+is+VOL3274=.&_IXMAXHITS_=18&_IXACTION_=display&_IXp=1
(accessed September 2013).

Additionally, Abbey worked with several younger artists who not only imitated him, but also drew great influence from the different facets of Pre-Raphaelitism.

Though Abbey died in the first quarter of the twentieth century, his unofficial followers continued to incorporate a hybrid of composition and style from both Pre-Raphaelitism as well as Abbey's own oeuvre. By this time, the "apprentices," Cowper, Shaw, and Brickdale, were advanced enough in their respective careers so that they were the ones submitting and exhibiting regularly at the Royal Academy, among other institutions, including the Royal Watercolor Society and the like. They were also now in a position to teach younger artists (Shaw and Brickdale worked together at the Byam Shaw School) and thereby legitimately carry on the fusion of Abbey and the PRB.

Abbey served as artistic linchpin between the original Pre-Raphaelites and late nineteenth/ early twentieth century artists of Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism by providing an obvious and visual link between these two artistic movements. The NPR harkened back to compositions, subjects, and style employed by the PRB, but their compositions were also variations of these predecessors *as well as* those by Abbey. I concluded from my initial research that Cowper, Shaw and Brickdale, in particular, were echoing only the Brotherhood in their Pre-Raphaelite-inspired work. For the first time in Abbey scholarship, I am now claiming not only that Abbey often echoed PRB compositions, but also, and more importantly, that the NPR compositions were re-interpreting Pre-Raphaelite compositions that Abbey himself had previously borrowed or been inspired by.

Chapter 3
Abbey and the Pre-Raphaelite Legacy: Selected Images

"We have all lost in Art what in our lifetime we shall never see again."[1]

ABBEY SELECTED IMAGES- PRB PRECEDENT & NPR RE-INTERPRETATION

Due to Abbey's role as linchpin between the original members of the nineteenth-century PRB and the twentieth-century Neo-Pre-Raphaelites, he may also be considered an artistic intercessor between the two groups. This becomes particularly apparent when examples of his work are compositionally compared to both camps. There is compelling visual evidence to suggest his indebtedness to his Victorian predecessors, as well as obvious echoing years later by Abbey's own followers. A brief selection of Abbey's paintings has been chosen in order to illustrate such comparisons, although other objects reinforce this bond. In this chapter, *Fair is my love* (1900), *King Lear: Act I scene I* (1898), *Richard, Duke of Gloucester and the Lady Anne* (1896) and *Hamlet: the play scene* (1897) serve as solid examples of this visual indebtedness.

FAIR IS MY LOVE

Abbey's *Fair is my love* (1900, fig.7), now housed at the Harris Museum in Preston, England, is not a particularly large composition, measuring 24.45 inches by 36.1 inches. The painting takes its title from some "unidentified lines" of verse inscribed on the back of the canvas:

> Fair is my love, my dear and only jewel,
> Mild are her looks, but yet her heart is cruel,
> O that her heart were, as her looks are, mild,
> Then should I not from comfort be exiled.[2]

---

[1] Percy Macquoid, R.I., in "Tributes," Lucas, 490.
[2] Quoted from John Christian, ed. *Last Romantics: The Romantic Tradition in British Art: Burne-Jones to Stanley Spencer* (London: Lund Humphries in association with Barbican Art Gallery, 1989), 119.

Such an inscription causes the viewer to wonder if these are the lyrics to the female's song, though her lips are closed? Is it, instead, the internal thoughts of the man at right? Does this describe the relationship between the two figures, or is Abbey simply using these lines as a creative and imaginative accompaniment?

The precedent for this image is Millais' *Rosalind in the forest* (c. 1868; fig. 10).[3] Like the Abbey composition made nearly thirty years later, it too shows a young woman leaning against the trunk of a large tree. While Rosalind appears to be in the middle of a forest, with trees, leaves and wildlife around, she too has her legs bent at the knee and head slightly turned so that she gazes off into the distance. Instead of a lute, she lightly holds a spear-like halberd. It is she who is dressed with the black cap and male attire that was worn by the male figure in Abbey's work. Millais takes his subject matter from Shakespeare's *As you like it*, portraying the female protagonist after she has been exiled to the Forest of Arden. She disguises herself as a male shepherd and goes by the name "Ganymede", a figure from Greek mythology. Millais' figure is contemplative, most likely a reflection on the Shakespearean narrative.

Visually, however, one sees that this female was the basis for both of Abbey's figures.[4] Rosalind, with legs bent and head turned, also has her left hand raised (with fingers bent upwards) and right arm extended down at her side, where she grips the spear. By 1900, Abbey had re-vamped this earlier composition and took aspects of Rosalind and divided them between the two figures. The spear has been replaced with a lute (no longer referencing the

---

[3] I have found this image dated c. 1851-1871 but the most "popular" date is 1868. It is currently part of the Walker Art Gallery (National Museums Liverpool) and the museum has dated it to 1870 (according to BBC Your Paintings, http://www.bbc.co.uk/arts/yourpaintings/ , accessed June 2014).

[4] Another comparison to be made would be the print, *Rosalind and Celia* (c. 1867) based off of Millais' un-traced painting of the same year. It shows Rosalind in the same position, with her cousin Celia slumped against her. The fool, who joined them from court, leans against the tree at right. The website, www.dgibnet.com (accessed September 2014; admittedly not a scholarly website) claims that a sketch of this composition exists at the Walker Art Gallery in Liverpool, England but I have not been able to substantiate this claim either online, through the Walker's website, or catalogues on Millais' work.

Shakespearean drama) and the female's arm movements have been reversed. Abbey's work has the right arm up (supporting the base of the instrument) with fingers bent (the middle knuckle of both women extend further than the rest); the left arm is also raised (again to hold the lute). Meanwhile, the white detailing at the seams of Rosalind's costume have been echoed in the pink ribbon that has been fashioned as a strap which then cascades down from the tip of the lute.

In 1905, Cadogan Cowper re-interpreted the composition in his *La Belle Dame Sans Merci* (fig. 11), which was also a specialty of Rossetti. CC's subject matter, taken from Keat's poem of the same name, literally meaning "the beautiful woman without mercy/pity." As notable Keats scholar and playwright Dorothy Hewlett writes, "[*La Belle Dame sans Merci*] had a stronger effect on mid-Victorian verse than perhaps any other of Keats' poems."[5]

The poem begins with a traveler discovering a knight on the road, "O WHAT can ail thee, knight-at-arms,/ Alone and palely loitering?/ The sedge has wither'd from the lake,/ And no birds sing./ O what can ail thee, knight-at-arms!/ So haggard and so woe begone?/ The squirrel's granary is full,/ And the harvest's done."[6] In response to such a question, the knight answers with a tale of his own about a beautiful woman he once met and with whom he instantly fell in love. The woman, with wild eyes and long hair, and the knight traveled together. He was lulled to sleep by her kisses and dreamt about deathly pale kings, princes and warrior.[7] When the man awoke, he was alone in the cold with no trace of the temptress.

Cadogan Cowper produced three images on this subject, roughly twenty years apart—1905, 1926, 1946. His earliest image (1905), used here as a comparison to Millais and Abbey's earlier compositions, offers an alternative view of Keats' wicked temptress. When reproduced in *The Art Journal* the same year, it was accompanied with the statement, "Mr. F. Cadogan Cowper's

---

[5] Quoted in Aubrey Noakes, *Waterhouse: John William Waterhouse* (London: Chaucer, 2004), 112.
[6] John Keats, *La Belle Dame sans Merci*, 1-8.
[7] Paraphrased from the rest of the poem.

La Belle Dame Sans Merci is a cleverly arranged decorative essay rather than a picture of the enchantress with the "wild, sad eyes."" [8] Indeed, this femme fatale harkens back to representations of stunners, like Rossetti's *Helen of Troy* (1863; fig. 12), Millais' *Bridesmaid* (1851; fig 13) as well as his *Ophelia* (1851-52; fig 14). This female type was compositionally influential for Cowper's own 1906 watercolor *Mariana in the South* (to be discussed shortly).

Unlike Millais' or Abbey's examples, Cowper's figure and the tree she leans against dominates the entirety of the composition. A sense of verticality is reinforced, not only by the decision to use a tall canvas, but also by the massive, centrally-located tree. She sits against the trunk, strumming a lute and gazing at the viewer from a slightly-tilted head. Her cascading skirts, decorated with intricate designs of gold and crimson, span the width of the composition. The ring of flowers encircling her head accentuates her auburn hair, a lá *Ophelia*, and cascades down her back—matching the nuanced hues of the tree, her dress, and lute. These colored details connect the woman visually to the tree, her garments, and the repetitive tree line at back. She is literally one with nature.

La Belle Dame seductively stares out at the viewer who is presumably the infatuated knight. If the painting is true to Keat's poem, they may have stopped to rest, and she is lulling the knight to sleep by the strumming of her lute. The viewer, then, becomes the tragic victim of the story, having fallen prey to the merciless beauty.

Millais, Abbey, and Cadogan Cowper, then, have each uniquely used a composition which combines a female figure leaning against a large, centrally located tree.[9] Millais used it to illustrate a part of Shakespeare's *As you like it*, while Abbey visually changed it to include a secondary figure and replace the instrument of harm or protection with one of music and harmony, and left both subject and meaning ambiguous. Cowper re-interpreted the basic visual

---

[8] Anonymous, *The Art Journal,* 1905.

[9] Rossetti also produced *La Belle Dame Sans Merci* (c. 1850; pen and ink over pencil on green paper; Virginia Surtees, *The Paintings and Drawings of Dante Gabriel Rossetti: a catalogue raisonné* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 39. He shows the two figures, arms linked, walking. The woman's mouth is open to suggest she is singing and the knight is smiling.

elements to present an alternate version of the Keat's femme fatale and suggests that, in effect, the viewer becomes the male companion that Abbey had depicted in his work.[10]

KING LEAR

Abbey's *King Lear* (c. 1898; fig. 15) is an enormous horizontal composition measuring 4.5 ft by 10.6 ft. It takes its subject matter from Act 1, Scene 1 from the Shakespearean play. The dejected King Lear, having just disowned his loyal (and favorite) daughter Cordelia for refusing to proclaim her love for him, exits at right, supported by his Fool and knights. Abbey divides the composition into three visual parts: at left are the evil, scheming sisters, Regan and Goneril; at center is Cordelia and the King of France, who bends to kiss her hand; and at right is the slumped king, departing with his attendants. Regan, dressed in crimson, "mock-curtsies" to Cordelia, while Goneril, dressed in a black gown with red stripe, stands erect in the corner, haughtily pointing towards her renounced sibling with her left hand.[11] At the center stands a stoic Cordelia, head turned towards her sisters with a look of farewell, while her extended left hand is being kissed by the King of France, who has proposed marriage despite her sudden lack of dowry. This extended limb, combined with the bowed head of her male suitor, is echoed by the bowed head of the dog (a traditional symbol of fidelity) which follows the royal retinue and the hunched King Lear at far right.[12]

[10] Cadogan Cowper also uses the compositional format of a woman standing in front of a large tree (in a central location) in his *Lancelot slays the Caitiff Knight Sir Tarquin and rescues the fair lady and the knight in captivity* (c.1954-55) Private collection.

[11] Oakley argues that Goneril's cloak resembles the coil and spring of a cobra, with its line "continuing up through her arm and ending in the fisted hand poised beneath her chin, with two fingers extended like the forked tongue of a snake." (46) She continues the discussion by linking this character (and others in Shakespeare) with snakes. Moreover, there is a discussion about the embellishment on Regan's gown and the importance of the red color in relation to the female sex.

[12] This gesture is also found in Arthur Hugh's *April Love.*

Cordelia, while slightly left of center, is the most colorful of the three sisters, dressed in a voluminous gown of pale green with blue piping. The three females and their interaction constitute a very active moment. The Royal Academy catalogue included Cordelia's parting lines to her sisters:

> Ye jewels of our father, with washed eyes
> Cordelia leaves you. I know what you are;
> And, like a sister, am most loth to call
> Your faults as they are named. Love well our father.
> To your professed bosoms I commit him.
> But yet, alas! Stood I within his grace,
> I would prefer him to a better place.
> So farewell to you both.[13]

Abbey has updated and secularized the artistic tradition of a sacra conversazione, or "sacred conversation" usually reserved for a triad of saints or other religious personages. Cordelia "speaks" to her sisters (visually, through her parting glance; textually through Shakespeare's verse included with the catalogue) who respond with their respective gazes—Regan mockingly smiles at her, emphasized through the curtsey gesture, and Goneril smugly regards her with cool disdain. The curved beam above Goneril's head acts as an architectural framing device, while the wooden throne, also with an arched top, behind Regan acts as a niche—a popular artistic device for "housing" saints or martyrs, particularly when depicting a sacra conversazione, which was the case with Nanni de Banco's *Quatro Santi Coronati* on the exterior of Italian Gothic cathedral, Orsanmichele. Indeed, the typical niche depicting a sacred conversation includes two pillars and a top (rounded, pointed, scalloped, etc). The throne mimics this convention with its upright supports and arched back. Moreover, the dialogue among the three figures is reinforced by not only their upright positions, seen in contrast to the slumped male figures, but also the degree of bodily gesture that visually moves the eye in a circular motion among the sisters. Of

---

[13] Quoted in Oakley, 45.

the three, the gaze is primarily drawn to Regan, whose curtsey effectively allows for both hands to reach toward both sisters. Regan's head is tilted toward Cordelia and the raised side of the gown reinforces this visual gesture toward the disowned daughter. Consequently, Cordelia's head, turned severely to the right, leads the viewer's gaze to the erect Gonreil. Goneril and Cordelia stare directly at one another in a non-verbal challenge.

The contrast between the scheming sisters and the loyal Cordelia is further emphasized by Abbey's choice of color for their garments. As one contemporary critic noted, Abbey "concentrated the cool light colors [in the figures of Cordelia and her suitor] while the poisonous beauty of Regan and Goneril is clothed either in crimson and scarlet or purple."[14] Additionally, Regan's garment is primarily of crimson with some black detailing while Goneril's cloak is black with a crimson lining.

King Lear was met with positive critical review, with one critic from the *Art Journal* writing:

> Unmistakably in this important group, Mr Abbey has reached a very high level and is going far to prove, by this magnificent series of object lessons, that his decorative style is capable of giving the fullest expression to dramatic motives. Already he is beginning to receive the tribute of imitation here and there on the Academy walls the efforts of faithful followers may be observed.[15]

Scholars Oakley and Foster agree that the visual precedent for this image is taken from works by older PRB associate, Ford Madox Brown: *Cordelia's potion* (c. 1866-72; fig. 16) and *Cordelia parting from her sisters* (c.1850; fig. 17).[16] Although Brown was an associate of the PRB and never a formal member, he played a key role in the group's existence. He gave lessons

---

[14] Quoted in Oakley, 46; S., *Spectator*, May 14, 1989, p. 694.
[15] Art Journal, 1898, 176.
[16] Brown did a series of 18 sketches for King Lear in 1843-44, two of which were later turned into paintings (*Lear and Cordelia* and *Cordelia's Portion*), one of which was turned into an oil-sketch (*Cordelia parting from her sisters*). These drawings are discussed in Helen O. Borowitz ("'King Lear' in the Art of Ford Madox Brown" in *Victorian Studies* (1978), Lucy Rabin (*Ford Madox Brown and the Pre-Raphaelite History-Picture*, 51-60), and Martin Meisel (*Realizations* 419-26).

in how to paint with oil to the younger artist Dante Gabriel Rossetti and the pupil's request. The opportune meeting with Rossetti and Hunt in 1848 led to Brown to adopt many of the Pre-Raphaelite characteristics, thereby aligning his own work with theirs in the minds of both the public and critics.[17]

The link between Abbey's work (a staunch admirer of Rossetti) and Brown's is reaffirmed by contemporary critical reviews of Abbey's work from the 1898 editions of both the *Art Journal* and *Magazine of Art*.[18] As the latter bluntly states, "Mr. Abbey looks at Shakespeare with all the force and vividness of Ford Madox Brown; with all his incisiveness, invention, and sense of style, and with far more grace and vastly greater accomplishment."[19]

In *Cordelia's Portion*, Brown also allows for three separate groupings of characters: from left to right, there are the scheming sisters and their husbands, all greedily placing hands on Lear's crown; the sagging Lear, dressed in white robes, holding his scepter in one hand and grasping the arm of the throne with the other; Cordelia with her two suitors, the King of France, who grasps her arm, and the Duke of Burgundy, who no longer wishes to pursue the disowned princess. In both, a dropping King Lear in white appears. Like Abbey's later painting, Brown's image depicts the same moment where Lear has disowned his favorite daughter. In this earlier work, Regan and Goneril exchange a sinister look which suggests their malevolent intent; Cordelia raises her hand to her face in a gesture which bespeaks of her dismay of Lear's pronouncement.

In stark contrast to Abbey's deliberate dedication to historical detail, the Liverpool Museum of Art points out Brown's alternate mode to accurate representation:

---

[17] Relationships taken from Stephen Wilding, *Waking Dreams: the art of the Pre-Raphaelites from the Delaware Art Museum* (Alexandria, VA.: Art Services International, 2004).
[18] For contemporary reviews, see *The Art Journal* (1898), p. 176; *Magazine of Art* (1898), p. 465.
[19] *Magazine of Art*, 1898, 465.

> Madox Brown's approach to historical verisimilitude in this picture is rather fanciful. The King of France wears vaguely fourteenth-century costume, Lear is dressed in a druidical toga, while Cornwall and Albany have some of the stock accompaniments of stage banditti. The mistletoe above Lear's head strikes an authentically ancient British note as do the curiously placed oak leaves in the helmets of Lear's soldiers. Rather less in keeping are the Greek honeysuckle motifs and the imperial griffins on the throne. The tripod table is Roman and the censer, orb and sceptre might well have emanated from the workshop of Morris, Marshall, Faulkner and Company. On the foreground map is marked Dover, where the play ends with the death of Lear, Cordelia and her sisters.[20]

The print, *Cordelia parting from her sisters*, was originally published in *The Germ* to accompany William Michael Rossetti's poem, "Cordelia", which, as Foster describes, actually offers greater detail on the expression of the three women than Shakespeare. It is the poem, then, Foster argues which

> provid[es] Abbey's specific inspiration while Ford Madox Brown supplies his compositional prototype. "Cordelia, unabashed and strong… Departs, a righteous-souled princess," writes Rossetti, while her two sisters look on, "sneering with lips still curled to lies, Sinuous of body, serpent wise."[21]

In the print, Brown includes: the two sisters at far left (with each figure's name inscribed at bottom); a large arched doorway, through which the viewer sees the retreating figure of the King, while his fool remains in the middleground; and Cordelia with the King of France at far left. In this composition, Goneril looks out at the viewer with an expression of innocence, while it is Regan and Cordelia who menacingly point at one another. The French King holds Cordelia's outstretched hand, as he too turns his head to watch, though seemingly bored, at the sisters' exchange, a pose repeated by Abbey.

Though both of Brown's compositions include the three women in the foreground, Abbey has included aspects of both *Cordelia's potion* and *Cordelia parting from her sisters* in his more frieze-like picture. Abbey maintains the slumped posture of a white-clad Lear of both Brown

---

[20] Quoted from Liverpool Museums (Lady Lever) website: http://www.liverpoolmuseums.org.uk/ladylever/collections/paintings/gallery2/cordeliasportion.aspx (accessed September 2014).

[21] Foster and Quick, *Edwin Austin* Abbey, 7-8; the excerpt from the Rossetti poem is quoted but not footnoted.

images, and he incorporates Lear's retreating form through the arched doorway in the background of the rather sketchily rendered 1850 print. Abbey also upholds the exchange of glances between sisters—between Goneril and Regan in *Potion*, and Regan and Cordelia in *Parting* – but progresses from the visual precedent by incorporating all three sisters into the non-verbal altercation, as Goneril and Cordelia glare at one another and Regan mockingly curtsies to her disinherited sister. Abbey maintains all crucial elements, however: the presence of all the sisters, the disappointed Lear with his Fool and attendants, and the stalwart King of France. However, by incorporating these aspects into one continuous narrative, with all figures and action at the foreground of the picture plane, Abbey has created a particularly dynamic re-interpretation of the Shakespearean play.

Abbey's *Lear* composition is echoed in Neo-Pre-Raphaelite artist Thomas Cooper Gotch's work, *The Dancing Lesson* (fig. 18) of c. 1905. The artist shows two young girls: a red-haired one at left in a red and gold dress and a blonde-haired girl, standing in profile at right, tentatively lifting the front of her simple ivory frock. The figure at left, presumably the "teacher" of this titled dancing lesson, lifts her dress to show an extended, pointed right foot. Her pose, complete with turned head, mimics Regan's mock curtsey in Abbey's *Lear*. In Gotch's image the fair-haired companion looks tentatively at the boisterous display before her. With hunched back and curls cascading freely down her back, she is an amalgamation of Abbey's figures of both Lear and Cordelia. Her posture and raised arms—in this case raising her dress to tentatively repeat the steps rather than lean against attendants for support—echo the slumped Lear, while her intense stare and raised gown also recall Cordelia's interaction with Regan. Although Abbey's image was fraught with malice, Gotch's representation of children playing—most likely

their own imitation of adult behavior—is innocent.[22] Like Abbey, however, Gotch also paints with reds, golds, and black—a color palette which is repeated in most, if not all, of the former's oeuvre.

RICHARD, DUKE OF GLOUCESTER AND THE LADY ANNE

Abbey's *Richard, Duke of Gloucester and the Lady Anne* (c. 1896; fig. 20) is another of Abbey's big horizontal canvases (approximately 4.4 ft x 8.7 ft) and illustrates the funeral procession of King Henry VI from Shakespeare's *Richard III* (act 1, scene 2).[23] Abbey's "setting is a cobbled road lined with half-timbered houses on the route from the Tower to King Henry VI's grave in Chertsey. Moving across the picture's background is the funeral cortege of the king, whose armored corpse appears at the upper left, resting on a bier supported by hooded mourners and accompanied by an honor guard."[24] The middle-ground is filled with a succession of black-hooded mourners, with the halberds head down, as is appropriate for funerals.[25] In the foreground, stride Lady Anne and Richard, both depicted as actively moving forward. Anne stares straight ahead with her clenched fist extended near Richard's raised hand, which holds a gold wedding band. Richard is proposing marriage to a "furiously resistant Lady Anne, Henry VI's widowed daughter-in-law."[26]

---

[22] The representation of a young girl lifting her skirts in the act of dancing can also be seen in T.C. Gotch's *Study for Golden Youth*, c. 1906 (fig. 19). The finished oil painting will be discussed in comparison to Abbey's *Richard*.
[23] As Oakley points out in a footnote, Abbey produced another royal funeral procession, *The Dirge of the Three Queens* (c. 1895), a pastel currently housed at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. It depicts act 1, scene 5 of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, a play attributed to both Shakespeare and John Fletcher. For more information on this object, please refer to the entry by Mary L. Sullivan in Doreen Bolger et. al, *American pastels in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1989), 60-61.
[24] Oakley, 42.
[25] Lucas, vol. 2, 294; As Lucas writes "Owing to the immense amount of detail to be kept in mind Abbey had, by an oversight, painted the gentlemen's halberds with their heads upwards, but arms are reversed at funerals, and it was therefore necessary to scrape these out and repaint them downwards." Lucas further details the necessary last-minute changes to Lady Anne's dress (the coat-of-arms originally included was from the wrong branch of her family) as well as the need for a new model for the face of Lady Anne.
[26] Oakley, 42.

A viewer familiar with the Shakespearean narrative would know that shortly before the moment the artist has chosen, Anne had cursed Richard for the brutal stabbing of both her father-in-law (Henry VI) and her husband (Edward, Prince of Wales). The villainous Richard takes this literally in stride, and asserts that he killed them both in order to get closer to her. In the scene by Abbey, Richard offers to let her kill him (or to kill himself) with the unsheathed sword he holds in his hand. Instead of abiding by her wishes and plunging it into his breast, he proposes marriage and holds up the gold ring. Anne will eventually succumb to Richard's flattery and accept the proposal. As contemporary critic H.H. Statham noted in his review of the Royal Academy exhibition in 1896:

> The point of the picture lies in the vivid realization of Gloster [sic] … he has the power to carry the situation; the woman, in spite of her vigorous action and clenched fist, is already struggling in the toils.[27]

Indeed, the attention is focused primarily on the interaction between the Lady Anne and Richard, with the funeral procession of the dead monarch a secondary consideration. In earlier studies and sketches of this image, Abbey re-worked the positioning of Richard, ultimately bringing him closer to the front of the picture plane, placing him parallel to Anne, and making his figure larger and ultimately more menacing.[28] In the finished oil, his evilness is accentuated by the deathly pallor of his skin tone in relation to the pale whiteness of that of Anne.

Additionally, in contrast to the preparatory sketches, the final work has a significantly increased number of mourners, all wearing black, hooded cloaks with red linings— like the sister in black in Abbey's *King Lear*-- this crimson color is repeated on the red of the halberds, the embroidery on Anne's gown, Richard's attire, the bier which carries the king, as well as the coats of arms which surround it. Set against a background of similarly darkly clad figures, the bodies

---

[27] Quoted in Oakley, 43; H.H. Statham, *Fortnightly Review* 65 (June 1896): 961-962.

[28] Studies and preparatory sketches for this work are part of the Edwin Austin Abbey Memorial Collection at the Yale University Art Gallery. See accession numbers: 1937.2218, 1937.2219, 1937.2220.

of Anne and Richard are set apart by their garments, attitude, and interaction, thereby drawing attention from the viewer.

Oakley suggests that there is no visual precedent for this bizarre "wooing scene" from *Richard III*, but that Abbey may have found "a point of departure in an illustration by John Gilbert in a volume that Abbey owned."[29] The scholar is referencing John Gilbert's *Richard III* (fig. 21), a wood engraving by the Dalziel Borthers, from *The works of Shakespeare*, 1867. Admittedly, there are similarities between the two objects: Lady Anne's rejection of the proposal; the body of the king on a funeral bier, decorated with coats-of-arms; an honor guard dressed in black cloaks, carrying their halberds; a cobbled-stoned street filled with houses. However, Abbey made drastic changes to the Gilbert composition for his own work. The relationship between Richard and Anne, for example—Richard is no longer on bended knee before Anne, and Anne no longer looks at him with disgust, one arm raised, the other firmly grasping a sword. Abbey has "transform[ed] Anne's attitude from righteous avenger to fleeing victim and Richard's from kneeling petitioner to aggressive pursuer."[30] Moreover, Anne's dress has been changed to reflect coats-of-arms of her family, more figures, like the courtier and page have been added, and the number of mourners has swelled. The halberds have been reversed from Gilbert's print, a sign of mourning appropriate to period custom, and suggested that the figures are in motion rather than static witnesses. While it is a deviation from Shakespeare's text, it is a pictorially effective one, as Statham further noted in his 1896 review:

> The wrangle took place [in the play] after the bier had been set down and the procession stopped by Gloster's [sic] imperious order; in the picture, the group is in movement and Gloster walks at the lady's side, with better result, no doubt, for the animation of the scene.[31]

---

[29] Oakley, 42.
[30] Ibid., 43.
[31] Quoted in Oakley, 43; Statham, *Fortnightly Review,* 961.

The composition of a processional, though not particularly popular among the Neo-Pre-Raphaelites beyond Abbey himself, does exist in the work of T.C. Gotch. His *Golden Youth* (c. 1907; fig. 19) has been described as "an evening picture, depicting a procession of boys and girls dancing and bearing lanterns, watched by spectators against a background of sand hills, pine trees and the sea."[32] Whereas Abbey's *Richard* was set against cobble-stoned streets lined with houses, Gotch's *Golden Youth* depicts dancing girls, children holding lanterns fastened to large poles. The artist also transformed the black-hooded mourners into colorfully dressed spectators, some shielding their eyes from the sun, watching the parade-like festivities in front of them. The poles, particularly those held by the two boys in matching yellow tunics, mimic the halberds from the funeral procession, with the red lanterns adding a festive air. This is an investigation not only of light and shadow—since the children are shown in different degrees of sunlight—but of the innocence and play of childhood—a theme that is common to Gotch's work. Like *Richard*, the members of the parade are shown actively moving, while the observers are in various states of rest—a mother bounces a baby, a young girl dances along, and two girls (perhaps sisters) embrace as they look on. Gotch has altered Abbey's processional to a composition that celebrates life, light, childhood and innocence—a stark contrast to the Shakespearean narrative of death, cruelty, and murder.

<u>PLAY SCENE FROM "HAMLET"</u>

Abbey's *Play scene from "Hamlet"* of 1897 (fig. 5) depicts the play-within-a-play from the Shakespearean drama. Hamlet, in an effort to confirm his suspicions that the former king, his father, was poisoned by Claudius, the current king, Hamlet's uncle and stepfather, arranged for a

---

[32] Pamela Lomax, *The Golden Dream: A Biography of Thomas Cooper Gotch* (Bristol: Sansom & Company, 2004), 133.

group of actors to stage a play based on a similar assassination plot. As Hamlet says, he has devised this to "catch the conscience of the king."[33] To that end, Abbey has situated the viewer with the actors on the stage, with the court of Denmark facing us. King Claudius and the Queen sit on a double throne, with the King clenching the arm rest, as if his guilt may make him momentarily jump up, and Queen Gertrude is huddled at the far end of the throne, grasping her veil tightly about her chin, perhaps in a gesture of shame and guilt. Ophelia and Hamlet are in the immediate foreground, lying on a collection of wolf skins. Ophelia, dressed in pale pink, intently watches the actors, as her wide-eyed gaze trails off to the viewer's left. She sits through the production seemingly uncomprehending about the larger plot unfolding. Hamlet, outstretched and leaning perpendicular to her, surreptitiously glances toward Claudius to see the king's reaction, while his friend Horatio, the mustached figure at far right, blatantly turns to see the royals' reactions, having been previously instructed by Hamlet to do so.[34]

The visual precedent for this particular scene from Hamlet comes from Daniel Maclise's oil (fig. 22) of the same name, made in 1842.[35] Contemporary critics from the *Art Journal, Athenaeum* and the (London) *Times* also made the connection and expected the modern (1897) viewers to do the same.[36] As the *Times* critic wrote:

> Mr. E.A. Abbey has made a valiant attempt to repeat his Shakespearean success [referencing *Richard III*] and to paint over again, with a modern hand and in the manner of the end of the century, a subject that Maclise treated long ago in one of the best known of early Victorian pictures… [Abbey] has chosen, moreover, the same motive as Maclise did—Hamlet on the floor, leaning against Ophelia; the King and Queen on their seat of State behind… If, however, we have named Maclise, it is only to show how differently the same subject may strike two different minds at different epochs, though those epochs follow closely upon one another, and though the incident portrayed be one incrusted with

[33] Foster and Quick, *Edwin Austin Abbey,* 43.; *Hamlet*, act II, scene ii.

[34] Hamlet to Horatio "Give him heedful note/ for I mine eyes will rivet to his face,/ And after we will both our judgments join/ In censure of his seeming." (Act III, scene ii, lines 78-80); These lines were included in the Royal Academy catalogue in 1897 (Oakley, 45.)

[35] I had come across this image and comparison in good faith, but it is also discussed in Oakley, 26.

[36] See A.C.R. Carter, *Art Journal*, 1897, p. 179; *Athenaeum,* May 1, 1897, p. 16; *Times* (London), May 1, 1897, 16.

> associations. Maclise had merits, even great merits; he is now as much under-rated as he was over-rated by our fathers and grandfathers; but in his "Hamlet" it is plain that he had no ideas beyond the theatre…[37]

This acerbic recalling of Maclise's work of forty-five years earlier does relate the two works together and confirms Abbey's compositional inspiration. Maclise's image is organized around three main groupings: Hamlet, Ophelia and Horatio at left; the actors performing the poisoning scene at center; and the King, Queen, and Polonius (Ophelia's father) at right. The artist allows the viewer to be a bystander, watching the three simultaneous action sequences at the same time.[38]

Maclise and Abbey's respective paintings share similar qualities: Hamlet is lying down next to a brightly-lit Ophelia; Horatio observes the behavior of the king; Claudius & Gertrude act guilty while the reenactment occurs (in Maclise's version, Claudius turns away, while Gertrude anxiously clasps her hands).

Arguably, the most important visual difference between these two objects is that Abbey has changed the "staging" so that the viewer is now an active participant, inhabiting the space where the actors are up close and thus able to observe the reactions and mental states of those involved—primarily Hamlet, Ophelia, Gertrude, and Claudius. This drastic deviation from Maclise's earlier work presumes that the viewer is familiar with the subject; and moreover, encourages psychological confrontation with the revelation of the figures' guilt, angst, and anxiety. The elimination of the actual representation of the actors is a "modern" twist, specific to Abbey's composition, as this scene, even in stage production, would have included those

---

[37] *Times*, May 1, 1897, p. 16
[38] Oakley suggests that this format is a traditional representation of the Shakespearean scene in visual imagery, as well as staging for theater productions (Oakley, 44).

secondary figures.[39] The placement of the viewer on-stage with the actors, allows the spectator to "share a sense of involvement that surpasses the immediacy of the simply "theatrical.""[40]

The *Times* critic continues his assessment:

> Mr. Abbey's picture which suggests the Lyceum or any other stage; that he has given us a reading of Shakespeare as he understands him, and has dressed and posed his characters as he thinks they may have been dressed and posed in Elsinore… Its chief merits seem to us to be … powerful realization of the characters of the King and Queen—the King, a hard, cunning scoundrel, not so much conscience-stricken as conscious of being found out; the Queen, afraid, half-shrouding her face from the spectators, and drawing back her dress from contact with her husband.[41]

Much to the pleasure of this critic, Abbey was attempting to make the characters as psychologically and archeologically accurate as possible—they are more or less

> standard Shakespearean actors; Hamlet, disheveled and revengeful rather than stately and melancholy, is—to the best of Abbey's archeological ability—a medieval Dane, while Ophelia—dressed originally in virginal white—is a naïve, impressionable and rather plain Celtic maiden.[42]

The critic made several excellent points, but while he may not have had anything positive to say for the rendering of Hamlet, he did remark that Ophelia "is one of the greatest puzzles in literature, and neither actress nor painter has ever rendered her in a way to satisfy all the world. In her face, as Mr. Abbey gives it, it is not fanciful to trace, not only astonishment and a vague fear, but the shadow of approaching madness."[43]

Ophelia is indeed one of the most striking elements of Abbey's composition, with her otherworldly look, as her gaze is transfixed on a point outside the picture plane. Abbey has chosen to emphasize the tragic heroine, as her pale skin and pink dress allow her to stand out

---

[39] Although, Hogarth also did this in the *Beggar's Opera* (1728-29).
[40] Foster and Quick, 43.
[41] *Times*, May 1, 1897, 16.
[42] Foster and Quick, 43; The artist ultimately made changes to the Ophelia figure (primarily her dress). See Lucas for more information.
[43] *Times*, 16.

from the other figures—the rest of the ensemble is dressed in darker colors (the monarchs in red and black; Hamlet in black and purple) and their faces are shadowed by comparison, as if she is singled out by a light source in the viewer's space.

The rendering of this particular figure seems based in part on several Pre-Raphaelite women with trace-like stares by Millais, such as his *Ophelia* (c. 1851-52) or *The Bridesmaid* (c. 1851) or even some of Rossetti's early stunners, like *Bocca Baciata* (1859) and *Helen of Troy* (1863). As such, it is one of the best examples of Abbey's borrowing from a Pre-Raphaelite scene.

First of all, Millais' *Ophelia* is an obvious comparison, not only because the subject comes from the same Shakespearean play and depicts the same heroine, but because of the wide-eyed gaze, trance-like state, and reddish hair of the floating figure. Both depictions of Ophelia portray her with slightly parted lips—Millais does this to suggest her singing, while Abbey uses this detail to convey her anxious state. Neither rendering of Ophelia portrays her as cognizant of the world around her. Instead, floating down the river to her imminent death or watching a performance about murder and betrayal reinforce her tragic and oblivious nature to the circumstances around her.

Millais' *Bridesmaid* also is relevant with its Ophelia-like figure with reddish-blonde hair, parted a la Madonna and wild eyes. Though Ophelia's expression really is innocent, Millais' *Bridesmaid*, with red parted lips, seems more intimate and thus powerful. As per an old superstition, she is passing a piece of wedding cake through a wedding ring nine times, she will see a vision of her future lover.[44] Like both aforementioned Ophelias, this Bridesmaid, too, is in a trance-like state, though instead of being of questionable mental health, she is anxiously awaiting the fulfillment of her wedding cake fantasy.

[44] Russell Ash, *Sir John Everett Millais* (London: Pavillion, 1996), plate 11, n.p.

Abbey's wide-eyed tragic heroine also harkens back to Rossetti's early stunners, two examples being *Bocca Baciata* (fig. 23, 1859) and *Helen of Troy* (c. 1863).[45] Both these stunners have an abundance of hair cascading down and over their shoulders, parted again in the middle (á la Madonna), with expressions fixated to the left of the picture plane. These half-length portraits of embowered women are presented to the viewer, as much as for the viewer's pleasure as for an observation of the woman's unguarded moment. Helen of Troy fingers the beads at her neck, while *Bocca Baciata (The Kissed Mouth)* holds a strand of her hair and a marigold between her fingers. While these female figures have similar features to Abbey's Ophelia, the Rossetti stunners are markedly more sensual and voluptuous, while Abbey's Ophelia remains contrastingly innocent and child-like.

Though Abbey's *Play scene from "Hamlet"* was exhibited in 1897, the Neo-Pre-Raphaelites (many of whom were just beginning to foster personal relationships with the artist) were paying attention—especially to the figure of Ophelia. There, for example, is an indebtedness of the Ophelia figure in Kate Bunce's *Keepsake* (1898-1901; fig. 24), and Evelyn Pickering de Morgan's *The Hour Glass* (fig. 25, 1905).

The primary figure in Bunce's *Keepsake* is a young brunette female, seated on a throne in a medieval dress reminiscent of Abbey's figures.[46] She is seated, with head tilted, and hands lightly grasping the armrests beside her. Her blue belt echoes the sash Abbey's Ophelia fingers with her left hand, and the embroidery on the top portion of the garment of Bunce's figure replaces the beading and jewels in Abbey's work. Each moreover has some sort of am-band decoration as part of their gowns. The two women are in similar poses, although that the woman

---

[45] Rossetti's *Beata Beatrix* (1864-70) is his canonical example of a woman in a trance-like state. However, the degree of her reverie makes her more of an extreme case than Abbey's *Ophelia*.

[46] Seeing as this image was started the year after Abbey exhibited his work, it would be interesting to trace whether or not Bunce viewed it at the RA, or otherwise had direct knowledge of it.

in *Keepsake* is seated on a throne, while Ophelia is sprawled on furs. Yet the most remarkable difference between the two is the degree of awareness in their eyes. Bunce's figure focuses on something tangible which the viewer cannot see, and is concentrating on it. Her look has purpose to it, rather than the unfocused gaze of Ophelia.

Finally, Evelyn Pickering de Morgan (whose work will also be discussed in Chapter 10) also imitates Abbey's Ophelia figure in her *Hour Glass* of 1905. Though a follower of Edward Burne-Jones and the second generation of Pre-Raphaelites, there is a strong visual connection between the two female figures. Morgan's solitary figure stares transfixed in her own thoughts, as suggested by the title and the hour glass in her right hand, most likely to do with the loss of time. Unlike the other examples, this figure's hair is not free-flowing, but in an elaborate coiffure with an intricate headpiece. Like Bunce's *Keepsake*, the solitary figure of *Hour Glass* sits in a throne with legs stretched to the side. Both arms are extended and visible and like the Bunce example, this woman also seems to have an amount of awareness to her expression. It is not the glazed look of incomprehension or anxiety found in Abbey's figure, but the dreaded certainty that something is about to happen. She is perhaps the womanly counterpart to Ophelia's child-like innocence.

CONCLUSION

Abbey thus proved to be the foremost essential link between the original Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood and their Neo-Pre-Raphaelite counterparts in the twentieth-century. An admirer of the PRB from an early age, Abbey was fortunate enough to know many key Victorian artists, above all Millais. He was familiar with the work of all the members as well as writings and ideologies of Ruskin. By the turn-of-the-century, all of the Brotherhood except Hunt, had died,

thus leaving Abbey in a unique position as link between the “old” and “new” generations of Pre-Raphaelitism. Abbey’s presence at the Royal Academy, as teacher, mentor, and Academician allowed him unfettered access to the students of the RA schools who shared a more Ruskinian interest in minute detail and truth to nature. Furthermore, he cultivated professional relationships with the younger generation who shared a vested interest in the compositions of the PRB; and many of these artists, who will be discussed in subsequent chapters, were already aligning their own styles with those of Millais, Hunt, Rossetti and Ruskin. Abbey’s for the Neo-Pre-Raphaelites, then, was as conduit along with the original PRB.

Chapter 4: The *King's* Corridor

There is great news. Instead of my only being commissioned by Lord Carlisle to do one fresco in the Houses of Parliament ... it is decided that six artists shall be given the six spaces in the corridor to fill... This is ... exciting news for the art world. For they have been waiting nearly 50 years for commissions to fill the vacant spaces left for historical pictures in the corridors.[1]

Frank Cadogan Cowper's (known also as "CC") above lines expresses his excitement over his commission for one of the six murals to be completed in the East Corridor, the central pathway that leads to the House of Commons in the Houses of Parliament. There were six different artists chosen for six individual panels (fig. 26-31): *Henry VIII and Katharine of Aragon Before the Papal Legate at Blackfriar's* (Frank O. Salisbury), *Latimer Preaching before Edward VI at St. Paul's Cross* (Ernest Board), *The Entry of Queen Mary I and Princess Elizabeth into London* (J.L. Byam Shaw), *Plucking the White and Red Roses in Old Temple Garden* (Henry Payne), *John Cabot and his Sons Receive the Charter From Henry VII in Search of New Lands* (Denis Eden), and finally *Erasmus and Thomas More Visit the Children of Henry VII at Greenwich* (Frank Cadogan Cowper).

The artistic overseer of this project was none other than Edwin Austin Abbey, official court painter for the *Coronation of Edward VII* (fig. 6). Although he rejected producing one of the murals himself, he did suggest several of his protégées for the commission. This chapter will investigate the relationships between Abbey and the muralists, briefly examine the historical precedent to the Parliament murals; critically analyze select examples from the 1908 scheme for the House of Commons; and evaluate patterns of indebtedness of certain murals to works by Abbey. The most analysis will be given to the panels by Cadogan Cowper and Byam Shaw, as they are specifically part of the Abbey-centric Neo-Pre-Raphaelite circle.

[1] COW/2/23.

It comes as no surprise that Abbey was chosen to take charge of the muralists and execution of the six panels. As hitherto stated in Chapters 2 and 3, Abbey was a prolific artist who worked in several different media. By the time the project was commissioned in 1908, his reputation had already preceded him—especially as a muralist. From 1890-1901, he worked on the *Quest for the Holy Grails* for the Boston Public Library; from 1902 – 1907, he and his studio assistants (Cowper and Board) completed the *Coronation of King Edward VII* (1890-1901); the murals for the Royal Exchange were completed in 1904, and from 1902 until his death in 1911, Abbey undertook his largest commission, that of the decoration of the House and Senate Chambers, the Supreme and Superior Court Room and rotunda in the Pennsylvania Capitol in Harrisburg.[2]

From an historical context, Queen Victoria died in 1901, Edward VII's coronation occurred in 1902, and by 1906 a new Liberal Government had come to power. These House of Commons murals were commissioned in 1908 and unveiled in 1910. It became an opportunity to bring together Abbey, Eden, Shaw, Board and Salisbury, the master's protégées. Eden and Shaw were students together at the Royal Academy (most likely overlapping with Abbey's Visitorship) and Salisbury had just finished the mural decorations with Abbey at the aforesaid Royal Exchange (1904). Though there is no proof that Payne had worked with or been acquainted with Abbey before this commission, he was a Birmingham artist and worked primarily in large-scale stained glass.[3] Together, these young artists formed a very distinct

[2] Abbey died before the completion of the *Apotheosis of Pennsylvania* mural. It was finished by studio assistant Ernest Board under the supervision of Abbey's mural colleague, John Singer Sargent.

[3] However, it is known that Payne was chosen by Lord Beauchamp to be a muralist on this project based on the strength of the artist's work at Madresfield Court (the former's home); Hay and Riding, *Art in Parliament: the Permanent Collection of the House of Commons* (Norwich, The Palace of Westminster and Jarrold Publishing, 1996), 91. Payne produced wall paintings for Madresfield Court from 1902-1923.

group.[4] Abbey labeled them "Primitif," while German critic Hermann Muthesius dubbed them "Neo-Pre-Raphaelite."[5] Critics at the time saw this particular band of artists as struggling to break free from the restrictions of the Royal Academy traditions. Muthesius, in particular, saw them as the "most promising hope for a revival of decorative art in Britain."[6]

The First Mural Scheme For The House of Commons-- Prince Albert And The 1840 Program

The mural scheme of 1908 began not at the turn of the century, but established its roots with the first decoration program of the 1840s, and some historical background thus proves useful. Historical precedent began when the Royal Fine Arts Commission was appointed on the recommendation of the 1841 Select Committee. Chaired by Prince Albert, the group was responsible for determining artists and subjects "for the purpose of promoting and encouraging the Fine Arts in the United Kingdom [with] direct reference to the moral wants of our nation."[7] Thus, the desire for a scheme of decoration of the Palace of Westminster was realized. The meetings of both the Select Committee of 1841 and the Royal Fine Arts Commission were almost entirely focused on establishing "the best means of founding a British 'school' of 'high art'."[8] There was a competition for large-scale cartoons in 1842 and in 1844, the winning artists were given specific subjects to paint on the wall of the Palace.

While it appeared to be an excellent solution to the decoration of Westminster, problems abounded. In 1844, Sir Charles Barry recommended to the Commission that the murals should

[4] Though Salisbury, like Abbey, completed multiple murals in his lifetime, for Cowper and Shaw, their contribution of panels here was their only foray into the vast world of mural production.
[5] Quoted in ibid., 96; Letter from Abbey to Carlisle (17 July 1908).
[6] Quoted in ibid., 97; H. Muthesius, "Kunst and Leben in England," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst,* 13 (1902).
[7] Quoted in Clare A.P. Willsdon, *Mural Painting in Britian 1840-1940: Image and Meaning* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 28.
[8] Ibid., 30.

have “reference to events in the history of the country.”[9] However, the Secretary of the Royal Fine Arts Commission, Sir Charles Lock Eastlake, himself an artist, reminded the other members of the Commission that “the purpose of the building must regulate the selection of subjects.”[10]

Pre-Raphaelite associate, Ford Madox Brown, submitted an unsuccessful entry for the cartoon competition for a work done in fresco. Known today as the oil on canvas *The Seeds and Fruits of English Poetry* (fig. 32), this object was

> dismissed… as unworthy of execution, whilst Ruskin had been equally damning of the project in discussion with Joseph Severn: With your hopes for the elevation of English art by means of fresco I cannot sympathize. I have not the remotest hope of anything of the kind… It is not the material nor the space that gives us thoughts passions or powers. I see on our Academy walls nothing but what is ignoble in small pictures, and would be disgusting in large ones.[11]

Though not accepted, Brown planned to submit an elaborate composition depicting the birth and flowering of English poetry. Having re-worked it at a later date into its current state as a large-scale painting, there are three scenes separated by Gothic architectural elements. The central portion shows fourteenth-century poet Geoffrey Chaucer reading at the court of Edward III. His patron, the Black Price, is on his left.[12] The two flanking sections refer to Chaucer’s descendants, the great English literary masters. At left are clustered John Milton, Edmund Spenser and William Shakespeare, while at right stand Lord Byron, Alexander Pope and Robert Burns.

As Willsdon has suggested in *Mural Painting in Britain 1840-1940,* perhaps this decorative scheme at Westminster was a way to “present a direct commentary on the nature of the British Constitution and the special role he [Prince Albert] saw for the present-day monarch

---

[9] Quoted in Willsdon, 30.; Sir Charles Barry, *New Houses of Parliament. Architect’s Report as to Internal Decorations…*Appendix 1, *Second Report* of the CFA (1843), PP XXIX, p.7.
[10] Ibid., 30
[11] Quoted in Willsdon, 50-51; Letter from J. Ruskin to J. Severn (21 Sept. 1845) in *Works*, ed. Cook and Wedderburn (1903-12), vol. 4, 394.
[12] Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archeology; this image was also on display in Washington, DC 2013.

within both it and modern Europe…"[13] In a draft memorandum presented to the Commission around 1844, Prince Albert argued,

> the most difficult subject, perhaps, which this Commission has to consider and report upon to the Queen is the selection of proper subjects for paintings which are to adorn the walls of the chief halls in the new Palace [thereby proposing that the murals] should… record the chief events of British history, that they should characterize the peculiar parts of the Edifice, where they are put up, & that they should furnish the artist with the means of exhibiting his skill in the *highest* branch of the Art.[14]

HISTORICAL BASIS FOR 1908 MURAL SCHEME UNDER COMMISSIONER OF WORKS, LEWIS HARCOURT

The Select Committee of 1906 operated differently than its predecessors of nearly fifty years earlier. The early twentieth-century counterpart was established "to enquire and report with respect to the unfinished condition of the rooms of the Palace of Westminster appropriate to the Service of this House."[15] Whereas the nineteenth-century committee was controlled by royal decree, the twentieth-century group made a concerted effort to be an independent entity from such imperial rule. As a result, they reported directly to the House of Commons and furthermore assumed the position of "strict, albeit respectful independence from royal involvement."[16]

The death of Queen Victoria in 1901 and a more Liberal form of government coming to power allowed for the separation between monarchy and the 1906 Select Committee. As a result, the artists who were asked to revive the mural decoration at Westminster were to report to the First Commissioner of Works, Lewis Harcourt, Member of Parliament, as well as Harcourt's nominal artistic advisor, Lord Carlisle, an amateur artist, patron of Pre-Raphaelites William Morris and Edward Burne-Jones, and close friend of Abbey. The new Liberal government,

---

[13] Ibid., 31.
[14] Quoted in Willsdon, 31; Prince Albert, *Memorandum* to Peel (c. 1844)
[15] Quoted ibid., 94; Motion of Lord Stanmore to the House of Lords (19 July 1906).
[16] Ibid., 94.

having come to power in 1906, was eager to follow the proposals of the Select Committee in relation to the decoration of Westminster. They proposed that the East Corridor be the first area within the Palace to be worked on, as it was one of the most frequented parts of the building, "through which many members of the public pass in daytime, when Parliament is sitting, on their way to the Committee Rooms upstairs…The focus was now on the parts most tangibly associated with what would be considered the "*voice of the people.*"[17] The East Corridor, technically being part of the House of Commons, and its beautification fell under the responsibility of the First Commissioner of Works, Lewis Harcourt.

However, as Harcourt had previously admitted to being artistically unaware, he needed an advisor who could lend experience, expertise, and perhaps credibility to the individual selection of skilled artists. Abbey's appointment thereby provided Harcourt with the knowledge he needed:

> In order that some common decision may be come to as to the scale, color and medium and in order that the general treatment shall be harmonious and avoid the divergence of style which appears in the Royal Exchange, Mr. Abbey has kindly consented to advise me and assist the artists in arriving at a general scheme.[18]

In accordance with Harcourt's desire for uniformity among the murals, Abbey imposed stylistic restrictions upon the images. There was to be a unity in color, as the palette was limited to red, gold, and black. Abbey further stipulated that "the foreground men must be 5 ft. 6 in. high—and the horizon line 4 ft. from the ground line—and the V.P. in the center… and local color shapes rather than light and shade shapes."[19]

For thematic subject, Carlisle and Harcourt agreed that the East Corridor murals ought to complement those already in the corridors leading off the Central Lobby. As a result, subjects

---

[17] Ibid., 94.
[18] Quoted in Willsdon, 96; Letter from Harcourt to Solomon (24 July 1908).
[19] Quoted in ibid., 97; Letter from Abbey to Carlisle (10 Nov. 1908).

from Tudor history were selected. This choice satisfied Carlisle's desire for the combination of "the picturesque with some important historical or social movement."[20]

It was fitting, then, that Harcourt purposefully selected a group of artists who paralleled his own radical, political beliefs. Considering the limited terms of officially acceptable figurative art in Britain at the time, he promoted what could be considered "a 'radical' school to match the 'reformist' purposes of his own party."[21] Once the murals were unveiled in 1910, it came to light that the critics were not inclined to endorse images created by the Neo-Pre-Raphaelites in the style of their predecessors, the Pre Raphaelites. In October of that year, contributor Frank Cadogan Cowper wrote to critic M.H. Spielmann,

> There will be a number of people who will be ready to run down these paintings—simply because they are not in the style which is the fashion at this moment—as one writer has already begun doing! Did you see the notice in the Morning Post Oct. 4th? The critic does not understand the thing at all. He talks of Brangwyn and Gerald Moira, and the "Spirit of Tintoretto, Veronese, and Tiepolo." But Brangwyn—fine painter as he is—or the spirit of Tiepolo! Is utterly unsuited to such an essentially medieval subject as, say:-- The Picking of the White and Red Roses in old Temple Gardens—a 6ft 9 in. square in a little Gothic corridor![22]

THE MURALS: VISUAL, HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL

This built environment and its panels, each measuring 81 in. wide by 83 in. high, provide a visual language that interacts with and reinforces British culture, aesthetics, and politics. This decorative program is important to the visual construction of English and Imperial powers at the start of the Edwardian era. The physical location, as passageway to one of the main Houses, is a highly public and trafficked area. The murals, therefore, are strategically placed; while seemingly narratives of British history, the imagery evokes a modern commentary on

[20] Quoted in ibid., 99; Letter from Carlisle to Harcourt (17 May 1908).
[21] Ibid., 96.
[22] Letter from Frank Cadogan Cowper to Isodore Spielmann (9 Oct 1910). Private Collection.

government. The location of these murals and their visibility confirm the worldview of Britain and ingeniously construct a national English reflecting the radical changes occurring in the realm at the start of the twentieth century.

As British historian David Powell writes,

> Contemporaries were conscious at once of a generational shift, a change in the style of monarchy which was felt to reflect a change in the temper of the nation at large—a quickening of the pace of life, a relaxation of conventions and an impatience with restraints, an openness to new ideas… new experiences.[23]

The East Corridor is off the Central Lobby, a large octagonal hall which is the central point between both the House of Commons and the House of Lords, and acts as the crossroads between the two Houses of Parliament.[24] The Tudor-themed panels were believed to complement those already in the corridors leading off the Central Lobby. Such a choice satisfied the desire for the combination of "the picturesque with some important historical or social movement."[25] These particular historical paintings were selected as illustrating formative moments of British history and reinforced the greatness of the nation. These selected monumental moments contributed to the construction of a pre-Elizabethan English identity and were reinforced by the narrations from the Reformation, a period in which it was believed that

> for the first time did they [the English] fully appreciate the benefits of their geographical position, and set to work to make the most of them. Commerce, industry, seamanship, adventure, all assumed those forms with which we have ever since been familiar. The modern Englishman came into definite existence.[26]

However, the function of this particular twentieth-century decorative program was perhaps politically motivated and provided a commentary on and by the new liberal government.

---

[23] David Powell, *The Edwardian Crisis* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), 1.
[24] Virtual Tours- UK Parliament, Interactive Map of Parliament, http://www.parliament.uk/visiting/online-tours/ (accessed January 2015).
[25] Quoted in Willsdon, 99; Letter from Carlisle to Harcourt.
[26] Quoted in ibid., 100; M. Creighton, *The English National Character*, Romanes Lecture, Sheldonian Theater, Oxford (17 June 1896).

Pictorially, this program presented a revised vision for the nation. The negotiation between visual representation, national pride, and political propaganda was so nuanced that when the murals were unveiled, politically-charged responses proved subtle. While the subjects ostensibly depict historical vignettes, the political subtext provides insight about the monarchy, religious freedom, and the re-shaping of the British Constitution.

As there is no definitive text I have discovered to indicate Harcourt's organizational intention, there are endless possibilities of how to "read" the mural program as a whole: walking in from the East Corridor toward the House of Commons, leaving the House of Commons and entering the Central Lobby, or within the hallway itself. Additionally, the order may rely upon the date in each of the subtitles—though Payne's mural does not have a date—or according to the political message each panel represents, according to Harcourt's design and Parliamentary documents.[27]

Presuming Harcourt's intent was to start with Salisbury's work and follow down and around the hallway and ending with Cowper's *Erasmus*, that would match up with the governmental meanings as represented through the objects.

MURAL: FRANK SALISBURY; *HENRY VIII AND KATHARINE OF ARAGON BEFORE THE PAPAL LEGATE AT BLACKFRIARS.*

When the space is entered from the Commons Corridor, Salisbury's mural is the first on the immediate left. Salisbury represented a pivotal and dramatic event in British political and religious history, namely Henry VIII's divorce from Catherine of Aragon. His desire of a male heir was the catalyst for the break with Rome (Catholicism) and the introduction of Protestantism

[27] This may be beyond the scope of this dissertation, but I do have an email sent (Feb 18, 2016) to the Deputy Curator, Melanie Unwin, who may be able to shed some light on the subject.

to England. Salisbury has illustrated an actual event and passage from Shakespeare where the King petitions for a divorce before the Papal Legate and Cardinal Wolsey. The Queen enters the court, crosses over to her husband and kneeling before him with one hand embracing his and the other gesturing towards him, implores him to reconsider. The accompanying text reads "I take God and all the world to witness that I have been to you a true, humble and obedient wife."[28] The figure of Catherine's upturned head is illuminated in stark contrast to Henry's darkened figure. As a whole, the image illustrates the couple's private turmoil that was not only publicly acknowledged but was also responsible for the major religious shift of an entire nation.

The break with Rome shaped British identity by asserting English independence from Rome, both politically and religiously. It marks the beginning of the Church of England, on which British rule is based and the re-shaping of the constitution. This narrative reflects the Constitutional re-shaping by the British Liberals from 1906-10.[29]

SALISBURY'S INFLUENCE: ABBEY'S *STUDY FOR THE TRIAL OF QUEEN CATHARINE OF ARAGON, FROM HENRY VIII*

Salisbury's depiction continues Abbey's requirement of coloring (red, black, gold). At left is the standing King, body in shadow, with one hand on his armrest and the other fisted with Catherine's hand gently resting upon it. Henry is wearing his elaborately decorative robes of gold, black and some brown. The Queen, shown in profile, is genuflecting before her husband, hand on his, pleading for a change of heart. Her robes are detailed with patterned designs of gold

---

[28] The entire text accompanying the images comes from George Cavendish's *Life of Wolsey* accompanied the image, describing Catherine's actions as "kneeling down in the sight of all the Court and assembly at the King's feet in broken English made her solemn protest against the divorce…"; Quoted in Hay and Riding, 92.

[29] The information regarding political context was primarily taken from a file called "East Corridor" generously shared by Deputy Curator of Houses of Parliament, Melanie Unwin. This information was originally obtained from Unwin in 2014 and was possibly of use for the forthcoming publication on Art in Parliament, though a more updated version than that of Hay and Riding's. At the bottom of said file, there is a note "Curator's Office (EW), 07/2010, Background information note".

and black.[30] Her pale upturned face is framed by a white headdress, allowing for a stark contrast between the colors and perhaps moods of the wedded couple. Her two ladies in waiting stand respectfully behind her, also wearing brighter headdresses of white with gold and black detailing. Sitting slightly off center is Cardinal Wolsey. The decorative top of his seat starts immediately at the end of His Royal Highness' black and gold canopy. Wolsey looks on with indifference at the display before him in the foreground. Approaching him from far right, and mostly concealed by the ladies maids is most likely Cardinal Campeggio, who brings with him a leather-bound book—perhaps a Bible.[31]

Abbey's sketch (n.d.; fig. 33) *Study for the Trial of Queen Catherine of Aragon, from Henry VIII* is presumably more of an illustration to Shakespeare's narrative, yet it is the same subject as Salisbury's mural. Whereas the title of the panel indicates that the King and Queen are situated at the Papal Legate, Abbey's study does not. The sketch presents the figures at Court, with Henry presiding as King. He sits at far right with white-stockinged legs crossed and a tunic of black with a suggestion of golden detailing on the sleeves. His head is lowered onto his clasped hands, a gesture of deep thought and concentration. Across from him at far left is a kneeling Catherine (on the first step of the dais) in a simple gown of pure white, with palms out in a gesture of supplication. An imperial guard, with red tunic and leg extended, stands between Catherine and the viewer. Indistinguishable faces and figures line the background. To Henry's left, again providing a boundary between he and the viewer, are two figures, both dressed in red Cardinal robes and hats, presumably Cardinals Wolsey and Campeggio respectively.

Interestingly enough, Salisbury's panel presents a claustrophobic image, with the pivotal scene happening in the immediate foreground, including Wolsey who is seated slightly back.

[30] The designs on her robing are similar to those found on Burne-Jones' *Sidonia von Burke* (c. 1860).
[31] As this scene is happening at the Papal Legate (the legatine court at Blackfriars), it could also be a book of papal laws.

Abbey's study, moreover, presents the action in the middle-ground of the composition. The foreground is all red carpet and visually separates the viewer from the discussion between King and Queen. The viewer, therefore, is akin to a voyeur in this work. The background is festooned with banners and elaborately detailed stained-glass windows. The isocephalic (but undetailed) heads in front of this (most likely to visually lead the eye up from the proceedings to the impressive height of the room. Accordingly, the different shades of red of the soldier's tunic, the carpet, the Cardinals' attire and vertical panel of red behind the King. This monochrome stage allows for the white gown and figure of Catherine to lead the eye to Henry's angled white legs. Through color, rather than gesture as with Salisbury's image, Abbey has emphasized the figures and their primary importance to the scene.

MURAL: ERNEST BOARD, *LATIMER PREACHING BEFORE EDWARD VI AT ST. PAUL'S CROSS, 1548*

Board's central panel on this wall shows *Latimer preaching before Edward VI at St. Paul's Cross*, 1548. Latimer was a bishop noted for his reformist teachings. The mural glorifies the British freedom of speech and freedom of conscience. The Liberals used this to represent the association between Liberalism and non-conformity.

Board's composition initially feels like a theater design. The immediate foreground has life-sized figures in accordance with Abbey's demands, all of whom are styled in blacks, reds, and golds. Latimer is placed in an elevated pulpit (ambo), dressed in white vestments and black stole, leaning out towards King Edward VI. His left arm extends beyond the edge of the ambo, with his hand is in a blessing gesture toward his audience. Opposite Latimer is the seated King Edward VI. He, too, is elevated and the King's head and feathered cap stand higher than that of the preacher. The royal entourage is dressed in finery of black, gold and red and at the left

corner is a squire holding a book on a pillow, while simultaneously looking at the resting dog, an iconographic symbol of fidelity.

Though the political message behind this mural is one of Liberalism and non-conformity, it is telling that Latimer and his enthusiastic preaching is presented in shadow. By contrast, Edward VI sits ramrod straight, stoic, and relatively expressionless. Additionally, members of the royal retinue also appear to be disinterested. One woman's eyes are downcast; a man in black behind the throne is reading, and the bearded man leaning against the wall is playing with his pendant with one hand, while the other holds his head. Yet, the presumably commoners in the background are held in rapt attention by Latimer and his preaching. Board was commissioned to produce an historical work; but politically, it would appear to be making a subtle commentary about the old world order and the new—even though the representation of the "old" (in comparison to the 1906 government) is lit with light and the "new" is cast in shadow. Perhaps, it is meant to indicate a transition of the Liberals' desire for British freedoms of speech and conscience, thereby allowing for the freedom of Liberalism and non-conformity.

MURAL: J.L. BYAM SHAW, *THE ENTRY OF QUEEN MARY I AND PRINCESS ELIZABETH INTO LONDON, 1553*

Historically, Catholic Queen Mary I enters London in a triumphal procession as legitimate and rightful heir to the English crown. This came after a nine-day rule by the Protestant Lady Jane Grey. This incident of religious tolerance reflects the Edwardian Liberal attitude of religious tolerance and acceptance.

Unlike his colleagues, Shaw's panel was executed in the spirit of an illustrator.[32] There are hard black outlines around each figure to delineate its shape, visually evident immediately in the execution of the cobblestones along the base of the picture plane. Additionally, Shaw has used a lighter palette, also giving it the feel of a drawing, watercolor or illustration. While he does follow the obligatory red, black and gold scheme, these colors are not as prominent as in the companion works. Furthermore, whereas the five other artists express movement through gesture and strong diagonals, Shaw's composition is filled with static portraits. The scene he creates, therefore, is more of a snapshot in time of a single moment.

As explained by the title, the artist depicts Queen Mary I and Princess Elizabeth entering London. Mary's figure looms in the foreground, her cascading robes located at center. She is elaborately dressed, with a gown of red and gold, covered by a fur-lined coat of rich purple. Her lips are pinched as she takes the outstretched hands of the figure before her, and clergy flanking him. Elizabeth's body, meanwhile, is slightly obstructed from view by Mary's voluminous robes. The princess holds her walking stick up to her nose and quite literally looks down her nose at the scene displayed before her. Clad in a cloak of bright pink, she is merely tolerating the gesture of welcome. A large horse, presumably on which one or both of them rode, is halted behind her. Royal guards in the background hold onlookers back, in one instance a young boy in a striped tunic is being physically restrained from approaching the women.

MURAL: HENRY PAYNE, *PLUCKING THE WHITE AND RED ROSES IN OLD TEMPLE GARDENS: ORIGIN OF THE PARTIES*

Across from Shaw's work is Payne's mural, *Plucking the White and Red Roses in Old Temple Gardens,* an illustration to Shakespeare's *Henry VI*, but more importantly, a reference to

[32] First suggested in conversation with Melanie Unwin, Curator of Parliament, June 2012.

what in essence propelled the Tudor dynasty to a position of power. Of this panel, the artist wrote, “the old nobility of England [having] exterminated themselves and exhausted the country, which was once more glad to be under the rule of a strong monarch.”[33] This allusion to a strong monarchy was Liberal intent for this panel.

Such a non-Tudor subject seems odd when considered with the context of the other panels; an episode which supposedly occurred in the mid-fifteenth century, well before the founding of the Tudor dynasty in 1485.[34] Despite its uncertain historical basis, its inclusion in the mural program may have been to celebrate the Tudor dynasty both as the legitimate heirs to the Yorkist and Lancastrian Houses, as well as the union of these Houses through the marriage of the Lancastrian Henry Tudor (Henry VII) with Elizabeth, the daughter of the Yorkist King Edward IV.

The War of the Roses, as it came to be known, resulted in the extinction of the power of the old nobility. The country, exhausted from its civil struggles, was relieved to be under the authority of a strong monarch once more. The origin of the British political parties, the Whigs and Tories, came about after the Revolution of 1688.[35] From an historical perspective, Harcourt chose this particular account as a way to comment on modern British history. The image’s subtitle, *The Origin of Parties,* was a play on the realization of modern political structures. Just as Henry VI had been considered a strong monarch, so too was “George V that the Liberals looked when he agreed in 1910 to create a hundred new non-hereditary peers, if necessary, to

[33] Quoted in Willsdon, 100; Typed description of the episode filed with letter from Payne to Carlisle (27 Oct. 1910), CHA (Castle Howard Archive), $J_{22/84.}$

[34] In all likelihood, the story may have been created by Tudor propagandists and then later popularized by Shakespeare as is suggested in Hay and Riding, 91; William Shakespeare, *Henry VI*, act ii, scene iv.

[35] William Martin Conway, *The Historical Paintings in the Houses of Parliament; descriptive text and key to characters represented in the six Tudor panels in the House of Commons* (London: Fine Arts Publishing Co., [191-]), 7.

secure the reform of the Lords' powers."[36] This subtlety, however, may have eluded some, as even artist Payne wrote to Carlisle, after the completion of his commission, "Could you tell me what was really meant by the title of the "Origin of Parties"?"[37]

As a visual representation of the union of the two Houses, Payne included the Tudor rose with elements of both the red representing the House of Lancaster and the white from the House of York. The fifteenth-century nobles are shown walking through the Temple Gardens when Richard Plantagenet (Richard III), the central figure exhibiting strong diagonal gestures, challenges those who would support him in his quarrel against Earl Somerset, situated back left, "to pluck a white rose from the briar with me."[38] Somerset's sole follower selects a red rose, the badge of the Tudor. Somerset addresses Plantagenet, indicating that the color red will signify friends, and white, his enemies.

Payne has illustrated the moment in which Plantagenet answers Somerset:

> And, by my soul, this pale and angry rose,
> As cognizance of my blood-drinking hate,
> Will I forever and my faction wear,
> Until it wither with me to my grave
> Or flourish to the height of my degree.[39]

This scene in the Temple Gardens, therefore, represents "the dynastic struggle which terminated with the ascent of the Tudors and the origins of the Tudor device itself."[40]

---

[36] Willsdon, 100.
[37] Quoted in ibid., 97; Letter from Payne to Carlisle (27 Oct. 1910).
[38] Shakespeare, act ii, scene iv.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Hay and Riding, 92.

PAYNE'S INFLUENCE: BURNE-JONES

Payne's *Origin* appears to be strongly stylistically indebted to the work of Edward Burne-Jones. This Victorian painter embodied the paradox of the Victorian age—a time in which it was modern to be medieval.[41] Hence, much of Burne-Jones' production often encompassed knights, damsels-in-distress, and *belles dames sans merci.* As such, these beautiful literary and mythological figures were stylistically very distinct from other Pre-Raphaelite portrayals. He used a distinctly muted color palette, a small number of figures to fill the entirety of the immediate foreground. Additionally, there is a high degree of difficulty and attention to detail in the elements that Burne-Jones includes.

His enormous canvases are similar in size to these murals and just as intricately detailed. Of all Burne-Jones' oeuvre, however, Payne's *Origin* may be most related to the *Briar Rose* series (1870-1890; fig.34). Though the figures in these images are sleeping, their bodies still create strong diagonals, and as such, there becomes an emphasis on their physical positioning. In preparation of this series, Burne-Jones wrote to friend Lady Leighton Warren, "I wonder if on your land there grow stems of wild rose such as I have to paint in my four pictures of Sleeping Palace—and if deep in some tangle there is a hoary, aged monarch of the tangle, thick as a wrist and with long, horrible spikes…"[42] The final set of four images show various groups of sleeping figures among the briar—the prince and his soldiers, the Council Chamber, women in the garden, and the sleeping princess along with her ladies-in-waiting.

Quite obviously, both the *Briar Rose* series and the Payne mural are enormous works and both take place out-of-doors among the thorny rose patches. Payne's central figure, Plantagenet, extends his arm out in a strong horizontal gesture. Like the legs of Burne-Jones' recumbent

[41] Christopher Wood, *Edward Burne-Jones: The Life and Works of Sir Edward Burne-Jones* (New York: Stewart, Tabori and Change, 1998), 7.
[42] Wood, 108.

princess stretched out toward her sleeping ladies, this action directs the viewer's attention to the opposing figure of Somerset. Payne's obvious visual challenge between the men in the garden is as claustrophobic and confined as the overgrown briar patch in which the prince finds himself. Payne's figures are close to the picture plane and are therefore positioned in the immediate foreground. As this is such a large mural, the viewer would be visually overwhelmed not only by the height and physical stature of each figure, but also by the detailed setting in which the characters find themselves. The garden is enclosed by the six dominant figures, the stonewalls and a central archway, which coincidentally, presents the only means of escape. The abundance of roses, bushes and foliage and detail of each increases the viewer's anxiety over this enclosed space as well as the realization of their inadvertent entrapment within the scene itself. The viewer is visually cornered by the dueling men and has no means of escape.

To a lesser degree, Burne-Jones also represents a state of apprehension with his dense backdrop. Whereas Payne's garden drama provides the viewer with a sense of danger, Burne-Jones' compositional arrangement allows the viewer to observe without fear of interrupting the inevitable battle. His inactive figures pose no threat, for not only are they asleep, but there is a definition of space separating them from us as viewers. While the audience may be participating from an observational standpoint, the sense of danger is lessened and we are free to wander about the briar, as there is no sense that the prince and his soldiers will awaken.

MURAL: DENIS EDEN, *JOHN CABOT AND HIS SONS RECEIVE THE CHARTER FROM HENRY VII TO SAIL IN SEARCH OF NEW LANDS, 1496*

John Cabot and his sons receive the charter from Henry VII to sail in search of new lands, painted by Denis Eden, celebrates Tudor sea power. Cabot obtained the first Royal Patent, "authorizing an adventure to discover new lands, and to take possession of them in the

name of the king."[43] This Charter allowed Cabot to be the first European to discover North America when he landed in Newfoundland in 1497

> and landed in Labrador, making him the first European of his period to land on the American continent. This early Tudor adventure became the basis of English territorial claims on the north American continent.[44]

This narrative foreshadows the growth of the British Dominion and was intended to reflect the power of the modern British Empire. It further advocates the Liberal policy of free trade and reminds the viewer that Newfoundland was given Dominion status in 1907, described thusly as "the first stone…of our colonial empire."[45]

Eden has presented the viewer with the representation of the official charter from Henry VII to Cabot. The King is centrally located, seated on his throne in the foreground; the artist has included a folded banner "hanging" with the inscription "Henr[y] Rex" to confirm the identity. Henry VII is swathed in red robes, ermine, red, gold and black jewels strewn around his shoulders, and crown—all trappings to indicate his status. With head bent toward the kneeling figures to his right, he extends his hand—revealing a blue and black velvet sleeve—with the folded charter for Cabot. Cabot and two other men kneel to the side of the throne; the recipient is the man in black robes with his back to the viewer, and outstretched hand. To the left of the king and right side of the composition, stands the oldest of Cabot's two sons. He stands, wearing red tunic and black leggings, holding a flowing red banner. The second son to which the title alludes is seated immediately in front of the King on a step. His black and gold collar highlights a crown-shaped pendant laying over his light blue tunic. This young boy is rolling a piece of parchment—most likely a nautical map from the visible details—and is the only figure in the composition looking up (most likely in the direction of his father).

---

[43] Parliament website; Explore Parliament-net; http://www.explore-parliament.net/ (accessed February 2016).
[44] Ibid.
[45] Curatorial records, Houses of Parliament.

MURAL: FRANK CADOGAN COPWER, *ERASMUS AND THOMAS MORE VISIT THE CHILDREN OF HENRY VII AT GREENWICH: THE NEW LEARNING, 1499*

Cowper's *Erasmus and More* exemplifies the belief that the origin of modern England could best be seen "through the eyes of Erasmus."[46] This panel celebrates the tradition of Humanist scholarship in Britain, which flourished during the Tudor period. The three main figures—young Henry VIII, More and Erasmus—are pivotal components to Tudor England. Erasmus was considered to be the father of modern thought, and by extension, modern England. It is widely known that his ideas were formative in the Protestant Reformation, despite his remaining Catholic. His inclusion here represents a model of scholarship which disregards religious denominations. More, also Speaker of the House of Commons, expressed the first known request for free speech. This remains one of the basic ideas on which government is still based in the UK. More, therefore, represents both politician and statesman.[47]

The subtitle of this mural, once again, propels Harcourt's agenda. Entitled *The New Learning*, it suggests the universal education that the Liberals desired to be available to all children, regardless of religious affinity. This argument was a basis of the 1906 Education Bill, whose rejection by the Lords had been one of the primary incentives for the move to reform the Lords by creating the one-hundred new non-hereditary peer positions.

The content of Cowper's work stemmed from the visit of three fifteenth-century friends to the royal nursery at Greenwich: Desiderius Erasmus, important leader of German humanism; Thomas More, English writer in the Tudor court of King Henry VIII; and John Colet, English

---

[46] Quoted in Willsdon, 101; J.A. Froude, *Life and Letters of Erasmus,* Lectures delivered at Oxford 1893-94 (London, 1894), 431.

[47] Notes from Curatorial Archives, Houses of Parliament.

writer, Chaplain to King Henry VIII, and an important member of the Reformation.[48] According to Erasmus, he was staying at the "country seat"[49] of Lord and Lady Mountjoy in Greenwich. While there, More and Colet came to pay him a farewell visit, and, in the words of Erasmus,

> [Thomas More] took me out with him for a walk as far as the next village, where all the King's children, except Prince Arthur, who was then the eldest son, were being educated. When we came into the hall… in the midst stood Prince Henry, now nine years old, and having already something of royalty in his demeanor, in which there was a certain dignity combined with a singular courtesy. On his right was Margaret, about eleven years of age, afterwards married to James King of Scots; and on his left played Mary, a child of four. Edmund was an infant in arms.[50]

Upon their arrival, Thomas More was said to have approached young Prince Henry and presented him with "some versus or other literary offering."[51] Erasmus, not having known previously of his royal destination, had nothing to present to the Prince. As a result, he promised Henry that he too would prove his courtesy in the same way on some future occasion. Erasmus was kept to his promise, as the Prince sent a note reminding him of the agreement. The scholar was then obliged to spend the remaining three days of his visit to England composing Latin versus honoring the country, the royal children, and particularly Henry VII.[52]

In his panel, Cowper represents the initial visit of More, Erasmus, and Colet to the royal nursery as well as several noteworthy royals.[53] The children are situated on a dais covered by a red canopy in the immediate foreground. The artist has positioned them as well as their attendants on the left side of the composition. Appearing from the far left corner of the panel stands the partial figure of an imperial guard, clad in robes of red and gold. He is facing the

---

[48] He boldly read the New Testament in Greek and translated it in English for his students at Oxford, a practice strictly forbidden by the Church. English Bible History: John Colet, (accessed 11 Jan 2008). http://www.greatsite.com/timeline-english-bible-history/john-colet.html

[49] Jessie Noakes, *Art, History, and Literature Illustrations: A series of 18 colored and 100 half-tone illustrations* (London: Virtue & Co. Ltd., 1920), 13.

[50] Quoted in Conway, 3.

[51] Noakes, 13.

[52] Ibid., 13.

[53] Figure key for this image provided in publications by Conway and Noakes.

royal children as well as the scene in front of him, holding what appears to be a halberd, an obvious indication of protection.

The trio of Prince Henry, Princess Margaret and Thomas More are the visual focus of this scene. Margaret stands regally in the center of the dais, hands folded patiently, as More kneels opposite her with an outstretched offering of a book of poetic verses. Henry is dressed like a miniature king in regal paraphernalia; he assumes a stance of power and position with legs spread apart and motions with his left hand to receive the offering from the kneeling subject.

As the title indicates, the visit is to the children's nursery, a carefree place in which to reenact productions witnessed in the royal palace by their parents, the King and Queen. Prince Henry, though later to be the King of England, is for now, just a boy. Though maintaining a look of indifference on his face, it does not change the fact that he does thrust out his hand, an action proposing his expectant nature. The entire episode is conducted by the royal children; they will grow up to hold positions of authority and demand respect, are for now, playing in their nursery, with Erasmus and More accommodating them as they would Henry and Catherine.

COWPER'S INFLUENCE FOR HENRY VIII: HOLBEIN AND HOLMAN HUNT

Pictorially, Cowper's figure of young Henry VIII is indebted to Northern Renaissance artist Hans Holbein's *Portrait of Henry VIII* (fig. 35; 1540) as well as Pre-Raphaelite William Holman Hunt's *King of Hearts* (fig. 36; 1862-1863).[54]

With the instructions that the artists should take to Northern examples for inspiration (see footnote 48), it is the oeuvre of Holbein to which the figure of young Henry VIII owes its

[54] Cowper is very open in his correspondence (please see RA Archives) that the general the general sources of inspiration for the Parliamentary murals. In a letter dated 9 October 1910 and written to critic M. H. Spielmann, he declared, "according to our subjects and periods, our paintings ought to be in the spirit of: van Eyck, Memlinc [sic], Dürer, Holbein and Antony Mor. And this is what we have aimed at—."[54] Thus, admittedly CC and the other muralists were pulling inspiration from Northern Renaissance art.

greatest debt.[55] Cowper's prince is a direct quotation of Holbein's masterpiece, *Portrait of Henry VIII*. CC has captured the younger version of the Northerner's canonical male figure. Holbein's titular sitter is shown with his hand on his hip, dressed in sumptuous attire, feathered cap, and bedazzling arrangement of royal jewels. His face is stern and suggestive of his status as powerful monarch. The artist addresses the adult's maturity with manly facial hair and stony features. He has an engaging and unyielding presence to him, both characteristics which visually confirm that he is a force with which to be reckoned.

In effect, the artist worked backwards. He used the Holbein image as a means to understand the man that the young Prince would eventually become. The twentieth-century portrayal presents a smaller replica of the King, complete with featherless cap, tunic and finery, all attire that is fit for a boy of his birthright. His youthfulness is emphasized by his active gestures and long hair peaking out from beneath the cap. In all, the representation of the child mimics that of his senior counterpart. Here, Henry is the boy who will be king, despite the appearance of youthful arrogance combined with the certainty that he is heir to the throne. Cowper's representation is therefore a variation on a theme. As viewers and the artistic world recognized Henry VIII as an adult King, this new version presented a counterbalance with his effort of describing the childhood of such an overwhelming personage. There remain glimpses of Holbein's adult within the young Prince, but it is the internal character and royal demeanor of Henry that the later artist had so deftly captured.

Though there is a definite parallel between Cowper's Prince and that of Holbein's King, it must be said that the Neo-Pre-Raphaelite may also have been considering work by artists of the

---

[55] For additional Holbein imagery, see: Susan Foister, *Holbein in England* (Tate Publishing: London), 2006; Stephanie Buck and Jochen Sander, *Hans Holbein the Younger: Painter at the Court of Henry VIII* (Thames & Hudson: New York), 2003; John Rowlands, *Holbein: The Paintings of Hans Holbein the Younger Complete Edition*, (Phaidon: Oxford), 1985; The Queen's Gallery, *Holbein and the Court of King Henry VIII* (The Queen's Gallery: London, 1978).

Brotherhood. As such, the youthful Henry figure is also indebted to William Holman Hunt's *King of Hearts* (1862-1863). Though not a representation of Henry VIII specifically, Hunt's image does visually present a young boy much like that of CC's heir to the throne. *The King of Hearts*, though based on Tudor portraits of Henry VIII and Edward VI, is a portrait of the Pre-Raphaelite artist's nephew, Teddy Wilson.[56] Set in the grassy outdoors, the sitter is shown directly addressing the viewer, with a small ball in his outstretched right hand. He makes eye contact with his audience and is perhaps offering the object as a gift. Like the CC counterpart, the legs of Hunt's figure are spread apart and he, too, is shown wearing stockings, a fur-lined tunic, and jaunty hat atop a head of boyish curls. His rosy cheeks, wide eyes, and partially opened mouth reveal his young age. Unlike Prince Henry, this boy establishes eye contact with his unknown companion, presumably the viewer, and is neither haughty nor condescending with this unwavering and unapologetic gaze. Whereas the young Henry is accepting a gift, this figure is presenting the ball to the viewer, as a gesture of invitation to join in his games.

The columns behind the young boy may arguably parallel childhood and the maturation process. These freestanding masonry objects start in the background, far away from the central figure, and advance so that they are approaching the young boy. The furthest one has no vine encircling its base, yet the one closest to the figure is overgrown with foliage, encompassing not only the column but the capital as well. This progression of columns with their ever-increasing amount of vegetation may be a visual parallel to the boy's growth. The first column is bare, but the flowers atop its capital are blooming. The second column has two rows of vines wrapped around it, while the third has a markedly increased amount. Teddy's head, seen larger than the hidden stone structures, is strategically placed between the columns with minimal covering and

---

[56] Judith Bronkhurst, *William Holman Hunt: a catalogue raisonné* (New Haven; London: Published for the Paul Mellon Center for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press), 2006.

those with abundance. This may be an artistic indication of the young man's place in childhood. Dressed as a miniature king, he is no longer a young child, yet he has not fully grown into the role of adult. His eyes suggest intelligence beyond his years and he appears to be engaging in sport for adults.[57]

The title of the painting, *King of Hearts,* alludes to its subject's engaging appearance.[58] His attire overtly references Holbein's aforementioned *Portrait of Henry VIII*, and as such, alludes to this figure maturing into a man of great importance.[59] Whereas Henry was ultimately King of England, Teddy Wison, with his pleasant demeanor and delighted expression, will be the king of the viewer's heart. An exuberant and expectant youth, he takes hold of the viewer's heart through his winsome attitude and enthusiastic expression.

INFLUENCE FOR ERASMUS: HOLBEIN AND DÜRER

Cowper's figure of Erasmus is also visually akin to Dürer's *Portrait of Erasmus* of 1520 (fig.37**)** as well as Holbein's *Desiderius Erasmus* of 1523 (fig. 38). These German images, contemporary to one another, present the contemplative scholar directly to the viewer. In each depiction, the solitary figure of Erasmus is the focus of the portrait. Both Holbein and Dürer portray the man with a scholarly cap (as does Cowper) over short curls. Wearing contemporary attire, the artists moreover portray an aged man engrossed in the process of learning. Holbein's painting includes a closed book before the scholar, whereas Dürer's drawing suggests the act of reading by the downcast eyes. Though the object of Erasmus' attention is not explicitly revealed

---

[57] As such, there is an allusion to croquet, a fashionable game recently introduced to England (1852 or 1853), as well as a parallel with Henry VIII who had bowling alleys constructed at Whitehall Palace; Bronkhurst, 98.
[58] Bronkhurst, 98. Bronhurst also suggests that the title has the sound of an old nursery rhyme, thereby deepening the playful associations of a child dressed as Henry VIII. The title itself may have been suggested by Lewis Carroll who had incorporated the "ditty 'The Queen of Hearts''' in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, completed in 1863.
[59] Teddy Wilson later became Dr. Edward Wilson; Bronkhurst, 98.

to the viewer, it may be implied that he is involved in the act of reading. By comparison, Cowper's profiled figure is in deep concentration, without possession of a book. Instead, it is Thomas More who offers the bound object to the Prince. CC's figure conforms to the Erasmus tradition of his Northern predecessors in both physical appearance and implication of the scholar's enlightened nature and interest in education by indirectly referencing his attribute of intellect—the book.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS MURAL FOR COWPER

For Cowper, the House of Commons commission was a great coup for the up-and-coming artist. His friendship and previous work experience with Abbey may have solidified his credentials, but it was CC's own artistic merit and creativity which earned the mural critical praise. A work within the Houses of Parliament may have also ensured that CC's production, after the conclusion of his studentship at the Royal Academy, continued to be worthy of note by art critics. It was with the *Erasmus* mural that his career found stability and "Cadogan Cowper" became a recognized name both in and out of Academic circles.

CONCLUSION

According to Cowper, the mural artists wanted "that little corridor to look like a richly gilded and painted and medieval casket or shrine, of which the historical wall paintings were intended to be part of the decoration."[60] Although German critic Muthesius had identified the goals of the so-called "Abbey School" as "primarily of a decorative nature… in the matter of

[60] F.C. Cowper, quoted in E.V. Lucas, *Edwin Austin Abbey, Royal Academician: A Record of His Life and Work* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921), 461-2.

color they strive for a rich, dense carpet effect,"[61] it was possibly their artistic ability to create a sense of reality and actuality about the historical past which directly appealed to their patrons. It was this capacity by the program artists to make the past appear credible that was Harcourt's express purpose. As Willsdon hypothesized, "if the modern citizen of Britain passing through the East Corridor could recognize himself in the scenes of Reformation history, their message would be clear…"[62]

Thus, Harcourt's vision for the East Corridor was a success. Abbey and the muralists were able to give visual voice to the First Commissioner of Work's abstract concept of not only significant historical and social events within British history, but also the desire to pictorially represent the "voice of the people."[63] Scenes were selected which expressly propagated Harcourt's personal political agenda. The main concern of Abbey and his team of artists was less about contemporary political and religious messages, than it was with creating six fluid panels filled with historical intricacies. Harcourt's program was an effective vehicle to further the message of Britain's history and legitimacy to the throne. Whereas the emphasis of the execution of the murals centered upon a Liberal political agenda for Harcourt and Carlisle, the artists were involved with the project for the sheer joy of creating a work of art. Their creations were infused with episodes from the British past, but remained relevant to current-day policies. Yet, through it all, the energy was focused on the final product. For Board, Salisbury, Eden, Payne, Shaw, and Cowper, the East corridor became their own gothic cathedral where Parliament's desire for historical representations mixed with their own appreciation for

[61] Quoted in Willsdon, 103; Muthesius, "Kunst und Leben" (1902), 66; As an aside, Harcourt forbade the embellishment envisioned by the artists. He believed that an excess of decoration might have distracted from the historic message he was trying to propagate. Furthermore, it may have also detracted from Abbey's intense attention to historical authenticity.
[62] Willsdon, 103.
[63] Ibid., 92.

aestheticism, design, and creativity. As Cowper wrote shortly after the murals were presented to the public,

> I hope you will stick up for our ambition to have the ceiling of the corridor and all the stonework painted and gilded up in the Gothic style. It would look magnificent in spite of the glass over the pictures. It is the whims of the Puritan spirit to like the cold stone. Mr. Harcourt says that if the corridor were done like that the whole of the rest of the building must be done so… Why should not our corridor be called the King's corridor or something like that!!![64]

[64] Letter from Cadogan Cowper to M.H. Spielmann (18 October 1910), Private Collection.

Chapter 5
Frank Cadogan Cowper (1877-1958)

Certainly…I understand the theory of PreRaphaelitism perfectly now, and as far as the method of painting is concerned [I] understand it better than all the P.R.B. … did themselves…
--Frank Cadogan Cowper[1]

INTRODUCTION

British artist Frank Cadogan Cowper (1877-1958), dubbed the "last Pre-Raphaelite" by Victorian art expert Christopher Wood and others, has managed to escape the revisionist focus on nearly all other artists and aspects of the nineteenth-century Pre-Raphaelite phenomenon of realism. The previous chapter has demonstrated how vital a role he played in the House of Parliament mural enterprise and as a link in the chain of Edwin Austin Abbey's influence. Although Cowper was not born until the original Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood was no longer in its heyday, there is still considerable proof that he consciously followed this artistic movement in both theory and practice. This artist is unique, both as a late, perhaps even final, adherent of Pre-Raphaelitism and as someone whose life and production straddle both the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, resulting in imagery which reflects the changing social, historical, and artistic sensibilities of the time.

In general, even in the past thirty years of revisionist scholarship in Pre-Raphaelitism, Cadogan Cowper's work has been primarily discussed briefly in footnotes, auction catalogues, and general survey material on late nineteenth-century British art. However, there remains a void in the art historical scholarship of this artist for an organized, in-depth history of his personal and artistic career. In 2008, the fifty-year anniversary of the artist's death, I wrote a Master's thesis on Cadogan Cowper and investigated his background, career, works, and varying

[1] Royal Academy Archives, COW/2/1.

influences. While it was not intended to serve as a definitive monograph of his accomplishments, the thesis nonetheless offered a long overdue analysis of his oeuvre.

Known by his friends and family as "CC," Cadogan Cowper led a life known to the public by its bare essentials. On July 27, 1897, he was admitted as a painting student to the Royal Academy schools in London. CC exhibited in 1899 at the Royal Academy for the first time, with pencil portraits of W.A.E. Erskine, Esq., and W.D. Eden, Esq.[2] He was admitted for a second term of studentship July 31, 1900, and experienced his first critical success in 1901 with *An Aristocrat answering the Summons to Execution, Paris 1791*. His student status ultimately ended the following year.[3] Shortly before terminating his program of study at the RA, CC began work in the studio of eminent American artist Edwin Austin Abbey. This six-month apprenticeship proved to be useful not only in terms of experience, but also in terms of networking. With Abbey's support, CC became more respected and accepted by the powerful and influential members of the Royal Academy. Cadogan Cowper rapidly became a name recognized for excellence as confirmed by critics in *The Morning Post, The Graphic,* and *The Athenaeum* as well as his commission to contribute to the Parliamentary murals (discussed in Chapter 4). Overall, CC enjoyed considerable success in mainstream art circles throughout his career. Two of his paintings, *St. Agnes in Prison receiving the "shining white garment"* of 1905 (fig. 39) and *Lucretia Borgia reigns in the Vatican in the absence of Pope Alexander VI* of 1914 (fig. 40) were purchased for the Tate Gallery by the Chantrey Bequest, a prestigious achievement for any artist. He received noteworthy recognition for his artistic production throughout his life, and was elected to several art societies: the Royal Academy, Royal Watercolor Society, and the

---

[2] COW/1/2.
[3] Royal Academy Class Register.

Royal Society of Portrait Painters. His final work for the Royal Academy was exhibited in 1957. He died the following year at the age of eighty-one.

Cadogan Cowper can be considered someone for whom the art of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood played a major role in his own artistic practices and production, and the work of John Everett Millais was of key importance. As CC wrote in a letter to his mother, dated 13 August 1899,

> Certainly…I understand the theory of Pre-Raphaelitism perfectly now, and as far as the method of painting is concerned we understand it better than all the P.R.B. (except Millais) did themselves, and Millais either painted in the proper way unconsciously because it came easiest without knowing why, or else he understood it thoroughly having found it out from the early Italians …and was a beast and kept it to himself. I think this is not unlikely because Millais must have looked upon Rossetti and Hunt as rivals as though they were all upholding the same theory of Art.[4]

Like Millais, Holman Hunt, and Arthur Hughes, Cadogan Cowper also experimented in his early works with a curved-arch canvas format framing some of his paintings, perhaps in a gesture of both imitation and veneration for Millais' work, for example, his *Huguenot* (1852; fig. 41) and *Ferdinand Lured by Ariel* (1849-50; fig. 42). This particular format is evident in at least four of CC's paintings: *Self Portrait*, (1899; fig. 43); *The Good Samaritan* (1900); the study for his *Lorenzo and Isabella, "How Ill she is, said he, etc."* (1900); *An Aristocrat answering the summons to execution—Paris 1793*, (1901; fig. 44) for which he was most likely influenced by Hunt's *Eve of St. Agnes* for the basis of the holy figure (1847-57).

However, an analysis of CC's work cannot be complete without asking two vital questions: why has he, up until this point, escaped scholarly attention and how does he fit exactly into the last phase of Pre-Raphaelitism? Thus far, academic scholarship has not established the artist's place in the canon of late nineteenth and early twentieth century art history.

---

[4] COW/2/1.

Above all, it is important to recognize that the rise of modernism killed academic art and genre pictures, and similarly impacted both Cadogan Cowper's artistic production and critical reviews. CC was working during a very turbulent and volatile time of change when, as a whole, the Academic tradition of art was coming to an end. The purpose and intention of art was evolving in order to accommodate the radically altering outside world. With the arrival of the First World War, artists began to use their work as a platform for social commentary as well as a means to propagate political beliefs and ideology. The first quarter of the twentieth-century, then, harkened the end of aestheticism, as well as the Academic traditions with which the work of Cadogan Cowper was closely tied.

In addition, CC was out of the artistic circle of action during his service in WWI. His art was enjoyed by the critics of his early days, though there does not appear to be as much critical response in his later years. Perhaps that was due to the fact that, though a prolific painter, the majority of his production was portraiture, especially after 1918.[5]

Moreover, the distinction should be made that while CC's work has been overlooked by academics, both his name and his works are at least familiar in certain late twentieth-century circles. Going back as far as 1971, the Mayer International Auction records show that Cadogan Cowper's work has been steadily represented in the market for the better part of the last thirty years, with prices ranging from a few thousand dollars to nearly three-hundred thousand in 2003 with the sale of the 1928 *Titiana sleeps: A midsummer night's dream*.[6] Arguably, this demonstrates that there is still, at the very least, an aesthetic appreciation and commercial market for his work.

---

[5] Due to the parameters of this project, this chapter will not address the artist's portraits.
[6] E. Mayer, *Mayer International Auction records* (Zurich), 2003.

Cowper was greatly influenced by the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, but the qualification of his being the final proponent does not justify his complex role in the later phases of the movement. Hitherto overlooked, the surviving correspondence with his mother makes it abundantly clear that he connected himself with some of the greats of the Brotherhood, including Millais, Hunt, and Rossetti. He can be considered one of the last Pre-Raphaelites, maintaining an interest in depicting Arthurian knights and damsels, as he exhibited *The Four Queens Find Lancelot Sleeping* at the RA as late as 1954.[7] Cadogan Cowper followed the Pre-Raphaelite belief in minute, fastidious attention to detail and their desire for illustrating literary subjects. However, the first wave of the PRB had dissolved by the early 1850s and by 1860, its initial phase was over. Later incarnations of Pre-Raphaelitism include artists like William Morris, Edward Burne-Jones, Frederick Sandys, Simeon Solomon, and John William Waterhouse. However, most experts concur that the reign of these stylistically Romantic artists died out with them by 1930. As far as female counterparts, the contemporaneous phase of the so-called Pre-Raphaelite Sisterhood is illustrated by artists like Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale (Chapter 7), Evelyn Pickering de Morgan, and Kate Elizabeth Bunce (both of whom will be addressed in Chapter 10). However, works of art by Frank Cadogan Cowper, along with the figural traditions of Pre-Raphaelitism, survived despite the predominance of the Modernist movement of the 1920s and 1930s. Cadogan Cowper was important to the movement because he continued the Pre-Raphaelite work and ideals long into the twentieth-century. It is because of his contribution that Victorian and Edwardian art survived well into the twentieth-century.

Cadogan Cowper's reputation as "the last Pre-Raphaelite", or at least one of them, as with Ford Madox Ford (Chapter 1), identifies the artist with the masculine tradition of the

---

[7] Christopher Wood, *Dictionary of Victorian Painters* (Woodbridge [Eng.]: Antique Collectors' Club, 1978,) 246.

Brotherhood of years ago. Technically speaking, however, this classification seems to be at odds with the reality of the twentieth-century man and his art. Whereas the Brotherhood was comprised of seven men dedicated to their artistic rebellion against the rules of art set forth by Sir Joshua Reynolds and the Royal Academy, Cadogan Cowper was a single individual who, in his time, did not find it necessary to engage in such a drastic social or artistic revolution. Unlike the experience of the PRB, the RA was accepting, even encouraging, of Cadogan Cowper's art and emulation of the Pre-Raphaelite technique and adherence to their ideas of art. It is in the modern artist's lack of using his art for political goals and motivations, therefore, that CC was not a strict devotee of the entire ideology behind the Pre-Raphaelite circle.

Yet, despite such discrepancies, the artist has posthumously gained the status as "the last" of the Pre-Raphaelites. The opposition between the man and the Brotherhood can thus be reconciled when the discussion focuses solely on artistic practice and beliefs. To all involved, the practice of art was actually a parallel to the practice of "the secular cult of labor"[8] and a nod to the "Victorian ethic of hard work."[9] To the PRB, as well as to CC, the creation of a work of art required a single-minded obsession with attention to detail, truthfulness to nature, and a naturalistic representation of that nature. This belief created in Cadogan Cowper's work not only a masterful detail of tangible objects, but also an adherence to truth in the representation of his subject.

While CC is arguably the last ambassador of the Pre-Raphaelites, it is important to recognize that he was not strictly only Pre-Raphaelite in nature. Unlike his Brotherhood companions, he produced an enormous amount of portraiture, so much so that the latter part of his oeuvre comes primarily from this genre. Whereas the PRB also produced imagery of Christ

---

[8] Herbert L. Sussman, *Victorian Masculinities: Manhood and Masculine poetics in early Victorian literature and art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 117.
[9] Ibid., 117.

and representations from His life, CC's religious works dealt more with events from the lives of saints, as opposed to those of Christ. Finally, a large part of original Pre-Raphaelite painting is dedicated to moralizing sentiments of nineteenth-century culture and society. Though similar commentaries may be found in some of Cadogan Cowper's representations, he was not primarily concerned with the culture or society of his day. He is quite outspoken on certain subjects in his personal correspondence, but there is a definite lack of such social-reform critiques in his work. While one may never know for sure, it seems appropriate to propose that either he could not be bothered with such things, or rather, that he opted to leave such revolutionary art to the other artists of the twentieth-century whose main artistic goal was to change radically cultural directions. It is the purpose of this chapter to explain the artist's role as a Neo-Pre-Raphaelite, and because of these parameters, only a relevant selection of his subject pictures will be examined.

RELATIONSHIP WITH EDWIN AUSTIN ABBEY

Though Cadogan Cowper's artistic life began with his admission into the Royal Academy in July of 1897, he actually became aware of Edwin Austin Abbey's work the previous year, during his year-long enrollment at the St. John's Wood Art School.[10] Of this time, the nineteen-year old artist wrote that upon viewing Abbey's *Richard, Duke of Gloucester and the Lady Anne* (1896; fig. 19) the students

> …became more or less'[Edwin Austin] Abbey mad,' and the sketches at the monthly competitions reflected the influence of this picture—my own sketches among them. But I soon learnt that I ought to have been better acquainted with Abbey's work already, and with the assistance of a fellow student who was more learned in it, I set about collecting

[10] In 1894, two of Cadogan Cowper's younger brothers, Gerald and Lionel, arrived for their education at Cranleigh. With similar familial artistic inclinations, both did well on the 1896 Art Exams. Gerald was honored with: Model drawing 2nd class, Freehand drawing 2nd class; Lionel earned Freehand drawing 1st class. CC returned to paint a portrait of the retiring headmaster, Rev. H.A. Rhodes, M.A. It was exhibited at the RA in 1932.

> the illustrations to the Comedies of Shakespeare, and other drawings of his which had appeared in *Harper's Magazine*. From this time onwards I followed his work with the most immense admiration, and the succeeding years of the Academy Exhibitions are associated in my mind with each of Abbey's great historical or Shakespearean pictures.[11]

Abbey helped to find a buyer for CC's *Hamlet—the churchyard scene* (1902; fig. 45) which proved to be career-changing endeavor. It was through this interaction that Cowper ultimately made the acquaintance with future mentor Abbey, the American artist he had admired for six years.[12] Abbey invited the young RA student to assist with the details of his own work, the *Coronation of King Edward VII* (1902-1907; fig. 6).[13] At this request, Cadogan Cowper wrote his, "mind was running on romantic pictures of my [his] own, but I knew what a chance it was to go and work in the studio of a great painter like Abbey."[14] In May of 1902, he wrote to his mother,

> All last week I have been painting the King's Coronation vestments on the lay-figure. Abbey could only get them just now for a short time and as he was busy on other things he set me to paint them! A pretty responsible job!! As they are the most important thing in the picture, except the King's head…However I have finished them and they go away tomorrow—so Abbey can't touch what I have done if he wants to—and I shall be able to point out my actual handiwork in the picture when it is finished!!![15]

And so Cadogan Cowper began his six-month apprenticeship in the studio of the eminent American artist. It proved to be a useful relationship, not only in terms of experience, but also in terms of networking. Of Abbey and his connections, CC once observed, "He is most interesting to talk to as he knows <u>every</u> celebrity personally that one can mention, and most of them intimately…"[16] With Abbey's support, CC became more respected and accepted by the powerful

---

[11] E.V.Lucas, *Edwin Austin Abbey: Royal Academician; the record of his life and work* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921), 370.
[12] *Hamlet* was purchased by the Queensland Art Gallery, Australia in 1903; Abbey helped Cowper to find a buyer for this work (Lucas, 370.)
[13] Ironically enough, in a letter written to his mother dated 24 April 1899, he stated, "…I'm afraid I'm getting tired of Abbey everything he does is so very theatrical." COW/1/3.
[14] Lucas, 370.
[15] COW/1/5/1; Excerpts from this same letter are found in Chapter 2.
[16] COW/1/6.

and influential members of the Royal Academy. *Cadogan Cowper* rapidly became a name recognized for excellence and was praised in *The Daily Telegraph, The Morning Post, The Graphic,* and *The Athenaeum.*[17]

Almost immediately after his studentship expired at the RA, the artist moved to Fairford for a number of months, where he ultimately lived with the Abbeys in their grand estate, Morgan Hall. He described his time there as "the most delightful … of [his] life."[18] The two artists worked closely and CC said that it was here that he learned exactly how ignorant he was as an artist, and how "slipshod" he was in his methods of work![19]

> Abbey's knowledge was simply astonishing. His long life as an illustrator from an early age had made him a perfect mine of knowledge upon anything to do with a subject picture. He had traveled and studied everywhere in Europe in search of material for his work. I think there must have been very little he did not know about architecture, costume, furniture, the arts and manners and customs of all periods of history or anything to do with an historical picture. He said to me once, talking of historical subjects: 'Always look up three times as much as you will want to put into a picture.' And it is this thoroughness which makes his work so interesting, whether illustrations or pictures. Most illustrators are content when they have learnt up barely enough of their subject to get them through their drawing… He always said: 'Economise [sic] everywhere else, but don't ever economise [sic] in the studio.'[20]

During his time in Fairford, he obviously learned a great deal from his mentor. While he did fret over the lack of material he sent back to the Royal Academy for exhibition, he continued to produce "small" works and periodically sent them back to London. Cowper also received illustration work from *Scribner's*, a popular American magazine, which was made possible because of Abbey's personal request to the editor. In the interim, Abbey was in high demand:

> The number of commissions Abbey has got simply appalls [sic] me he has more to do than he can possibly finish in eight years now. And yet he is just hesitating now about accepting an order to paint a series of gigantic canvases to decorate the "Capitol" of

---

[17] *Daily Telegraph*, 17 May 1907; *The Morning Post* COW/2/9/1; *The Graphic* COW/2/3/1; *The Athenaeum* 9 June 1900; *The Athenaeum* 1909, vol. 1.
[18] Lucas, 371.
[19] Ibid., 371.
[20] Ibid., 371.

> Pennsylvania which he says cannot take him less than fifteen years to do! In his spare moments he does illustrations for Harper's Magazine for which he now gets £140 each drawing, to which he seldom gives more than two days…[21]

Cadogan Cowper left Abbey's studio after six months, evidently at the older man's urgings, to broaden his artistic horizons. In the spring of 1903, CC traveled to Italy in order to study. He remarked years later that he wished he had stayed longer under Abbey's tutelage. Though he did not know it yet, the two would meet and thus work together nearly six years later.

SUBJECT WORKS

"It is likely that pictures of subject-interest will be fewer than ever in view of the lack of encouragement given by buyers of the present day. Yet a few remarkable achievements are reported, notably by young men—that, for example, by Mr. F. Cadgoan Cowper."[22]

Like the founding members of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, Cadogan Cowper created subject pictures that can be divided into two main categories—those with religious topics and those based on contemporary literature. Like the original Brotherhood, CC found inspiration in the writings of Shakespeare, Keats, Tennyson, Dante, and Goethe.

The single most important source of artistic stimulation, according to the List of Immortals created by the PRB, was Christ. For that reason, a vast majority of religious-based images produced by the Pre-Raphaelites focused largely on episodes from Christ's life. CC exhibited five works at the RA which depict holy subjects: *St. Francis of Assisi and the Heavenly Melody* (1904); *The Lower Church of St. Francis Assisi* (1906); *Assisi: the hour of "Ave Maria"* (1906); *St. Agnes in Prison receiving from Heaven the shining white garment* (1905); and *Lucretia Borgia Reigns in the Vatican in the Absence of Pope Alexander VI* (1914). Of these

---

[21] COW/1/7/1.
[22] *The Graphic* 23 March 1907.

works, his *St. Agnes* and *Lucretia Borgia* are on public display, with the former a distinguished purchase by the Tate Chantrey Fund.

ST. AGNES

The theme of St. Agnes was one that was also treated by Pre-Raphaelite artists, especially in the work of John Everett Millais, William Holman Hunt, and Pre-Raphaelite associate Arthur Hughes. The narrative of St. Agnes originates with William Caxton's fifteenth-century *Golden Legend* based on the fourth century tale. St. Agnes, now the patron saint of virgins and young girls, was very beautiful and being affluent, was considered to be highly marriageable at the age of twelve. Though she had many suitors, she had made a promise to belong only to Christ. As such, she rejected marriage and dedicated her life to God. According to hagiography, she refused to abandon her vow of chastity and was stripped of her clothing and sold to a brothel by her rejected suitor. She prayed for divine intervention and as if in answer to her prayers, the room filled with a heavenly light and a white robe appeared before her.[23]

Cadogan Cowper's *St. Agnes receiving from Heaven the shining white garment* (1905) portrays the moment in Caxton's tale when the young virgin is offered the white garment. St. Agnes is shown in her cell, sitting curled against the wall with hands upturned in a gesture of prayer. In front of the girl is an empty blue water bowl and hunks of moldy bread. This may indeed be a vague reference to the Last Supper as well as an ultimate allusion to Eucharist.

Compositionally, the image is divided into three parts: St. Agnes to the left, the spiritual garment in the center, and the angel at right. Cowper most likely manipulated the format so that the shining white dress was given central importance, as it significant to the narrative. Stylistically, it appears to be similar to a wedding gown. Such a rendering would support the

[23]Ronda De Sola Chervin, *Treasury of Women Saints* (Cincinnati, OH: St. Anthony Messenger Press: 1991), 136.

legend that Agnes wanted to dedicate her life to God, in effect acting as the virginal bride for her spiritual savior.

The figure of the angel is clad in flowing robes of red with gold embellishments detailing the Greek letters Chi Rho Iota (XPI), the monogram of Christ's name.[24] The angel wears a white stole detailed with blue crosses; flames emanate from the feet as a way to visually suggest the holiness and belonging to the heavenly realm. Interestingly, the head of the angel is angled down toward Agnes which simultaneously echoes the arch of the cell, and thereby frame of the painting. Behind the angel is a massive column, indicating the space behind them and the curved architecture of the chamber. Agnes is seated in an area covered with straw, but far below both of the figures is a window with a scene of grazing lambs outside, perhaps an allusion to Christ as the sacrificial Lamb of God. This window beneath the figures suggests that the room is multi-leveled and that the heroine finds herself on a top floor.

From a stylistic perspective, Cadogan Cowper's *Agnes* can be compared to earlier compositions by first and second generations of the PRB as well as mentor Edwin Austin Abbey. These compositions include: Dante Gabriel Rossetti's *Ecce Ancilla Domini!* (1849-50, fig. 46); Edward Burne-Jones' *Annunciation* (1879, fig. 47); and finally Abbey's Ophelia figure from *The Play scene from Hamlet* (1897; fig. 48).

Rossetti's *Ecce Ancilla Domini!*, taking its name from the Gospel of St. Luke ("Behold the handmaiden of the Lord"), depicts an Annunciation scene. The young virgin, like St. Agnes, is huddled on her bed, visibly cowering from the angel Gabriel who enters the scene from left. The Virgin, clad in robes of white to indicate her physical purity, peers down, in essence actively avoiding the gaze of the angel Gabriel. Instead of being presented with a shining white garment to cover herself, she is offered the three-bloomed lily, an attribute of her purity as well as

[24] This inscription is found on the figure's right shoulder and on the hem between the feet.

reference to the Trinity. The angel, like the one visiting St. Agnes, has flames coming forth from the feet.

Thus, it seems plausible that CC's *Agnes* was a reworking of Rossetti's Annunciation scene. The relationship between the two figures has been reversed. In Rossetti's earlier work, the angel approaches from the left while the Virgin shrinks away at right. The shadow from the feet and legs of the angel seen against the base of the bed suggests that Gabriel hovers slightly above the floor. They do remain, however, on the same spatial plane. By contrast, Cowper's young virgin is found on the left side of the composition with the angel floating far above at right. These two figures are not on the same spatial level and as such, the artist has made a distinct divide between the mortal and the spiritual beings. Moreover, while Rossetti's Virgin looks down, CC's Agnes willingly meets the gaze of the angel and seems to almost lift her body with her knees in order to greet the visitor. Her pose is one of relief and anticipation. Her head is tilted up toward the angel and the spread palms not only frame the face, but also create an open composition reflective of her welcoming attitude.

In addition to the alteration of the composition, CC has echoed the dominance of red, white, and blue within his image. Rossetti's color palette is very stark—for he uses only these three colors for the *Ecce*. The red of the Virgin's embroidery in Rossetti's work is repeated in the garments of CC's angel; the white of the robes of Gabriel and Mary is duplicated in the fabric of Agnes' gown; and the blue, seen first in the room divider behind the Virgin, is found not only in the water bowl for the young saint, but also in the cross-pattern of the angel's stole. Both present intimate interior settings, though the reaction of each young virgin allows for a different mood. The reaction of a cowering Madonna creates an unsettling image of the mother of Christ,

while the eager acceptance of Agnes presents a picture of anticipation for His chaste bride who has dedicated her earthly and spiritual life to Him.

St. Agnes is also indebted to later generation Pre-Raphaelite, Burne-Jones. In his *Annunciation* (1879) the artist presents a similar interaction between the Virgin and the angel Gabriel. However, when compared to the *St. Agnes* it becomes clear that CC has reversed the placement of the figures—the young saint looks expectantly at left, while the angel hovers at right. Meanwhile Burne-Jones' oil presents the floating angel at left and the contrapposto-stanced Madonna at right. While the bread and water bowl suggested Eucharist in the *St. Agnes*, the *Annunciation* includes a detailed frieze (to the left of the triumphal arch) depicting a traditional representation of the Expulsion of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden.

Abbey's 1897 work, *The Play scene from Hamlet* (fig. 5; detail of Ophelia, fig. 48) includes a representation of Ophelia which may also have inspired Cowper. Although the artists would not formally meet for five more years, and the *St Agnes* was not completed until three years later, there are still interesting parallels to be made between the two female figures. Abbey's Ophelia is seated on the floor, knees bent, as she stares transfixed by the performance before her. Her head is slightly tilted as her attention is set on a scene to her right, yet her widened eyes suggest a more trance-like state rather than one of rapt attention . She is not aware of the viewer's presence; instead the scene could be read as the viewer is one of the actor's on stage. In contrast, CC's Agnes, also seated like Ophelia, has both arms bent at the elbows and raised hands curved, echoing the roundness of her cheeks. Whereas Ophelia is adorned in a pale pink gown with intricate detailing on the upper arms and along the neckline, St. Agnes is engulfed by massive amounts of her golden-red hair, covering her nakedness. As with Ophelia's intense concentration, she, too, gazes in a state of wonderment at the floating angel above. Since

the young woman finds herself locked in a cell, the viewer becomes more of a silent voyeur to this miracle of the shining white garment, rather than a participant of a play within a play.

Though the theme of St. Agnes was recurrent in Victorian art, Pre-Raphaelite artists usually opted to follow Keats' and Tennyson's poems about the medieval legend. Thus, Cowper's image differs from that of his PRB predecessors because he took his subject from the originating story rather than the poetic versions, entitled *The Eve of St. Agnes*, by Keats (1819) and Tennyson (1837). Both texts allude to events occurring the evening before the feast day for St. Agnes, patron saint of purity. These poems are based on the belief that a girl could see her future husband in a dream if she performed certain rites before going to bed on the Eve of St. Agnes:

> They told her how, upon St. Agnes' Eve,
> Young virgins might have visions of delight
> And soft adornings from their loves receive
> Upon the honey'd middle of the night,
> If ceremonies due they did aright;
> As supperless to bed they must retire,
> And couch supine their beauties, lily white;
> Nor look behind, nor sidesways, but require
> Of Heaven with upward eyes for all that they desire[25]

Keats' poem, then, tells the story of the young lovers Madeleine and Porphyro who have been kept from one another because of the jealous rivalry between their two families. On St. Agnes' Eve, Madeleine resolves to follow the superstition of this night by retiring to her room and performing the proper rituals. Porphyro gains access to her bedroom, pretending to be a vision. In a state between sleep and wake, Madeline believes that she sees him in a dream. They agree to marry him and escape. Hence, it is this story of a young girl's adventures on the night of St. Agnes' Eve, made popular though the poetry of Keats and Tennyson, that the Pre-Raphaelites chose to portray, and not the tale of the actual martyred virgin, of which Cowper

[25] Keats, "The Eve of St. Agnes" vi: 46-54

focused his artistic efforts.[26]

Millais' wood engraving of 1857 for Moxon's *Tennyson* (fig. 49) visualizes imagery alluded to in the opening stanza of the Tennyson poem:

> Deep on the convent-roof the snows
> Are sparkling to the moon:
> My breath to heaven like vapour goes:
> May my soul follow soon!
> The shadows of the convent-towers
> Slant down the snowy sward,
> Still creeping with the creeping hours
> That lead me to my Lord:
> Make Thou my spirit pure and clear
> As are the frosty skies,
> Or this first snowdrop of the year
> That in my bosom lies.[27]

These verses discuss the cold winter's night from the point of view of a presumably female narrator. Millais' image presents an image of a freezing night, but instead of being shown from the point of view of Keats' man, the viewer is presented with a young maiden, who has presumably stopped to look out into the moonlight on her way to her bedchamber. The girl is shown, clad in a full-length nightdress, with her left hand on the opened windowsill and her right holding a blazing candle. The engraver has included the effect of the young woman's breath mixed with the cold night air and it has a billowing effect as it shoots from her parted lips. She stares into the starry night and looks out onto snow-covered rooftops. She finds herself on a spiral staircase with a dominating circular column, much like the supporting structure in Cadogan Cowper's *Agnes*.

Though the subject suggests young love, Tennyson's version seems to take its cue in part from the actual tale of Agnes, the martyred young virgin. Tennyson's narrator, presumably the

---

[26] Imagery according to Keat's poem and the moment of escape can be witnessed in Pre-Raphaelite Holman Hunt's painting 1847-57 or PRB associate Arthur Hughes'1856 image, both called *The Eve of St. Agnes.*
[27] Tennyson, *Eve of St. Agnes*, ii 1-12.

same female figure illustrated in Millais' engraving, is imploring Christ. The poem would suggest that the buildings in the distance are the convent roofs. As the text indicates, her breath leaves her body and goes to Heaven, ideally her soul to follow. The poem continues to describe her ideal lover—Christ. Unlike the nude Agnes anticipating the delivery of her white garment, this virgin is already clad in white robes—signaling her purity and confirming her status as virginal bride: "Draw me, thy bride, a glittering star,/ In raiment white and clean./… All heaven bursts her starry floors, / and strows her lights below/… For me the Heavenly Bridegroom waits/ To make me pure of sin/ The Sabbaths of Eternity/ One Sabbath deep and wide--/ a light upon the shining sea/ the Bridegroom with his bride!"[28] Like Agnes, this young woman has dedicated herself to Christ and is prepared to be His chaste bride. Whereas the figure of the angel in CC's work (as well as the flames coming from the feet) signaled a holy personage and a stand-in for the physical representation of Christ, Millais has treated the figure of Christ by including the burning candle the young girl holds.[29]

LUCRETIA BORGIA

Cowper's *Lucretia Borgia reigns in the Vatican in the absence of Pope Alexander VI* (1908-14) is a re-creation of an obscure and scandalous incident in papal history. In 1501, Lucretia Borgia, the illegitimate daughter of Pope Alexander VI, took his place at a meeting held in the Vatican. The subject was first suggested by the Diary entry of John Burchard, Bishop of

---

[28] Tennyson 23-36

[29] Millais made an earlier version of St. Agnes (1854, fig. 50) which shows the young martyr as a nun, confirming again her vow of chastity and desire to be a Bride of Christ. She wears the light-colored vestments of her calling, again either an allusion to a wedding dress or at the very least, reminiscent of the white garment the angel presents to the female figure in the Cadogan Cowper oil. In this 1854 engraving by Millais, the artist has included a candlelit crucifix on her altar, most possibly an identification of her Heavenly Bridegroom, Jesus Christ.

Orta, Papal Master of the Ceremonies, dated 27 July 1501.[30] In the RA catalogue of 1914 it was printed, "Before his Holiness, our Master, left the city, he turned over the palace and all business affairs to his daughter Lucrezia, giving her full power to open all letters which arrive."[31] The Cardinals and Lucrezia were painted from their contemporary portraits. The figure writing on the right is Cardinal Giovanni de Medici (afterwards Leo X), the one to the left holding back Lucretia's robe is Cardinal Farnese (afterwards Paul III) and the figure standing to the right is the Cardinal of Lisbon who had to advise the substitute Pope on her official duties.[32]

Cadogan Cowper's image met with much criticism from the Catholic Church, who called this work a "misrepresentation of history" [33]; an interesting critique as some early Pre-Raphaelite works were criticized for being ironically too pro-Catholic or Papist. In defense of his painting, the artist reminded the Church Council that had contacted him from Salford that it is an indisputable fact that Lucretia Borgia did in fact control the Vatican as the Pope's representative in the summer of 1501 for nine days and again in the autumn of the same year for an entire month. As CC wrote,

> Nobody who has studied the history of the period, not even Roman Catholics, deny this. Many histories refer to it. And my picture literally illustrates the account given by Ferdinand Gregorious [sic] in his Rome in the Middle Ages and his Life of Lucretia Borgia. Of course the Roman Catholics tone down, or explain away the incident as much as possible, as one would expect. The R.Cs generally do not know the history of their church. And naturally they do not approve of my picture. But it seems to me to be very late in the day for anybody to raise protests about pictures on the subject to the Borgias.[34]

---

[30] Mary Chamot, Dennis Farr and Martin Butlin, *The Modern British paintings, drawings, and sculpture, vol. 1 Artists A-L* (London: Oldbourne Press, 1964), 135.
[31] Ibid., 135.
[32] Ibid., 135; Letters from the artist 18 and 23 January 1956.
[33] RAA/SEC/12/6 July 16, 1914.
[34] Ibid.

Though the same faction refused to end the matter, they did ultimately leave the question of publication to the artist. In CC's style of an unapologetic attitude, he responded:

> I have no hesitation in saying that I think that the history of the Borgias has been made too well know by means of innumerable books, plays, operas, poems, and pictures for my picture to do the Roman Catholics any harm whatsoever.[35]

The image was purchased, as *St. Agnes* had been, by the Tate Museum with funds from the Chantrey Bequest the same year.

Within such a scandalous narrative, the artist has invented a suggestive moment where two noblemen part the robes of Lucretia's dress so that a Franciscan friar can kiss her shoe. The Papal stand-in is seated on a canopied throne. She sits regally, in a sumptuous gown of gold and white, as one cardinal clears a path for the kiss from the brown-robed friar. With Lucretia centrally located on the throne in mid-ground, she is surrounded by twelve cardinals dressed in robes of red—twelve apostles with a false Pope. The viewer is presented with the backs of two cardinals, another two flank the throne, and the remaining eight create a circular shape around Lucretia. Moreover, with the figure of Lucretia at center and the two cardinals in the immediate foreground, together these three figures create a pyramidal composition. The eye can then be led up in a severe vertical motion, though the back canopy of the throne, which meets a lunette-shaped upper wall, as well as the quadripartite Gothic ceiling. Within each section of ceiling are roundels; this circular motif, combined with the obvious Christian overtones of the painting, may be an allusion to Christ as the Alpha and Omega.[36] In addition, with twelve cardinals in attendance, Lucretia Borgia becomes a proxy for Christ with his twelve apostles. However, the artist may have been using such allusions in order to comment on the ridiculousness of the

---

[35] RAA/SEC/12/6 July 17, 1914.

[36] Book of Revelations 1:8, 17, "I am the Alpha and Omega" says the Lord God, "the one who is and who was and who is to come, the Almighty." The same words are used in reference to Christ as the Alpha and Omega in Revelations 21:6 and 22:13.

situation. For, in this particular instance, the earthly ruler is neither Christ nor his Papal surrogate, but rather, Alexander VI's illegitimate daughter!

Furthermore, the scale of the figures is dwarfed in comparison to the architecture. The background is filled with an isocephalic row of heads belonging to the attendants. The artist has included more heads than bodies, perhaps in an effort to suggest a large gathering. Though the face of Lucretia, in particular, and some of the Cardinals were individualized and based on contemporary portraits, the rendering is in fact so small that instead of presenting portraits, the artist has provided anonymity. In total, the figures of each Cardinal, though theoretically identifiable, form a massive grouping of red, again finding solidarity as a collective whole instead of twelve unique individuals.

There is a striking similarity in composition between this painting and Edwin Austin Abbey's *The Reconciliation of the Merchant Taylor's Company with the Skinners' Company in the Time of Richard III, after a quarrel as to precedence* (c.1904; fig. 51). Commissioned for the Royal Exchange by the two aforementioned companies, this panel measures seventeen feet by eleven feet and represents an incident between them during the reign of Richard III.[37] As Willsdon elaborates, this mural "shows Lord Mayor Billesden resplendent in his robes of state upon a scarlet dais in the Guidhall as if a king himself, his chain of office and City sceptre [sic] gleaming, as he settles the companies' dispute over precedence in civic processions of 1484."[38] Letters written by the artist to his father indicate that compositional sketches for this work began in 1897, with a study of pastel, graphite, oil paint and gold paint remaining in the Abbey estate

---

[37] Lucas, vol. 2, 303. The sketch for this work is housed at the Yale University Art Gallery (off-site storage facility). According to the Lucas biography, the panel "is the last on the right wall as one enters the central doors of that building" (303). Abbey discusses the sketch, presumably the one at Yale, as having been dated c. 1897. The title noted above is in accordance with the Lucas biography. However, a discussion of the mural program for the Royal Exchange, detailed in Willsdon's *Mural Painting in Britain*, suggests that the formal title is *Reconciliation of the Skinners' and Merchant Taylors' Companies by Lord Mayor Billesden, 1484* (76).

[38] Willsdon, 67.

until the time of his death in 1911, now part of the Edwin Austin Abbey Memorial Collection at Yale University. As Cowper lived with the Abbeys for a six-month period in 1902-1903 (and the panel wasn't installed until 1904), it stands to reason that the young artist would have had first hand knowledge of Abbey's on-going work for this project. It is not surprising, then, that both images have curved architectural elements as a framing device for the upper portions of the composition, a single figure seated on a royal dais placed at center, and roundel situated directly above. Though the architecture of the *Lucretia* is more ornate than the *Reconciliation,* the setting is reflective of the time period each artist is portraying.

At 87" x 60" (7.5 ft x 5 ft), the 1908-14 *Lucretia* is an unusual size for an easel painting. As a play on the theme of a crowning ceremony, it is useful to consider other larger–scale Coronation subjects. Jacques-Louis David's *Consecration of the Emperor Napoleon I and Coronation of the Empress Josephine in the Cathedral of Notre Dame de Paris on 2 December 1804* (1808, fig. 52) of one-hundred years earlier measures 20 ft 4 in x 32 ft 1 in, while Abbey's relatively contemporary *Coronation of King Edward VII* (1902-07) is a mere 9 ft x 15 ft by comparison. In both David's and Abbey's pictures, the soon-to-be crowned figures are wearing sumptuous light-colored costumes and are surrounded by large numbers of additional figures clad in red garments. CC would have most definitely referenced Abbey's royal commission, a point already made earlier in this chapter.

These supplementary figures in red are again reminiscent of earlier art by Velasquez, Abbey and Millais. The red Cardinals in *Lucretia Borgia* bear a striking resemblance in particular to Velasquez's portrait *Pope Innocent X* (1650, fig. 53) and Millais' *John Henry, Cardinal Newman* (1881, fig. 54). These ecclesiastics are presented in red vestments and are directly quoted in Cadogan Cowper's work. In addition, the contrast between the pale figure of

Lucretia Borgia and the crimson cloaks of the clergy is found in Abbey's *Richard, Duke of Gloucester and the Lady Anne* (from *Richard III*, 1896). In the Cadogan Cowper oil, as well as the Abbey scene, the female figure visually stands out all the more because of the juxtaposition between her pale garments and the red robes of her disciples.

CC was not the only artist to deal with this particular subject. Pre-Raphaelite artist Rossetti produced his first of two small watercolors representing the Papal stand-in of 1851, *Borgia*, (fig. 55). As a whole, this particular image was not done until 1858 when Rossetti converted it from a scene illustrating lines from *Richard III* to one about the Borgia subject. The pen and ink drawing was originally conceived as a group of people gathered in a woman's chamber with the woman as the central figure. Once altered to a watercolor of the Vatican subject, the "old grey-haired man [was changed into the] Pope."[39] In the new image, Lucretia finds herself surrounded by five additional figures—two older men, another adult woman, and two children. It may be surmised that these extra characters are members of the Borgia family. Lucretia remains seated in an oversized chair and the two adult males are leaning close, as if to whisper instructions into her ear. The two red-haired children in front dance, while at far right, a rodent dressed in red robes and cap similar to those of Cowper's Cardinals. Rossetti's animal addition looks menacingly out towards the viewer with hands clasped together. The surname of the family for the watercolor (as opposed to the female's specific name) removes the woman from her controversial place among the Papacy as well as denying her role in the death of her husband. By entitling the image in this manner, it becomes a family portrait which merely alludes to their notorious deeds.

---

[39] Virginia Surtees, *The Paintings and Drawings of Dante Gabriel Rossetti (1828-1882): A Catalogue Raisonné,* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).

Rossetti's second watercolor (1860-61; fig. 56) *Lucretia Borgia* represents the female not as the Papal surrogate, bur rather, as a cold-hearted femme fatale. She is shown washing her hands in a basin after administering poison to her husband, Duke Alfonso Bisceglie. Rossetti's image recalls that the woman was aided in the crime by her father, the Pope, whose reflection can be seen in the mirror. Her eyes are directed towards what only the mirror suggests and what the viewer witnesses through the mirror's reflection—her father assisting her husband walk around the room so that the poison will filter through his entire system. The tabletop below the mirror reveals a decanter of wine as well as a poppy—both sinister ingredients to the crime already in progress.

VANITY

There is a long tradition from the Renaissance of women embodying Vanity. Whereas much of Pre-Raphaelite art depicts women as beautiful creatures, literary figures, or victims of unrequited love, not all imagery of woman was complimentary. Cadogan Cowper explored the subject of vain woman with his Diploma work of 1907, *Vanity* (fig. 57), pictorially reminiscent of Millais' *Bridesmaid* (1851; fig. 13).[40] It is a portrait of a young heavy-lidded girl who presents herself with arms loosely folded over the back of a floral patterned seat. It may be relatively considered a bust-length portrait. The golden-haired beauty, like his belles dames sans merci

[40] Cowper's *The Blue Bird* (1918; fig. 58) is strikingly compositionally similar to *Vanity*, but not thematically. Again, the viewer is presented with a woman with a headdress, long hair over one shoulder, and white dress with ribbon-like sleeves of red with gold piping. She does not hold a mirror; instead she is accepting a string of pearls from a blue bird with a crown collar. According to the Christie's lot description of this work, it relates to Madame d'Aulnoy's fairy tale (1697) and was retold by Andrew Lang in the *Green Fairy Book* (1892). The tale describes a beautiful young princess who falls in love with a prince. Since the prince refuses to marry the princess' step-sister, the princess' fairy godmother turns him into a blue bird. Thus, he can fly into the tower in which she is trapped, and bring her presents of jewels as tokens of his affections. CC illustrates one such amorous encounter. For additional information, please see Christie's *Victorian, Pre-Raphaelite & British Impressionist Art Auction*; Sale 7973, Lot 52; 15 June 2011, London; http://www.christies.com/lotfinder/paintings/frank-cadogan-cowper-ra-the-blue-bird-5451320-details.aspx (accessed February 2016).

who would come twenty years later, has long locks cascading over one shoulder with the other side pushed elegantly behind the opposite shoulder. There is a white ruffle to the white, red, black and gold patterned dress, reminiscent in both Burne-Jones' 1860 *Sidonia von Bork* (fig. 59) as well as Giulio Romano's Renaissance work entitled *Portrait of Isabella d'Este* (c. 1531; fig. 60; called *Portrait of a woman* but traditionally identified as a portrait of Isabella d'Este). Cadogan Cowper's woman wears the same "zazara" headdress as the Romano work (which is also stylistically related to Titian's image of the same name). Such a fashioned headdress creates a halo-like effect, thereby misrepresenting the female figure as both pious and devout.

Though her eyes are downcast, they are not closed; close inspection reveals that she is subtlety glancing sideways, as if entranced by her own reflection as seen in the hand-mirror.[41] As a viewer, not much is visible through the glass other than the curve of her creamy white shoulder set against the backdrop of the long strands of golden hair. She is, indeed, a fair-haired beauty, but with the inclusion of such an unflattering title, one recognizes immediately that she is not all she appears. Instead of paying homage to female beauty and physical desire, the portrait becomes a representation of the deadly sin of vanity. Though the attribute of such a narcissistic indulgence is traditionally the looking glass, the artist has converted such a cumbersome object into a more portable, and hence obscure, item.

Frederick Sandys' *The Pearl* (early to mid-1860s, fig. 62) further explores the nature of a vain woman, though his earlier composition is more obvious in reference to its moralizing sentiment than CC's Diploma piece. In stark contrast to the later Cadogan Cowper work, Sandys' creates a presentation of a woman as seen from the side. Her hair has been swept up into what the viewer may assume to be a fashionable style, and the lowered décolletage reveals the creamy sloping arch of her shoulder. She tilts her head to the side and gazes admiringly into the raised

[41] A similar comparison is Byam Shaw's *Jezebel* (1896; fig. 61).

hand-mirror. Though Sandys' image is called *The Pearl*, most assuredly referencing her sole earring, it noticeably exploits the woman's vain enjoyment of herself. The tilt of the neck, as well as the sensuously rendered eye, suggest erotic possibilities. Sandys' woman is fascinated with her own reflection, and gazes longingly into the mirror. The reflective woman stares back at the flesh and blood female with as much power and desirability as might a lover.

This combination of self-absorption and literal power is also illustrated in Cadogan Cowper's *Damsel of the lake called Nimüe the enchantress* (1924, fig. 63**),** a figure from the Arthurian legend. CC depicts a moment when the enchantress already has the full extent of her magic, having surpassed the skills of her master, Merlin. Cowper's image of a solitary female is a blend of his earlier *Vanity* as well as being a reference to the specific Arthurian legend. Nimüe is shown examining her long tresses in a small hand-mirror. This is not the malicious sorceress of Burne-Jones' *Beguiling of Merlin* (1874; fig. 64), but rather a narcissistic enchantress whose submission to vanity will be the cause of her destruction.

For a femme fatale who is determined and dedicated to usurping Merlin's power, CC's *Nimüe* is an innovative portrait of the woman's ultimate influence as well as indicator of eventual demise. According to this early twentieth century depiction, it was not only her greed that led her downfall but also a self-absorbed attitude with her own physical looks. Though more blatantly obvious than the female figure in *Vanity*, this woman is also consumed by her reflection. Unlike the glimpse of reflection in the 1907 work, this 1924 oil allows the viewer to see what she sees—her face. The heavy-lidded eyes, while presenting an alluring vision to the viewer, captivate the woman herself as she becomes enchanted with and entranced by her own vision. The woman is so taken with the reflection she sees in the glass that she unknowingly is placed in a hypnotic, trancelike state, much like that of Rossetti's *Beata Beatrix* (1863; fig. 65). Nimüe is

a vision of beauty in addition to a moralizing sentiment, as told through Arthurian legend, of the possible downfalls when consumed with errant ways.

ARTHURIAN LEGEND: LATE IN CC'S CAREER

Cadogan Cowper's 1954 oil *The Four Queens Find Lancelot Sleeping* (fig. 66) is the penultimate subject picture exhibited at the RA before his death in 1958. It is a rather triumphant survival of Pre-Raphaelitism in the mid-twentieth century in its subject, mood and technique. Had the four queens not been rendered as glamorously as "1950s film stars,"[42] there would be no other visual indication to suggest a date much later than 1900.

The subject stems from *Morte d'Arthur* when the four queens (Morgan le Fay, Queen of the land of Gore; the Queen of Northgalis; the Queen of Eastland and the Queen of the "Out Isles") discover Lancelot sleeping beneath an apple tree. According to legend, each of the queens desires the man for their paramour, so Morgan le Fay, using her powers, places the young man under enchantment and has him transported to her castle where he will be asked to choose one of them. He refuses to participate, as he is faithful to his beloved Guinevere, and ultimately escapes.[43]

CC has represented the moment when the four women come upon the unsuspecting knight in the forest. The recumbent male figure has been quoted from the 1926 and 1946 images of the La Belle Dame's victim (figs. 67, 68). Unlike the knight, Lancelot has not been lulled to sleep by a beautiful maiden, but rather, has befallen Morgan le Fay's magical spell, as supported by the title. Three of the queens standing centrally over the man's body, are a modern twist on the Renaissance interest in the three graces. The foremost queen puts a finger up to her lips to

---

[42] John Christian, *The Last Romantics: The Romantic Tradition in British Art: Burne-Jones to Stanley Spencer* (London: Lund Humphies in association with Barbican Art Gallery, 1989), 134.
[43] Ibid., 134.

silence her companions while simultaneously extending her left arm in an effort to quiet the approaching fourth queen. The image is one of four harmless women as opposed to their legendary lust and desire for the young knight.

By comparison, Rossetti dealt with a similar subject in his engraving *King Arthur and the Weeping Queens* (1857, fig. 69). Though the identity of the male figure has changed to King Arthur, the body is still recumbent and there is a surrounding of female queens. This particular illustration for Moxon's *Tennyson* illustrates the lines from *The Palace of Art*, "Or mythic Uther's deeply-wounded son/ In some fair space of slooping greens/ Lay, dozing in the vale of Avalon,/ And watch'd by weeping queens."[44] Ten queens tend the body and each wears a crown of different design. Cadogan Cowper's *Four Queens*, is obviously indebted to this particular image. The figures of the queens, though more stylized in the twentieth century painting, harken back to the stunners of Rossetti, quite possibly even a visual synthesis of *Beata Beatrix.* Moreover, CC's crowns, though more intricately designed, seem to be lifted from the Rossetti engraving.

While the Rossetti example suggests a compelling basis for the Cowper *Four Queens*, it may also be possible that the artist was considering Abbey's pen and ink drawing entitled *Before the Princess's Pavilion—Love's Labour Lost* (1891, fig. 70). Though it takes its subject from the Shakespearean story and not the Arthurian legend Cowper uses, both compositions include the presence of four women, spread in a circular formation with three being in close proximity to one another and the fourth on the periphery. The male presence in Cowper's work is introduced by the sleeping figure of Lancelot, while Abbey includes a male guard at far left. Though Cowper and Rossetti have depicted queens who have stumbled across the male, Abbey presents the viewer with a moment of female solidarity before, according to Shakespeare, the four

[44] Surtees, 49.

unsuspecting male suitors will woo one of the ladies who has adopted the identity of one of her co-conspirators. Like Abbey's earlier work, CC's format is grounded with the inclusion of a centralized tree, which visually frames some of the women.

CONCLUSION

Cadogan Cowper's legacy to Victorian art is more significant than merely being hailed as the *last* of the Pre-Raphaelites. Not only was he the final representative of the mid-nineteenth-century group, he was also the last of these Abby-centric Neo-Pre-Raphaelites. His death over fifty years ago signaled the end of an era, with CC's influence ultimately bridging a gap between the original founding Brotherhood and their subsequent generational followers. Yet through it all, his art marks the transition of Victorian art from the fin-de-siècle into the twentieth century.

Although he never knew the PRB personally, the artist fit into their world many years later. Like the Aesthetic motto of *art for art's sake*, CC created his work not for glory or adulation, though his writings reveal that he took pleasure in success and financial security, but rather, for the enjoyment, experience and challenge presented by emulating the Pre-Raphaelites. He ignored the barriers of modern twentieth-century art and remained faithful to his deep love and appreciation of Victorian art.

CC was indifferent to the shifting norms of art in the 1900s and the onset of modernism and became a prolific artist, whose widespread appeal was interrelated with his direct connection to the PRB. Though his work is cited and praised by those with knowledge of his oeuvre, he is not recognized outside of Pre-Raphaelite scholarly realms. Though several theories abound, it is possible to infer that this discrepancy is partly the reflection of not only critics' changing tastes and social demands, but also public availability. Despite the fact that the artist exhibited an

enormous quantity of work at both the Royal Academy and the Royal Watercolor Society, there are untold amounts of imagery that were offered to friends and family that have never been displayed in a public forum. Of the production that has been recorded, the provenance of many pieces is unknown, either sold at auction or distributed to members of his estate after his death in 1958. Thus, while there remains an inventory of exhibited works, the actual works have often been lost to the ravages of time and storage or are only represented through mediocre illustrations in RA exhibition catalogues.

Although born after the heyday of the early phases of Pre-Raphaelitism, he was a standard-bearer of a Victorian approach to art that was extended well beyond its original time. His work was admired by his contemporaries as well as by critics, thereby testifying to the popularity of his art, and by extension, to the continued fascination with religious and literary subject matter rendered with an attention to extreme detail. His responsibility to the movement ensured the survival of a particular type of art and solidified his worthiness of both attention and study.

His work has not always been considered mainstream, but rather Pre-Raphaelite retardataire. CC never escaped the Victorian mindset in relation to traditional gendered roles and contributed greatly to the continued success of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. Values and traditions were important to him and as such, logical thought suggests that he expected excellence in his own work as well as those whom he deemed worthy of sources of inspiration. Though the PRB was a posthumous manifestation as his artistic muse, the debt was reciprocated through the artist's exaltation of their imagery.

Cowper was the very image of a confident and aspiring artist and maintained such enthusiasm until his death:

> Because naturally every good artist who has confidence in himself does his best to become a regular exhibitor at the Academy, because it is the recognized institution of the country. And pictures sell there better than anywhere else. And if you can become a prominent exhibitor and eventually get elected to the body of Academicians and Associates you become a personage, and can count upon a decent income. Consequently, the vast majority of all the best art that the country can produce goes to the Academy. Any artist who is any good atall will tell you that this is so, as a matter of course. It is universally admitted.[45]

The measure of success for CC was therefore recognition by the Academy as well as an elected position of Associate and Academician, not eternal fame. By this metric, he not only met his own standard of excellence, but also succeeded beyond that, as he was duly celebrated with the ultimate appointment of Academician in the Royal Academy (1934), Associate of the Royal Watercolor Society (1904) and member of the Royal Society of Portrait Painters (1921).

[45] COW/2/14

Chapter 6
John Liston Byam Shaw (1872-1919)

"Byam Shaw was an artist who always commanded respect by the sincerity and integrity of his work. He was not a "modern" as the word is now understood, but belonged by temperament and taste to the Pre-Raphaelite period, leaning towards the Rossetti rather than Millais and Holman Hunt side of the movement. Byam Shaw's outlook was romantic, and his romance was tinged with medievalism... It was not the fault of Byam Shaw that his contemporaries were more concerned with flats than with churches and castles, and in considering his art, we must always think of him as a decorative painter who was born a little too late to find his just milieu."

-- *The Sunday Times*, March 23, 1919[1]

Shaw: Prolific Artist and Teacher

John Liston Byam Shaw was an exceptionally prolific artist in the late Victorian and Edwardian eras. He was a painter, illustrator, draughtsman, watercolorist, muralist, cartoonist, theater designer and teacher. As his biographer and co-founder of the Byam Shaw School of Art, Rex Vicat Cole recalls, Shaw

> paint[ed] in oil, water-color, in body-color, and in tempera. His finished drawings were in pen-and-ink, pencil, pastel, and, occasionally, lithography… Other work comprised of stained-glass designs, reredos and wall paintings, allegorical, political and war cartoons, posters, book-plates, advertisements, and some designing of stage dresses and arrangement of tableaux.[2]

Unlike the other artists discussed, Shaw's oeuvre is remarkable, not only because of its sheer volume, but also because it encompassed so many different types of media.[3] The artist began to exhibit in London at the Royal Academy in 1893 and continued consistently up until his death in 1919. He submitted several canvases each year for those twenty-six years, with a break only in 1915 and 1918 when he was "much occupied with war work to send anything. In these years he had thirty-five pictures hung, each one remarkable for versatility in thought and design.

---

[1] Quoted in Rex Vicat Cole, *The Art and Life of Byam Shaw* (London: Seeley, Service & Co. Ltd, 1932),204-05; Frank Rutter, "Obituary" *The Sunday Times,* March 23, 1919.

[2] Cole, 204.

[3] Shaw's exhibition history is included in Cole's biography but can also be found according to institution, e.g.: Algernon Graves, *Royal Academy Exhibitors; a complete dictionary of contributors and their work from its foundation in 1769-1904* (London: H. Graves & Co., 1905-06); Algernon Graves, *Royal Academy Exhibitors, 1905-1970; a dictionary of artists and their works in the summer exhibitions in the Royal Academy of Arts* (Wakefield: EP Publishing, 1973).

Usually they were large works and extremely elaborate."[4] He was elected to both the Royal Institute of Painters in Oils and the Royal Institute of Painters in Watercolors in 1898 and submitted five and three works respectively. In 1902, he became a member of the Pastel Society and contributed five works. From 1913 until his death six years later, he was an associate of the Royal Society of Painters in Watercolors and sent twenty-six drawings to their exhibitions. Like Fortescue-Brickdale, Shaw also participated in the exhibitions held at the Dowdeswell Gallery and it is estimated that he sent one-hundred and eighteen works. Cole also approximates that the artist illustrated over one-thousand books (as Shaw began this type of work when he was twenty-five years of age and made a habit of making book illustrations in the evenings for the rest of his life).[5] His oeuvre also included church decoration: in 1909, he produced two roundels for St. Mark's College (Chelsea) and reredos in Holy Trinity Church (Bournemouth) as well as reredos for the Great Shefford Church in 1912. Between 1914 and 1918, he made war cartoons which appeared in such publications as *Daily Call*, *Daily Express, The Cartoon, Saturday Journal, Sunday Times*, *The Daily Chronicle, Passing Show* and *The Dump.*[6] Additionally, many of his drawings, designs, and paintings were reproduced in magazines and newspapers between 1889 and 1924 (five years after his death).

In the midst of this output, Shaw became a teacher. In 1904, he began a post at the Women's Department in King's College with friend Rex Vicat Cole, until they both resigned in 1910 and co-founded their own school of art, aptly named *The Byam Shaw School of Art*.[7] It was

---

[4] Cole, 203.
[5] Anecdote from Cole, 70.
[6] In 1914, Shaw joined the United Arts Rifles (1st Battalion, County of London Volunteer Regiment), a training corps whose headquarters were at that time in the basement of the Royal Academy (Burlington House). Shortly thereafter, Shaw transferred to the Special Constabulary. Byam Shaw Catalogue (Ashmoleon), Epilogue, n.p.; Cole, 185; John Christian, ed. *The Last Romantics: The Romantic Tradition in British Art: Burne-Jones to Stanley Spencer* (London: Lund Humphries in association with Barbican Art Gallery, 1989), 128.
[7] *The Byam School of Art* was absorbed in 2003 as part of the Central St. Martin's College of Art and Design within the London Institute. (accessed 28 June 2015 http://www.artbiogs.co.uk/2/schools/byam-shaw-school-art).

only a matter of time before Shaw's long-time friend and colleague, Fortescue-Brickdale, became a teacher there as well. Cole summarized this extensive career when he wrote, "What a prodigious and varied output in forty-six years of life, even for a man who "believed in being busy" and whose motto was "Try very hard"!"[8]

SCHOLARSHIP: HOW TO CLASSIFY SHAW

Art historical scholarship dedicated exclusively to Byam Shaw is limited. While he is often mentioned in publications on Pre-Raphaelitism (as noted in Chapter 1), specific works appear in exhibition catalogues on late Victorian art, for example John Christian's 1989 aforementioned *Last Romantics*. The exhibition catalogue *Byam Shaw: a selection of paintings and book illustrations* from the Ashmolean Museum (1986) is most often quoted, as it is singularly the only book available which focuses on the artist. Rex Vicat Cole wrote Shaw's biography in 1932, entitled *The art and life of Byam Shaw*. Finally, there is an article by Timothy Barringer, "Not a "modern" as the world is now understood"? Byam Shaw, imperialism and the poetics of professional society" in the larger Corbett and Perry *English art 1860-1914: Modern artists and identity* (2001).[9] Barringer has also more recently published a catalogue to accompany a 2010 exhibit, *Before and After Modernism: Byam Shaw, Rex Vicat Cole, Yinka Shonibar MBE.*

Chapter 1 addressed issues of terminology surrounding Pre-Raphaelitism and Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism. Shaw is mentioned in many of these publications in the same grouping as

---

[8] Cole, 204.
[9] Barringer states "Byam Shaw's work features in Charles Harrison's recent general account of the history of art during the early twentieth-century." Timothy Barringer, ""Not a "modern" as the world is now understood"? in *English art 1860-1914: Modern artists and identity*, ed. David Peters Corbett and Lara Perry. (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001), 64. Charles Harrison, "Abstraction", chapter 3 of *Primitivism, Cubism, Abstraction: The Early Twentieth Century* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1993), 200-201.

Fortescue-Brickdale and Cadogan Cowper. Barringer's article, mentioned above, agrees with critic Frank Sutter who wrote in 1919 that the artist was an anachronism, as he was more of a decorative artist in a time that was not concerned with that. Barringer argues that Shaw, Brickdale and Cowper are often "loosely associated" with one another as an attempt to accept the notion that Shaw was displaced in time and actually belonged to an earlier era. As Rutter wrote in the artist's obituary, "Shaw was not a "modern" as the word is now understood, but belonged by temperament and taste to the Pre-Raphaelite period."[10]

When attempting to classify exactly to what era Shaw belonged, Christopher Wood argued that a wider net needed to be cast to include *late Victorian artists* whose influence of Burne-Jones could be "detected, in terms of both style and Romantic subject matter, such as J.W. Waterhouse, Herbert Draper, Frank Dicksee … Byam Shaw, Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale, T.C. Gotch" among others.[11] Wood continues his analysis by indicating that an examination of all these influences in detail is far beyond the scope of his 1998 publication, but that interested readers should be directed to John Christian's *Last Romantics* catalogue exhibition (to be discussed shortly) from 1989. In Wood's words, "this exhibition made it clear that the Pre-Raphaelite flame was never totally extinguished, even in the 1920s and 1930s. Frank Cadogan Cowper, for example, went on doggedly paintings knights, damsels and *belles dames sans merci* into the 1920s, and beyond."[12]

---

[10] Quoted in Barringer (Corbett and Perry), 64; Rutter *Sunday Times*.
[11] Christopher Wood, "Burne-Jones and his influence" in *Burne-Jones*, 143-144; Burne-Jones and his influence will be discussed in Chapter 10.
[12] Ibid., 143-144.

In another of Wood's books, *Victorian Painting*, he maintained the argument that Waterhouse and these so-called Last Romantics were Victorian artists who survived into the twentieth-century:[13]

> After 1900, however, the traditional values of Victorian art were increasingly under attack, from Impressionism, Post-Impressionism, Fauvism, even Cubism. A whole generation of Victorian artists, born between about 1850 and 1880, found that the techniques, styles and values of their youth were being dismissed as worthless and irrelevant. Some tried to adapt, but many, like Waterhouse, just went on doing what they knew best. They turned their backs on modernism, in the hope that it would go away.[14]

Whereas Wood has drawn parallels in these two aforementioned works between Shaw, Burne-Jones and Waterhouse, his powerful claim about Shaw and his involvement with Pre-Raphaelitism deals with chronology and the statement about the importance of artists born in the stated thirty-year period he mentions. The author calls attention to the fact that Holman Hunt died in 1910, Poynter in 1919, Dicksee in 1928 and Cowper in 1958; and yet there were two artists, Shaw and Brickdale, both born in the 1870s, who were able to keep, as Wood describes it, the "Pre-Raphaelite flame burning."[15] The author described Shaw as

> an artist of prodigious talent and versatility. He was a passionate admirer of Rossetti…a brilliant technician, and the intense coloring and draughtsmanship … harks back to Millais and Holman Hunt. In an artist like Byam Shaw, the realist and the romantic strands of Pre-Raphaelitism are united in a glorious, highly Symbolist fusion.[16]

Brickdale is often paired with Shaw, due to their close friendship and fact that she was one of the first teachers at Shaw and Cole's school. Wood described her watercolors and oils as a "highly-wrought, medievalizing version of the late Pre-Raphaelite style."[17] Cowper, the last in this roughly pieced together Neo-Pre-Raphaelite trio, painted "lush, highly romantic Arthurian

---

[13] Wood's comments about additional artists can be found on p. 245-246 in Christopher Wood, *Victorian Painting* (London: Bulfinch Press, 1999).
[14] Wood, *Victorian Painting*, 242.
[15] Ibid., 245.
[16] Ibid., 245.
[17] Ibid., 245.

subjects, with a strong emphasis on richly colored materials."[18] Combined with the knowledge that the artist exhibited *The Four Queens Find Lancelot Sleeping* at the Royal Academy as late as 1954, which was subsequently admired by writer Evelyn Waugh, Wood is quite firm in his stance that Cowper is deserving of the title of the last of the Pre-Raphaelites, an argument discussed in Chapter 5.

Wood's use of the phrase "the last Romantics" stems from Christian's 1989 catalogue of the same name. Like Wood, Christian also links Shaw, Cowper and Brickdale together, calling them a "younger generation who see [Pre-Raphaelitism] as a living tradition … and tended to regard it as a phenomenon ripe for revival, going back to the early work of Millais and Rossetti and reinterpreting it in a more academic spirit."[19]

Interestingly, most descriptions of Shaw classify him as a protégée of Millais, thereby directly linking him to the PRB, but such a characterization is too limited. Admittedly, it was at Millais' suggestion that he attend St. John's Wood Art Schools in 1887.[20] Perhaps rather fittingly, in June of 1899 Shaw and his bride, artist Evelyn Pyke-Nott, honeymooned in Scotland at Ballachulish and Dunkeld so that he could see and sketch the areas for which Millais painted his *Sound of many waters* (c. 1876).[21]

In January of 1898, A. L. Baldry published a very favorable article about the promising young artist, Byam Shaw, in the *Magazine of Art*.[22] In "Our Rising Artists: Mr. Byam Shaw," the author considers the artist to be "a very striking example of the manner in which a young

---

[18] Ibid., 246.
[19] Christian, *Last Romantics*, 12.
[20] This anecdote is often quoted and is typically included in any biography of Shaw. It appears in the "Introduction" of *Byam Shaw: A selection of paintings and book illustrations exhibited at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford* (Great Britain: Balding & Mansell, Wisbech, Cambs, 1989); Cole's biography (1932); and Timothy Barringer, *Before and After Modernism: Byam Shaw, Rex Vicat Cole, Yinka Shonibare, MBE* (London: Central Saint Martin's College of Art & Design, 2010).
[21] Cole, 110.
[22] Ashmolean catalogue states that this article was written in October 1898. Accessed via British Periodicals (ProQuest) in June 2015 and the original article is dated January 1898.

painter will secure immediate acceptance."[23] At a mere twenty-six years of age and with only five years experience exhibiting at the Royal Academy, Baldry asserts that Shaw has "established himself among the best of the younger painters of the day to whom we have to look for the great things that are to mark the earlier years of the coming century."[24] Of the works exhibited between 1893 and 1898, Baldry writes that

> these pictures have been quite enough to make emphatically clear to a great many people the fact that there are in him artistic faculties which are worthy of the most sincere appreciation, and that to refuse him recognition would be to ignore one of the chief lights of our modern school.[25]

The critic suggests that the artist's quick rise to fame has much to do with the "extraordinary fertility of his imagination to the power, of which he has consistently proved himself possessed, of embodying in his pictures a great variety of fanciful suggestion, and a succession of ideas fascinating to the people who affect that type of art which has a story to tell."[26] Baldry continues:

> Each one of his canvases is full of curious allusions, of quaint comments on the manners and customs of humanity: and everything he paints has implied in it a good deal more than appears obviously on the surface. He is a satirist of a good-tempered kind, a humorist who can be amusing without descending into vulgarity, and an observer who has the power of selecting and emphasizing the details which are most worthy of attention. His symbolism is never too abstruse and his allegory is pleasantly free from obscurity and pedantry…But what is remarkable in a man of his years is the unusual insights which is revealed in his pictures.[27]

Yet among all of the praise, the critic has not labeled Shaw or linked him with any particular artistic circle. His imagination has been admired, the subjects dealt with "frankly and

---

[23] A.L. Baldry, "Our Rising Artists: Mr. Byam Shaw," *Magazine of Art*, January 1898, 633.
[24] Ibid., 633.
[25] Ibid., 634; The pictures to which Baldry is specifically referring are: "Abundance" (water-color); "Silent Noon" (oil); "The Blessed Damozel"; "Whither?"; "Jezebel"; "The Comforter"; "Love's Baubles"; "Truth"; "Queen of Spades"; "Miss E. Pyke-Nott"; "Queen of Hearts" (shown at the Institute of Oil Painters).
[26] Ibid., 634, 637.
[27] Ibid., 637.

honestly, and with a cheerful openness that is in itself fascinating."[28] Ironically, Baldry then switches to a biographical discussion of the artist and comments that Shaw

> paints subjects which demand the closest possible study of human nature, and he treats them with a freshness and wholesome vigor which come only from a soundly-balanced judgment… This capacity for healthy observation he owes partially to his natural disposition, but not a little as well to the nature of his training… Everything was schemed on the principle of habituation. The child [Shaw] was to see nothing and to handle nothing which was not calculated to accustom him to intuitively prefer real beauty, and to discriminate instinctively between faithful fact and specious imitation.[29]

The description of the artist's approach to nature is in alignment with Ruskin's vision and that of the early Pre-Raphaelites. Indeed, Baldry finally concedes that "in [Shaw's] sympathies he is strongly akin to the Pre-Raphaelites, but with observation of many of their principles he unites a very definite faith in the most modern practices of the decorative school."[30] The author concludes his assessment of the young artist by writing

> he is, in fact, referable to on one creed in art; he is individual, inventive… a man of unusual qualifications… His sense of decoration, his fine judgment for placing of detail, and, above all, his rare capacity for poetic invention, make his designs conspicuous… [With his] illustrations to Browning's poems he has put himself in the front rank of imaginative blank-and-white artists.[31]

This article played a significant role in bringing Shaw into the public eye. Baldry had likened him with the PRB of roughly fifty years prior and emphasized the artist's natural inclination for precise attention to detail. Assessed as frank, good-humored, and one of the best artists working at the coming turn-of-the-century, Baldry's 1898 *Magazine of Art* article ensured

---

[28] Ibid., 637.

[29] Ibid., 637-638; Shaw's artistic abilities were encouraged by his father from an early age, with the hopes that he would make it a profession. As Baldry points out, even the illustrated books to which Shaw was given access as a boy were carefully selected and "supervised" by his father. In 1878, Shaw's family moved from Madras to England where Shaw began a systematic study with J.A. Vinter. When Shaw's father died in 1887, Vinter took examples of his pupil's work to J.E. Millais, considered the "leader of the profession". With Millais' encouragement, Shaw worked toward study at the Royal Academy Schools vis-à-vis St. John's Wood. This information is found in Baldry's article and Cole's biography.

[30] Ibid., 642.

[31] Ibid., 642; excerpts also found in *Byam Shaw* (Ashmolean catalogue), not paginated; Abbey's black and white works were also praised by Millais and the artist was considered the best draughtsman at Harper's firm (Foster and Quick, 20).

that "Byam Shaw" was name to be remembered and had much to contribute to the aforementioned "modern school." Shaw's career continued to flourish, as Baldry had anticipated, with the critic's words ringing true for the artist / teacher: "among the men of the moment there is none to whom we can look with more confidence to justify in the future the estimation in which he is held to-day [sic]."[32]

SHAW'S INFLUENCES: TEACHERS AND ASSOCIATES

Shaw didn't necessarily list his great inspirations or leave record of indebtedness for each composition he created. It can be inferred, however, when considering the quantity of his work that, especially in the early years, he found influential themes and motifs in the oeuvres of Rossetti, Waterhouse, and Abbey. There are certainly others, to be sure, but for the scope of this chapter, these three artists, arguably his biggest influences of the early career will be discussed.[33]

Shaw is often referred to as a "Millais' protégé", most likely due to the older artist's suggestion that Shaw aspire to enter the Royal Academy Schools, yet Shaw leaves no written documentation to indicate that he held Millais in higher esteem or regard than the other founding members of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. While Shaw's early work quotes early Pre-Raphaelitism, as found in works by Millais, Hunt, and Rossetti, it is ironic that the artist chose to focus on Rossetti-inspired poetry for the first three works he exhibited at the Royal Academy. These compositions based on Rossetti's prose include: *Rose Mary: "*the Mother held the sphere on her knee, Lean this way and speak low to me, And take no note but of what you see (1893);

---

[32] Baldry, 642.

[33] Cole mentions in Shaw's biography that Leighton, Watts and Millais were among his artistic idols. Ironically, Shaw is often referred to as "Millais' protégée" but other than the two aforementioned anecdotes, Cole notes nothing of Shaw discussing Millais, either as a person or artist. As will be seen in the following section discussing image comparisons, Shaw's early work frequently quoted from Millais' early Pre-Raphaelite style. The chosen teachers and associates were selected due to their more personal relationship with Shaw.

*Silent Noon: "*This close companioned inarticulate hour, When twofold silence was the song of love*"* (1894); and *The Blessed Damozel: "*We two, she said, will seek the groves, Where the Lady Mary is*"* (1895). Moreover, in the exhibit of 1901, he used Christina Rossetti's poetry for the subtitle of his well-known *Boer War 1900:* "Last summer green things were greener, brambles fewer, the blue sky bluer." [34]

While there is no evidence to support the idea that Shaw and Rossetti knew one another personally, it is obvious in his selection of source material that Shaw found Rossetti's words and imagery unusually stimulating.[35] Additionally, while the Rossetti Memorial Exhibition was held in 1883, it stands to reason that Shaw would have had access to Rossetti's work during his preparatory and student years. Paradoxically, however, he held no tolerance for the older Pre-Raphaelite's *Beata Beatrix*, writing in 1896:

> I went to see the Madox Brown (Christ Washing Peter's feet), with which I am perfectly enraptured. It seemed to me to have all the delights of Holman Hunt without the mannerism of colour [sic]. Oh, I think it's lovely! … I can't tell you how much I like it. I was very much disappointed in turning from it to Beata Beatrix, it seemed to look so insipid and weak in colour [sic]. I always feel that way about Rossetti, when I have not seen one for a long time. The only thing I do not like is the halo, I wish it wasn't there. I cannot bring myself to think it is needed.[36]

Shaw was also affected by his instructor John William Waterhouse, who was a Visitor (a term used to describe an Academician who serves as temporary lecturer) during the artist's time as a student at the Royal Academy schools (July 1890-July 1895).[37] Though written in the *Art*

---

[34] Algernon Graves, *Royal Academy Exhibitors* (vol. 7), 93.
[35] Even the critics compared the two artists. In A.C.R. Carter's "Royal Academy: 1898" for *The Art Journal*, he writes "[Mr. Byam Shaw] aroused attention last year by a striking imitation of the manner of the pre-Raphaelites [sic] in his vividly coloured "Love's Baubles." In a measure he has shaken off much of the dry incisiveness of touch in the present composition, although evidence remains of that "pointillisme" which Rossetti himself detected in his own pictures." *Art Journal*, 183.
[36] Cole, 53.
[37] Visitor definition from Barringer, *Beyond Modernism*, 24; Shaw's dates at the RA from the Class Register found in the RA Archives.

Journal three years after Shaw had ended his time as a student and tutelage under Waterhouse, the latter's artistic significance was noteworthy:

> Just as Mr. Watts stands alone in that high world of imagination and mystery, where only the loftiest and noblest spirit prevails, so Mr. Waterhouse has made a domain for himself in the region of classical imagination. His task in some respects is made more difficult. The broad and serious truths to Mr. Watt's allegories are at once apparent and felt. It is the duty of Mr. Waterhouse to breathe new life into and restore, as it were, on canvas, the forgotten spirit of classical poetry. His art is to concentrate himself on the pulse of the myth, and make his whole picture throb in unison.[38]

It would seem, then, that the critics were praising Waterhouse and Shaw for similar characteristics: their imagination, inventiveness, observation, "poetic invention" (attributed to Shaw) and a modern interpretation of allegory (Waterhouse) or satire (Shaw). Baldry, in the aforementioned *Magazine of Art* review, praised Shaw for his ability to be a "humorist who can be amusing without descending into vulgarity" and here in the *Art Journal*, critic Carter commends Waterhouse for his ability to treat his themes "with consummate tenderness."[39]

More recently, scholar Barringer argues in *Before and after modernism* that Shaw applied Waterhouse's "modern" technique in his *Silent Noon* (1894) – another Rossettian subject-- and Cole posits that this decision confirmed the admiration Shaw felt for his instructor. This image, and its indebtedness to Waterhouse, and I believe Millais and Fortescue-Brickdale as well, will be addressed later in this chapter.

As for the argument of Shaw as a Neo-Pre-Raphaelite, it was perhaps Edwin Austin Abbey who could be considered the most influential of all Shaw's instructors, artistic idols, and inspiration. It was cited in several reviews of The Royal Academy Exhibitions that Abbey was

---

[38] A.C.R. Carter's "Royal Academy: 1898" for *The Art Journal*, 174.
[39] Baldry, 637.; Carter, *Art Journal*, 174.

influencing several young artists around the turn-of-the-century.[40] Among those named was Byam Shaw and it was in an article for *The Art Journal* written in 1898 that boldly stated "rarely has the water-color room held a more daring experiment than Mr. Byam Shaw's Abbey-like decoration… this work strikes that note of forcefulness and individuality which will make Mr. Shaw a painter with the strongest claims to recognition."[41] Earlier in the article, the writer, A.C.R. Carter acclaimed Shaw with the statement: "two ambitious pictures in this year's Academy are the works of young men…Mr. Byam Shaw [who] has shown in previous exhibitions, work that seemed destined, by its promise, to be succeeded by some great achievement."[42]

The career of Shaw and Abbey thus turn out to parallel one another, a point which until now has not been explicitly made in scholarly literature on either artist. Abbey and Shaw were both teachers—with Abbey acting as an instructor at the RA and Shaw opening up his own art school with co-founder Rex Vicat Cole—as well as royally commissioned muralists. Both professional activities provide an interesting facet to each artist's career and allow for a new insight to their relationship.

As mentioned previously, Abbey was credited with influencing younger artists, in part because of his "role as a Visitor at the Royal Academy Schools and the Royal College of Art, South Kensington…"[43] Documentation confirms that Abbey was a Visitor at the London School in 1900 and South Kensington in 1907.[44]

---

[40] Lucy Oakley, *Unfaded Pageant: Edwin Austin Abbey's Shakespearean Subjects from the Yale University Art Gallery and Other Collections* (New York: Miriam & Ira D. Wallach Art Gallery, Columbia, Columbia University, 1994), 60; *Art Journal*, 184 (Shaw).
[41] *Art Journal*, 184
[42] *Art Journal*, 182.
[43] Oakley, *Unfaded Pagent,* 60.
[44] Abbey's Visitor status is mentioned in passing in *Unfaded Pagent*, 60. The dates for his South Kensington visitorship are found in the Chronology section of this publication (13). There is a note that this Chronology has been reprinted with some additions and changes from the original Yale Catalogue, *Abbey, 1852-1911.* This information does not appear in the original catalogue. For the London dates, the Royal Academy of Arts Archive (RAA/PC/11/6) mentions the attendance and status of Abbey as Visitor in the Council Report of proposed changes

However influential Abbey was to his students, Shaw would not have encountered him in such a position. Shaw was a student at the Royal Academy (London) from 1890-1895; though Fortescue-Brickdale, Shaw's close colleague, would most likely have benefitted from Abbey's Visitorship, since she attended the RA during the key period from 1895-1900.[45] Since Shaw has been described as "akin" to the Pre-Raphaelites and Abbey, it is not a stretch to find the commonalities between his teaching philosophies and those of Abbey, Millais and even Ruskin. Famously, Ruskin advised the young artists of England to "go to nature in all singleness of heart, and walk with her laboriously and trustingly, having no other thought but how best to penetrate her meaning: rejecting nothing, selecting nothing, and scorning nothing."[46] Millais' motto, according to the previously cited 1898 *Art Journal* article, was "Go first to Nature and arrive at Art."[47] The critic comments that this adage was "put to practical use, and how this golden rule is now followed may be seen abundantly on the walls of the Academy."[48] Although this philosophy was made in the broader context of landscape painting, it still holds to the fundamental principle of close observation and sensitivity to detail.

Philosophically, Abbey agreed with both predecessors. In 1898, he had written:

> to go back to poor old Ruskin, who says (*under the instruction of the P.R.B.*)--… something about the representation of events not as they might be supposed *poetically* to have happened, but as they really might have happened. That is what I'd like to do. It was done by Millais in the early days… I'd like to carry that on.[49]

At the very least, Abbey was in staunch agreement with the Pre-Raphaelite ideal of hyper-extreme detail and close observation of how objects appear in nature, rather than

---

to the Schools laws 1900-1901. It is unclear in both situations how long Abbey continued his teaching position at either institution.

[45] Class Register, Royal Academy of Arts Archive.

[46] Quoted in Marcia Werner, *Pre-Raphaelite Painting and Nineteenth-Century Realism* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 46; Ruskin, *Works*, XII, 339.

[47] *Art Journal*, 170.

[48] Ibid., 170.

[49] Lucas, vol 1., 189.

idealizing them or considering events to have happened from a poetic standpoint. In March of 1902, he wrote an article for *Brush and Pencil* entitled the "Shortcomings of American Art Education." In it, he emphasized the need, and his preference, for vigorous schooling for those who wanted to become artists. In his words, "There are very few people who can't be taught to draw more or less well, but the mere ability to draw does not make an artist."[50] It was his belief that a successful curriculum would be one to incorporate all three branches of art: painting, sculpture, and architecture. These areas should not be "independent," according to Abbey, because "without a knowledge of the other two, each is incomplete."[51] As an American expatriate artist himself, he was insistent that

> the best American artists can hold their own anywhere. American art, as a whole, however, has the tendency to be preoccupied with problems of a technical nature, such as how to put on paint, and things of that sort. The painting of individual pictures is not just art in its highest form. Pictures are only fragments. The great things are works which carry an idea through to completion.[52]

Such a strong opinion about the artistic process and the interdependencies between painting, sculpture and architecture explains Abbey's meticulous approach to his own work.

It is unclear if Shaw was aware of Abbey's teaching beliefs; yet Shaw's School of Art was based strongly on the education both he and Cole received at the St. John's Wood School of Art, where technical skills, repetition, and consistency were greatly emphasized. As Barringer writes,

> Cole and Byam Shaw remembered the oppressive regimen when planning the curriculum for their own school. While drawing from casts remained, study of the nude model and the costumed lay figure played a far more prominent role, and students began to paint at an earlier stage.[53]

---

[50] Edwin Austin Abbey, "Shortcomings of American Art Education," *Brush and Pencil: An Illustrated Magazine of the Arts of To-Day*, ed. Frederick W. Morton, vol. IX (Chicago: The Brush and Pencil Publishing Company, 1902), 331.
[51] Ibid., 332.
[52] Ibid., 332.
[53] Ibid., 25.

In Cole's recollection of their decision to open an art school, he and Shaw were in sync with the "educational and artistic value of teaching and agreed in the methods to follow" which resulted in a partnership until Shaw's death in 1919.[54] The co-founders envisioned and succeeded in creating an atmosphere in which their students were prepared for the rigors of the Royal Academy Schools. To that end, they developed an education that would result in producing students who were "much further advanced than was actually necessary for passing their examination [for admittance to the RA]."[55] The Byam Shaw and Vicat Cole School of Art offered

> an all-around training by drawing and painting from casts: the head and figure model, still-life, and sketch-model, posed with accessories under different effects of lighting, with the addition of painting in the country in the vacation. Pen-and-ink illustration, perspective, and anatomy also had definite places.[56]

Shaw was adamant in his belief that

> teaching, when you draw and paint for students to the best of your ability, is a useful exercise. Teaching, when you see a talent developing, or even a mere means of expression being gained, or a worship of nature becoming a natural habit, is an engrossing occupation.[57]

According to Cole, Shaw took his role of teacher very seriously and believed that "no man could have worked harder for the students' benefit."[58] Yet, Cole also claimed that Shaw

> always thought that the inclination of students to spend many years merely drawing the figure, should be checked. In [Shaw's] own words, "What would help them much more when they have reached a certain point in their education would be the enabling of them to see great groups of people, and masses of fine color."[59]

---

[54] Cole, 168.
[55] Ibid., 168.; This insistence on overly preparing students for the entrance exam may have been fueled by the fact that Cole failed his exam and it took Shaw two tries before he was admitted.
[56] Ibid., 168.
[57] Ibid., 171.
[58] Ibid., 171.
[59] Ibid., 171-172.

An apt description of Shaw's attitude towards art making would be exacting and meticulous—found to different extents in the remarks by Ruskin, Millais and Abbey. Perhaps such a need for precision came from his rigorous education at "The Wood"; Shaw spoke gratefully of a former instructor whose slogan was, "The thing to do in drawing is to make the lines go in the right direction. If you *should* see your way to get a likeness—DO SO."[60]

In a peculiar twist of fate, both Shaw and Abbey were commissioned to provide works for the August 1902 Coronation of King Edward VII. As was mentioned in Chapter 2, Abbey was commissioned to paint a large-scale canvas in commemoration of the event and employed fellow Neo-Pre-Raphaelite artist Cadogan Cowper as his studio assistant to work on the piece while he finished the *Holy Grail* cycle. Simultaneously, Shaw was commissioned to produce thirty-four illustrations, some of which were to be in color, as part of Henry Burke's *Historic Record of the Coronation of King Edward VII and Queen Alexandra* (1904).[61] These water-color and pencil based drawings measured at 18 by 13 inches, most of which included several figures. In a letter dated September, 1903 Shaw wrote, "I am slaving away at Coronation… things. I hate them. Burke has made me put in the Archbishop of York and Sub-Dean of Westminster in the Anointing drawing. They nearly cover the Queen and Duchess of Marlborough altogether—about a week's worth of work wasted."[62] Though the artist was clearly frustrated, Cole put Shaw's commission into perspective. He recalled:

> [Shaw's] task can be appreciated when one realizes that it included a hundred portraits, accurate representations of innumerable official costumes, insignia, regalia, badges, and flags, There was also the unlooked-for difficulty that more than one character posed to him in a costume incorrectly worn, and he had to act as robe-master as well! He told me of his going to draw the Queen at the Palace—of the sentries' challenge and his answer: "I am Mr. Shaw, and have come to draw Her Majesty." Of his repetition of the phrase as

---

[60] "Introduction" in *Byam Shaw*, n.p.
[61] A copy of this book is held in the National Library of Ireland. http://catalogue.nli.ie/Record/vtls000185422 (accessed July 2015).
[62] Cole, 131.

> he was passed by policeman, and policeman to ushers, till he thought he said: "I am Mr. Draw and I have come to shaw Her Majesty," and later of his kindly and unceremonious reception… by the Queen herself, who immediately set him at his ease.[63]

This commission, though executed in different media, was not to be the only one on which Shaw and Abbey found themselves working "together." As was discussed in Chapter 4, Shaw was selected as one of the muralists overseen by Abbey for the Tudor murals in the House of Commons. Yet, as previously discussed, Abbey was an established muralist, having produced such works at the Boston Public Library (1901), the Harrisburg State Capitol (1902-1911) and the Royal Exchange (1904). Shaw, likewise, was commissioned to make drawings of the Coronation day of King George and Queen Mary on June 22, 1911. These illustrations were published in the *Sphere*, and while not technically murals, were of large dimensions. Shaw's prior work experience for the Coronation of King Edward, include drawings made beforehand: the King and Queen's salute, the Yeomen of the Guard, the Regalia and the King's Watermen.[64]

SILENT NOON

Many strong examples of indebtedness to Pre-Raphaelite works can be found in Shaw's oeuvre. For example, *Silent Noon* (1894, fig. 71) illustrates the final two lines from Rossetti's sonnet *The House of Life* (1870-81): "This closed companioned inarticulate hour/ When twofold silence was the song of love."[65] Recalling works by Millais (*Ophelia*; fig. 14), Holman Hunt (*Hireling Shepherd*), and Waterhouse (*Ophelia,* 1889; fig. 72), the composition includes a reclining female figure in a lush field, an apple gently grasped in her hand. The male gazes

[63] Cole, 131.
[64] Cole, 175; Other illustrations were made or altered after the artist had witnessed the ceremony. Cole includes Shaw's notations: "Thursday, June 22nd, Coronation, Abbey 7 am. Returned 3 pm. Alterations to, and sent in "King and train-bearers", "Queen's anointing", and "King's canopy-bearers." Next day he completed his drawings of "Queen and train-bearers", "Power", "Crowning", "Homage", and, on the Saturday and Sunday, those of the Anointing and the Jerusalem Chamber.
[65] *Byam Shaw*, n.p.; Barringer *Before Modernism*, 32.

longingly at the outstretched feminine form and the masses of red hair streaming about like a halo or sunburst. This painting does not show the all-over, painstaking, hyper-detailed technique of the early phases of Pre-Raphaelitism, but Shaw has included a significant amount of detail of the wooded area and leafy foliage, dappled sunlight, wild flowers and tranquil stream.

True to Rossetti's poem, Shaw has created a tranquil scene and with the use of strategically lit areas creates a quiet mood and feeling of stillness. The male merely looks at his companion—the implied music (and noise) from his lyre having stopped momentarily. The female's eyes are closed and lips parted; while parted lips traditionally may suggest the act of speaking, her body remains languid and prostrate. The apple in her hand, reinforcing the color of her hair and cheeks, reminds the viewer of the biblical story of the Temptation and visually aligns her with Eve. However, as an illustration of Rossetti's sonnet, this work is not to be interpreted as an image of a fallen woman or a representation of wanton behavior between the sexes. Instead, the artist visually reinforces the passage "this close-companioned inarticulate hour/ when twofold silence was the song of love." Even the title, *Silent Noon*, emphasizes the stillness of the scene and the intimate moment being shared by the two figures.

Compositionally, Shaw has used trees as framing devices to effectively demarcate the couple's space from the rest of the countryside. Strategically placed trees enclose the couple. They are visually separated from the rest of the surrounding fields, all bathed in sunlight, as they recline in this private, shaded retreat.

Shaw's reclining woman is a near perfect quotation of Millais' *Ophelia* (1851-52). The tragic Shakespearean heroine, though floating downstream, is also in a reclining position, with legs outstretched and arms at her sides. Unlike Shaw, Millais has positioned the arms bent at both elbows with fingers softly upturned towards her. Her left hand appears gracefully through

the water, while the other holds a bouquet of poppies, daisies and pansies, symbolic of death, innocence, and love in vain respectively. It is well documented that the artist painstakingly detailed his observation of nature, in true accordance with the aims of the PRB. He also chose this background from an actual location in Surrey and the plants, most of which have symbolic significance from the play, have been depicted with meticulous and scrupulous attention to botanical accuracy.

Such an exacting technique did not transfer to Shaw's work of nearly fifty years later, but certain elements appear in both paintings, including the female form, the stream, flora, verdant foliage, and some semblance of love or courtship. Ophelia's mouth is open, a gesture that is sexually suggestive, but also understood in a textual context to be indicative of her singing, as the verse from *Hamlet* indicates, "which time she chanted snatches of old tunes."[66] Shaw's woman is sprawled on the grass with her hand holding that of her lover's, while Ophelia, driven to madness with the knowledge that her lover, Hamlet, has murdered her father, slowly drowns in the river, "but long it could not be/ Till that her garments, heavy with their drink,/ Pull'd the poor wretch from her melodious lay/ To muddy death."[67] Both are quiet scenes, as Shaw's lovers enjoy a private moment, and Millais' figure softly murmurs until her impending death. Ophelia has lost her love and life and chooses this peaceful spot as her final resting place. In order to emphasize this point, the artist has made the stream and the figure the most prominent elements. In contrast, Shaw's figures are surrounded by the lush landscape, an element which nearly engulfs their forms, while the stream has been marginalized. As a result, the most prominent feature of the composition is the recumbent female and is the most recognizable and compelling aspect of pairing these two images together.

---

[66] Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, Act IV, Scene vii.
[67] Ibid.

Moreover, Cole's biography on Shaw briefly attributes Waterhouse's influence on *Silent Noon* by writing "It shows the admiration he then had for John Waterhouse (R.A.)."[68] While there is no way to definitively know Shaw's intentions for this Rossettian-inspired work, it is known that the model was the artist's highly respected sister and that he did admire Waterhouse's work, as the latter was one of his instructors at the RA. The inclusion of the apple and its inherent reference to Eve is problematic because of the possible interpretations. Barringer, in *Beyond Modernism*, discusses this painting in terms of paint application and the middle ground taken by Shaw between that of the PRB and Waterhouse. Moreover, the author suggests that the combination of apple and unbound hair may transform the scene from a "chaste idyll to an illicit rural tryst… [or] a post-coital reverie, or at least an erotic daydream."[69]

Neither Cole's brief statement nor Barringer's interpretation conclusively prove that Shaw's composition reveals a strong admiration for Waterhouse. While Barringer may be correct in his assertions about the artist's paint application being a middle-ground between the PRB and Waterhouse's own style, a much more compelling argument may be made for patterns of indebtedness when considering other compositions. Waterhouse's *Ophelia* (1889), for example, also shows a reclining female in a verdant landscape surrounded by trees and groupings of wildflowers. Unlike the ambiguous relationship Shaw portrays, Waterhouse has clearly portrayed the Shakespearean character in a highly sexualized and provocative manner. Both knees are drawn up beneath her medieval-styled white dress with a brown belt hung slung low on her hips. One hand is outstretched toward the viewer—perhaps in brazen invitation— while the other arm is bent at the elbow with her hand entwined in her long chestnut locks. The entry in

---

[68] Cole, 40.

[69] Barringer, *Beyond Modernism,* 32.; However, Barringer acknowledges that this particular assessment is highly unlikely due to the respectability of the model.

Academy Notes for 1889 reads,

> Ophelia, lying in the grass, with the wild flowers she has gathered in the folds of her dress. In one hand she holds a bunch of buttercups; in her rich brown hair, which half hides her face, is a coronet of daisies; in the background through the willow-stems a stream winds, and swallows fly low in the air.[70]

The original composition, shown in a photograph before the artist revised it, portrays a much more promiscuous and perhaps mad figure. With her head tilted slightly up and back, her mouth is partially open and her wide eyes betray a possibly crazed mind. Like Millais' *Spring* (1859), to be discussed shortly, this image presents

> a girl on the verge of sexual maturity, posing provocatively among symbols of natural fecundity that will also fade. Although the pose communicates abandon effectively, the angle at which Waterhouse [revised] Ophelia's head makes it more difficult to "read" her expression.[71]

By comparison, then, Waterhouse's earlier work, by five years, is significantly more sexualized than Shaw's *Silent Noon*. Though the females are reclining in roughly the same position in similar landscapes, their interaction with their male paramour (represented or implied) is completely different. Shaw's woman, while holding an apple which may be reminiscent of Eve or even the woman's own natural fertility, seems innocent and tranquil, while Waterhouse has presented the viewer with a picture of implicit desire and sexual abandon.

Waterhouse borrowed the figure of the reclining Ophelia directly from Millais' 1859 *Spring (Apple Blossoms*; fig. 73). Unlike Shaw's work, the females of Waterhouse and Millais are aware of the (implied male) viewer, as they stare directly out of the picture plane. The pose of Millais' woman is a combination of the aforementioned two artists. This young girl has one knee bent and the other extended, while both arms are bent and her loosely folded hands flank her face. Held across her lips is a long blade of grass on which she gently bites down. This is an

---

[70] *Academy Notes 1889 with Illustrations of the Principal Pictures at Burlington House*, ed. Henry Blackburn. (London: Chatto and Windus, Piccadilly, May 1889), 3.
[71] Peter Trippi, *J.W. Waterhouse,* (London; New York: Phaidon, 2002), 95.

incredibly provocative gesture. Unlike Shaw's double portrait, Millais' composition includes a company of females, all of different ages and at varying stages of maturity. The artist presents a picnic scene in front of a blossoming apple orchard and depicts them "tasting curds and cream. The underlying theme, however, is the transience of youth and beauty. This is expressed in the fragile bloom of adolescence, the wild flowers and the changing seasons."[72] The scythe found at the lower right corner reinforces this notion of fragility and temporality. This object is a strong reminder that death is inevitable—not only to the figures shown but also to the nature that surrounds them.

Millais' *Spring* was executed in the hyper-detailed naturalistic style of the Pre-Raphaelites, and is often considered to be a pendant to *Autumn Leaves* (1855-56). It has already been established that Waterhouse's modern technique was different than the early works done by the PRB and that Shaw opted for a method which was somewhere between the two. As Barringer argues

> Waterhouse's technique was closely akin to the work of the painters of the New English Art Club, influenced by contemporary French painting of the *juste milieu*, with vigorous, and highly visible brushstrokes and a relatively thick paint layer. Examined closely, the surface of a painting… is completely different from a Pre-Raphaelite work such as Millais' *Ophelia*; the miniscule, enameled detail of the latter contrasting with the thick, even gestural impasto of the former.[73]

Whereas Millas' *Spring* represents a sexually alluring temptress who is blatantly and brazenly inviting the viewer to engage with her, Shaw's *Silent Noon*, though including the same pose and background as found in the 1859 image, is a quiet image of a couple enjoying a moment to themselves. They are not aware of the viewer, and as such, our presence is voyeuristic. Like the apple blossoms and wildflowers suggested the fecundity and fertility of the

---

[72] http://www.liverpoolmuseums.org.uk/ladylever/collections/paintings/gallery2/spring.aspx (accessed August 19, 2015)

[73] Barringer, *Before Modernism*, 31.

women as well as the passage of time for Millais, so too may the apple held Shaw's woman's hand merely be a reminder of the natural cycle of life and its inevitable decline.

If, indeed, the apple in Shaw's composition is emblematic of the Temptation or Fall, then a compelling comparison can be made with Holman Hunt's *Hireling Shepherd* of 1851-52 (fig. 74). Like Shaw, Hunt presents two lovers sitting in a meadow—the shepherd who leans in towards the woman and the female companion, who places her weight on her outstretched arms in order to lean into his embrace. As is often discussed about this work, the sheep have strayed, many having over eaten and in danger of dying, all as a result of the shepherd's interest in a tryst with his red-haired, rosy-cheeked paramour. There is a baby lamb in the woman's lap and is flanked by two green apples. Interestingly, the apple at left has been partially eaten, perhaps alluding to the consummation by the pair. To that end, the positioning of the two figures plus the inclusion of the apple has always insinuated a sexual relationship between them, with the fruit alluding to her role as Eve. Ironically, her hair is parted á la Madonna and the sunlight streaming behind her provides the visual effect of a halo behind her red hair.

These two images, while greatly different in degree to sexuality, bear a striking resemblance to one another in terms of landscape. Shaw appears to have placed his figures at a different angle in the same field: there are rows of full-grown trees, providing shade as well as a compositional emphasis on verticality; a babbling brook at lower right next to the woman's toes which peak out from beneath her red skirt; and purple and yellow wildflowers dotting the lower portion of the picture plane. Painted in the exacting manner of the PRB, Hunt has enumerated every blade of grass, every shadow and lighting effect, as well as veins on the shepherd's arms and hands and the sunburned cheeks – a source of great criticism—of the female. The realistic naturalism which is depicted in this idyllic landscape provides a fitting backdrop for the foreplay

happening in the foreground. This cozy field is clearly echoed, though not quoted exactly, in Shaw's image. As Barringer explains, this is "one of the most fully articulated landscape settings in his oeuvre. He made use of sketches made some years earlier at Dorchester on the Thames, a favorite spot."[74]

QUEEN OF HEARTS

Queen of Hearts (1896; fig. 75) was one of the images which contributed to the artist's growing reputation and was made the year after he left the Royal Academy Schools. His friend, fellow pupil at the RA, and eventual teacher at his school, Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale is reported as having said,

> This always seems to me to have been the first picture in which he sprang suddenly out in his own extraordinarily brilliant and original style. Up to this time his pictures always show the influence of other painters who, no doubt, he ardently admired in his student days. This little picture is entirely his own style and color. It has an excellent portrait of Miss Pyke-Nott as the Queen, and his sister as the girl with the dish of tarts.[75]

Additionally, painter-critic Haldane MacFall expressed his appreciation of the painting:

> The Queen of Hearts has stepped out of a pack of cards, robed in a beautiful white robe, but she is in her early youth, and is a little shy even in the knowledge of her comeliness. Her white train is upheld by a tittering group of Maids of Honor, whose quaint and charming heads and shoulders are alone are shown in the background, and everyone is happy and laughing. The merry faces are painted with dexterous clearness and force by a few happy strokes. Here is a sweet, clean-hearted work of art, full of fine accomplishment. He brings to his art a sweet and altogether delightful tendency, an original and charming imagination, and a new manner of seeing and saying things.[76]

The catalogue entry for this work in Christian's *Last Romantics* emphasizes the fact, as Brickdale pointed out, that the model for the work was Shaw's fiancée. The writer of the entry expressed a belief that it was because of this personal relationship between artist and model (who

---

[74] Ibid., 33.; However, the author does not include a footnote of where this information can be found or verified.
[75] Cole, 68.
[76] Cole, 68-69.; Cole explains in a footnote about the professional career of MacFall.

was also an artist) that it was received well. It is also called "one of the artist's most appealing works. Far less attractive [than] the sequel *The Queen of Spades*."[77]

Shaw's composition portrays a predominantly single portrait of the titled Queen of Hearts. This regal figure is dressed in a long, white medieval-styled gown with a lengthy decorative train. The edge of the train is decorated with patterns of red hearts, fitting for her status as Queen of Hearts. The hearts are clustered together and cascade down with a repetitive formation. The attendants who are responsible for lifting portions of the garment have been spaced so that each section of embellishment is prominently displayed.

The women in the background are all smiling, while the Queen, identifiable as Pyke-Nott, lifts her head slightly and stares proudly to the viewer's left. Though her figure and garment dominate the composition, it is easily noticeable that she has been placed a step lower than the rest of her attendants. As MacFall indicated, she does seem to have stepped out of a pack of cards, visually reinforced by the playing cards spread around her as well as peaking out from beneath the vast gown. While it is unclear as to the suits of the cards that are strewn about, it is obvious that many are face cards, quite possibly illustrating the Queen of Hearts.

This subject matter seems to be unusual for Shaw's oeuvre. Anderson and Wright argue in *Heaven on Earth* that the gesture of the Queen is reminiscent of Van Eyck's *Arnolfini Marriage* (1434) and is furthermore suggestive of a Madonna figure without a child. They continue,

> the way in which she almost seems to float above the ground recalls the type of both Madonna of the Assumption and the Immaculate Conception, while there seems to be an evocation of the martyred saint in the wand which she holds in her left hand like a palm… this Queen of Hearts is clearly a Queen of Heaven.[78]

---

[77] Christian, *Last Romantics*, 129.
[78] Gail-Nina Anderson and Joanne Wright, *Heaven on Earth* (London: Djanogly Art Gallery, University of Nottingham Arts Centre in association with Lund Humphries, 1994), 110.

While I agree with the similarity to the gesture from Van Eyck's fifteenth-century work and recognize the red fabric surrounding her face in a halo effect, I find it difficult to interpret Shaw's *Queen of Hearts* as a nineteenth-century interpretation / modernization of either Madonna of the Assumption or Immaculate Conception. As Cole points out, Brickdale's admiration of this particular piece "is tempered with knowledge of his weak points; or, shall we say that, being in sympathy with him, and understanding his aims and achievement, … she can read where the book is closed to many a connoisseur."[79]

With this in mind, as well as the implication of Brickdale's statements that this "little picture" did not show the influence of other artists, it may be possible that a more appropriate conclusion or interpretation was that *Queen of Hearts* was an homage to Miss Pyke-Nott, whom he would wed three years later.[80]

As for not being influenced by other artists whom he admired, it is difficult to believe that, especially with his love of Rossetti, Shaw was not in some way thinking about *Regina Cordium* (1860; fig. 76). The model for Rossetti's oil painting was Elizabeth Siddal; the image was produced only a few months after their marriage. Rossetti portrays his wife as a stunner—a compositional type that would be a large part of his oeuvre during this time—with long red hair parted in the middle, á la Madonna, cascading down her pale and bare shoulders. The particular shade of red for her hair is repeated in the strands of beads looped around her neck with red heart pendant dangling down, as well as the repeated heart pattern on the flat surface behind her. The composition presents Siddal to the viewer as an embowered figure, with the base of the frame visually acting as a way to clearly define her space as well as that of the viewer. She is simultaneously separated and enclosed while being placed on display. She holds a flower

---

[79] Cole, 67-68.
[80] It certainly does not appear to be an illustration of the Lewis Carroll character from "Alice in Wonderland", first published in 1865.

(perhaps a pansy, symbolic of love-in-vain) in her one visable hand. The title of the work, *Regina Cordium* (*Queen of Hearts)*, is on a trompe l'oeil plate on the frame.

Rossetti has referenced his new bride as the Queen of Hearts and situated her against a gold and red backdrop decorated with a repetitive pattern of hearts and circle with x's inside of them. At upper right, in a large box, is seen a larger heart with a halo-like shape encircling the letter "R". If this work is indeed intended to be a celebration of his new wife, though his infidelity and her unhappiness is well documented, it is peculiar that he chose to give her such an iconographically negative flower.

Moreover, while Shaw's Queen was critiqued as looking as if she stepped out of a pack of playing cards, the flatness of Rossetti's composition suggests that this Queen *is* one of the actual cards. The Queen of Hearts card in a pack of playing cards is organized with a "Q" in each corner, a heart beneath it, and a mirrored representation of a Queen, also with one heart over one shoulder. The numbered cards in the heart suit have the number at each corner with a heart below it and the corresponding number of hearts in the middle. Rossetti's painting provides the top portrait of the Queen (as opposed to having a reversed version as well—ultimately depicting a twist on the concept of a double portrait) with the large heart above her shoulder, as would be expected to be seen in a face card. Additionally, he has included hearts in the background, perhaps as an allusion to the remaining heart cards in the pack.

At any rate, Shaw and Rossetti have portrayed two completely different representations of the Queen of Hearts. Shaw's is active and proud, while Rossetti's is more passive and admired for her stunner qualities and sensuous nature.

It is interesting to note that in 1862-63, a mere two years after this particular version of Rossetti's *Regina Cordium*, Holman Hunt produced his *King of Hearts* (fig. 36). Though it looks

as if this figure has stepped out of Holbein's iconic portrait of *Henry VIII*, it is a representation of the artist's nephew and godson. Legs spread and dressed in a red, ermine cloak, "The King" offers a green croquet ball to the viewer, presumably inviting the viewer into his space (the picture plane). The title, as Bronkhurst suggests in the catalogue raisonné, and seems apparent in the context of the previous comparisons, is a deliberate

> allusion to the flat image on a playing card. The lance and shield, with its heart gules that gives rise to the name, were not, however, part of the original conception… The title alludes to the sitter's engaging appearance, and it has the ring of an old nursery rhyme, deepening the playful associations conjured up by the spectacle of a young child dressed up as Henry VIII. It may have been suggested by Lewis Carroll, who had incorporated the ditty "The Queen of Hearts" in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland,* which he completed in 1863.[81]

According to a footnote by Judith Bronkhurst, Lewis Carroll and Holman Hunt met in June 1857 in Oxford, so having Hunt's image referencing both the male counterpart of the royal playing cards as well as Carroll's character is not out of the realm of possibility. Like Rossetti's Queen, Hunt's young King also has red hair, regal garments, and decorative heart placed well above his shoulder.

Unlike the Rossetti example, Shaw and Hunt provide full-length portraits of the Queen and King of Hearts respectively. Hunt's use of bright colors and early Pre-Raphaelite detail is contrasted by Shaw's darker tones and more less exacting technique, seen, for example, in the faces of the Maids of Honor in the background. Hunt's work does have a flat quality, as would a playing card, but the inclusion of the croquet game and specialized background suggest an interpretation more in alignment with that of Carroll's tale.

---

[81] Judith Bronkhurst, *William Holman Hunt: A Catalogue Raisonné* (New Haven, CT; London: Yale University Press, 2006), 194-95.

PORTRAIT OF MISS PYKE-NOTT

Byam Shaw met fellow artist Evelyn Pyke-Nott when they were both in attendance at St. John's Wood. He entered the Royal Academy Schools, as a probationary student, in 1890. In 1894, he and Pyke-Nott became engaged, but being a poor art student, it was a five-year engagement. They married in 1899, but one year earlier, he produced the portrait *Evelyn, Daughter of J.N. Pyke-Nott, Esq.* (1898; fig. 77) which celebrated and memorialized their impending nuptials. This "lavish, chivalric portrait of Evelyn … stands among Byam Shaw's most impressive works."[82]

The majestic full-length portrait of the artist's fiancée proclaims her status as an engaged woman-- removing the glove from her left hand to reveal an emerald and ruby engagement ring.[83] She is wearing a black dress with fashionable, angled black hat and cape.[84] The figure of Miss Pyke-Nott is monumental, as her fur-lined cape extends its lines to nearly each side of the composition. Behind her is an elaborately decorated background, with designs predominately executed in gold and black and crimson. Such an arrangement depicts scrolls and repeated outlines of the Pyke-Nott family crest. This duplication is a main motif of the elaborate panel and is suggestive of the "longevity of this family of Devon gentry."[85] The dual scrolls behind her head reveal her full name: "Evelyn Caroline Pyke-Nott", while the registers near the lower half of her body read "March 1898" and the aritst's name "Byam Shaw."

---

[82] Barringer, *Before Modernism*, 25.
[83] The details of the ring are from the catalogue entry in *Byam Shaw* (Ashmolean catalogue), n.p.
[84] Cole, 85. All reproductions of this image make the cape look black, but Cole insists it is green.
[85] Barringer, *Before Modernism,* 27.

Though it is hard to distinguish in reproductions of this work, there is a frieze behind her illustrating a "landscape including the family's house at Bydown, Devonshire and the extensive parkland surrounding it."[86] There are vignettes with repeated figures of Evelyn as a way to incorporate her favorite activities, including painting and sports.[87]

Unlike Shaw's full-length portrait of a contemporary and fashionable woman with hair up, assertive but genteel stare at the viewer and calm demeanor, Millais' *Bridesmaid* (1851; fig. 13) is the complete opposite. While both portraits intrinsically deal with the subject of marriage, the Pre-Raphaelite Brother has presented the viewer with a performance of an old superstition of passing a piece of wedding cake through a wedding ring nine times in order to see a vision of her future lover. Millais' figure is in a trance-like state, with parted lips and anxious stare. Shaw's portrait was a celebration of love and an announcement of their intentions, whereas Millais' is a wild-eyed woman awaiting the fulfillment of a marital fantasy. There are no family crests or representations of life pursuits; instead, it is a solid blue background, emphasizing that the main intention of the work of art is the action and internal psychology of the single, female figure.

Even by the title, Millais has chosen to keep this woman anonymous. Though Shaw's composition names its subject in relationship to her father, she is still initially given the courtesy of including her first name. Her full name is obviously represented in the scrolls and the name of her intended is included as well, separating her from the role she has in her family as daughter, and with the inclusion of the ring, conveys her new role as wife. Shaw, in the continuous narrative of the frieze, incorporates her painting and their shared time at both St. John's Wood and the Royal Academy. Millais' woman, by comparison, while sensuous in her trance-like state, seems isolated and submissive.

---

[86] Ibid., 27

[87] For a full description of this section of the painting, please refer to Barringer's article, 27. Cole does not go into detail other than to say that Shaw uses figures to represent her pursuits (Cole, 85).

CONCLUSION

In the preface of Cole's biography on Shaw, he writes, "If I had literary ability I would write of my friend's character so that the charm of his nature would be adequately revealed to those who had not the privilege of knowing him."[88] Though viewers in the twenti-first century do not have many primary sources in which to gain a feeling of Shaw's persona, one can learn about his attitude, technique, and inspirations with an examination of his works. This chapter has focused on his relationships, personal and professional, as well as methodological and compositional commonalities, not only with those close to the PRB, such as Ruskin and Millais, but also with Abbey, his direct link to Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism. Like the PRB before him, his subject matter and style changed post 1900, as he explored new themes and media and became involved in WWI. The scope of this chapter has been narrowed to what may arguably be considered as his early career, that is work of the late-nineteenth century when he was consciously aligning himself with earlier Pre-Raphaelite and late Victorian artists who were continuing an interest in romantic poetry, medievalism, and a precise and exacting technique. With the aid of Cole's recollections and Shaw's surviving letters, the viewer is able to understand a man with a "kindly jest and ready wit, quaint imagination… and methodical worker."[89] Baldry's article for *The Magazine of Art* was correct when he prophesized that Shaw was among the best young painters of the day (1898) and that the artistic community ought to look for great things to come from him in future years, and that "to refuse him recognition would be to ignore one of the chief lights of our modern school."[90]

---

[88] Cole, 7.
[89] Ibid., 7.
[90] Baldry, *Magazine of Art*, 634.

Chapter 7
Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale (1872-1945)

"I feel inclined to throw away my palette and brushes. What are my things by the side of stuff such as hers!" – G.F. Watts[1]

"Colour flashed jewel-like from every frame. Oh! Happy woman to paint like that and give such pleasure!" -- Francis Hodgkins, 1901[2]

Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale represented an unusual proponent of Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism. Unlike her contemporaries, she had a familial association to John Ruskin, through her father who had been "a fellow student of John Ruskin's at Oxford and a founding supporter of the Arundel Society, one of Ruskin's pet projects"[3] as well as her brother Charles, who was his student at a "recently founded Ruskin School of Drawing."[4] She enjoyed professional relationships with Cadogan Cowper (1897-1902) and Byam Shaw (1890-1895), having all met as students during their shared time at the Royal Academy Schools. Fortuitously, Brickdale was also an admirer of Abbey, who was in turn a friend of her brother-in-law.[5] Critics and academics hold various opinions about the most influential Victorian artist on Brickdale's Pre-Raphaelite inspired pictures—Millais, Hunt, Rossetti, Burne-Jones, or Ford Madox Brown.[6] In a 1901 exhibition of

---

[1] Quoted in Ashmolean Museum, *Centenary Exhibition of works by Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale 1872-1945* (Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 1972), 4; Mrs. Russell Barrington, *G. F. Watts: reminiscences* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1905), 199.

[2] From the instillation accompanying the exhibition catalogue for Pamela Gerrish Nunn, *A Pre-Raphaelite Journey: The Art of Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2012); *The Letters of Frances Hodgkins*, ed. Linda Gill and published by Auckland University Press, 1993.

[3] Nunn, *Pre-Raphaelite Journey,* 12.

[4] *Centenary Exhibition*, 3

[5] Nunn, *Pre-Raphaelite Journey*, 15; footnote 18 of the catalogue stipulates that Fortescue-Brickdale and Byam Shaw "assisted Cowper on his 1902 commissions connected with Edward VII's coronation (FCC to his mother, COW/1/5, Royal Academy Archives)" (33). What that particular letter actually indicates is that Cowper, Shaw and Fortescue-Brickdale were all asked by Speilmann, editor of the *Magazine of Art* to provide illustrations to *Henry VIII*, a "grand edition of Shakespeare that is coming out in America." This anecdote was written in the same letter which addresses Cowper's own work on Abbey's *Coronation* picture, as well as Cowper's mention that Abbey was allowing him to use any of the "costumes of armor" for the aforementioned illustration. It is my belief that Nunn misread the letter and its various anecdotes surrounding Cowper's work. Moreover, Fortescue-Brickdale was also in attendance at the RA schools with Denis Eden and Ernest Board, both of whom were muralists for the Houses of Parliament with Cadogan Cowper and Abbey.

[6] Ibid., 18.

her watercolors, she was touted as an "overnight success," having sold all forty-five works, and was

> definitively linked with Pre Raphaelitism which, though born half a century before, was kept alive not least by the fact that Arthur Hughes and William Holman Hunt were still active….These artists commanded tremendous respect at the beginning of the 20th century, so to be connected with them was a compliment rather than a put-down. The success of Burne-Jones, in particular, only recently deceased (1898), fired numerous painters in these first years of the 20th century.[7]

Writer Edith Sichel was sent to interview Brickdale about the show, who subsequently wrote to a friend that

> she is a new painter, a really inspired force, exquisite in color and poetic idea. I don't think I have had so much pleasure from a modern since the Pre-Raphaelites, but she is not like them in an imitative way. I went to see her… an interesting girl of twenty-six, cultivated and calm, with all the calm of a real gift. She not only possesses her soul, but she has a soul to possess.[8]

The turn of the twentieth century marked not only the end of her student days at the RA, but was also a very exciting time in the professional life of Brickdale. In 1902, she was elected to the ROI (Royal Institute of Oil Painters), coincidentally their first female member, as well as ARWS (Associate Royal Society of Painters in Watercolors). In 1919, she was made full Academician of the RWS. She continued an interest in book illustrations and in 1911, was asked by close friend, colleague, and fellow RA alum, Byam Shaw, to teach watercolor at the newly founded (1910) Byam Shaw and Rex Vicat Cole School of Art (which later became known simply as the Byam Shaw School of Art.)[9] Brickdale and Shaw enjoyed a close relationship until his death in 1919. In 1902, the New Zealand periodical *Otago Witness* declared

> Strangely enough the newest developments of painting [are] on the lines adopted in the early fifties by Rossetti and his friends. It is Miss Eleanor Brickdale and Mr. Byam Shaw whom those most keenly interested in art regard as the two coming artists of the English

---

[7] Ibid., 19.
[8] Quoted in Nunn, 19; Sichel to MW Cornish, July 1901 in Edith Sichel, *Letters, Verses and other Writings*, Emily M. Ritchie ed., privately published 1918, 110.
[9] Christian, *Last Romantics*, 130; *Dictionary of British Artists 1880-1940*, 118.

> school…Their pictures and their personalities are among the most interesting pictures and the most interesting art personalities of the day.[10]

The artist led a prolific career until her death in 1945 as an avid painter, watercolorist, and book illustrator. This chapter, therefore, will investigate a selection of her work and its compositional and thematic indebtedness to both members of the PRB as well as her contemporary colleagues, Abbey, Shaw, and Cowper.

Fortescue-Brickdale was successful during her time at the Royal Academy Schools. She first exhibited at the RA in 1896 with a black-and-white advertisement design; a pen and ink drawing, *Sir Lancelot du Lake* in 1897 (fig. 78) and her illustration to *Sleeping Beauty* in 1898. In this early part of her career, Fortescue-Brickdale's focus was black and white works—book plates, vignettes, and book illustrations.[11] In 1897, she was awarded a prize of 40£ for a lunette design, *Spring* (fig. 79) which was to decorate an awkward space in the dining room at Burlington House.[12] The money she earned from the success of *Spring* allowed her to finance her first large scale painting, *The pale complexion of true love* (1898; fig. 80) which was the first oil painting she exhibited at the Royal Academy. In general, she exhibited an oil painting at the RA each year until 1908, then less frequently until she became ill in 1932. In the exhibition catalogue accompanying *A Pre-Raphaelite Journey: the art of Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale*, art historian Pamela Gerrish Nunn argues,

> By the end of the 1890s, Eleanor was a successful and well-known artist. Her work struck a chord with the new middle classes- the lawyers, businessmen, clergy, writers, politicians, and philanthropists- who had an interest in culture and the disposable income to buy art. They appreciated her highly detailed, colorful illustrations of the English countryside and her interest in historical narrative. They also admired her use of literary sources, especially Tennyson and Shakespeare, images of knight, damsels, and peasants appealed to the public fascinated by the romance of the Middle Ages…All in all her work

---

[10] Quoted in Nunn, 21; "Art and Artists," *Otago Witness*, 11 June 1902, 70.
[11] *Centenary Exhibition*, 3.
[12] As mentioned in the following sources: *Centenary exhibitions*, Nunn, *Pre-Raphaelite Journey,* and Jan Marsh and Pamela Gerrish Nunn, *Women artists and the Pre-Raphaelite Movement* (London: Virago Press, 1989).

empathized with traditionalism, heroism and patriotism that was still very much in favor up until the Great War.[13]

PRE-RAPHAELITE INSPIRED WORKS

THE LITTLE FOOT PAGE

The Little Foot-page (1905; fig. 81) takes its subject from a Scottish ballad, *Burd Helen*, which tells the story of a peasant girl dressed as a foot-page in order to follow her lover, the knight. Brickdale's heroine is shown disguised in men's clothing, having discarded her feminine attire, seen in a pile at her feet.[14] She pauses momentarily before cutting her long locks, in order to be more believably male as she accompanies her knight as his servant.

The figure of Helen is centrally positioned and takes up nearly the entire height of the canvas. Her body is shown in profile, while her face looks out directly at the viewer, as if our presence has startled her and is the cause of her brief pause.

The treatment of Helen, as well as the surrounding lush foliage is reminiscent of compositions by predecessors Millais, Hunt, and contemporary Cowper, all works with which Brickdale would likely have been familiar. The theme of these comparison images is from the Keats poem detailing the narrative of Lorenzo and Isabella. Made popular in the 1860s by Holman Hunt's *Isabella and the pot of basil* (fig. 82), the viewer is presented with a forlorn Isabella watering a pot of basil (with Lorenzo's head in it) with her tears.

---

[13] Nunn, *Pre-Raphaelite Journey,* 7.

[14] This notion of cross-dressing is also seen in Hunt's *Valentine Rescuing Sylvia from Proteus* (1850-1851). It is Julia (in love with Proteus), the figure seen at far left, dressed as a page, seen nervously playing with the ring Proteus gave as a sign of his devotion. It was Hunt's first exhibited work on a Shakespearean theme, illustrating a moment from *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. In short, this scene follows the attempted rape of Sylvia (Valentine's beloved) by a penitent Proteus, best friend to Valentine. Judith Bronkhurst, *William Holman Hunt: A Catalogue Raisonné* (New Haven, CT; London: Yale University Press, 2006) vol. 1, 144-145 (plate 71).

Millais' oil, *Lorenzo and Isabella* (fig. 83), continues the story that Millais first treated in 1849. The scene presents the two lovers dining with Isabella's brothers. Seated on the left of the table are four male figures, but it is brother in the foreground, whose extended leg is shown kicking the dog near Isabella. Millais, with a hyper-realism and extreme attention to detail as practiced in early Pre-Raphaelitism, has meticulously conveyed how the man's hose clings to his muscled leg and negotiates the curve of his knee-cap. The treatment of figure's knees in Brickdale's *Foot-page*, especially in regards to the bunching around the outer knee, echoes that of Millais. The former's Helen also recalls the pointed toes, short tunic, and general interest in musculature.

Such a stylized manipulation of the figure may have also been influenced by Cadogan Cowper's unpublished pen drawing of the Keats subject, dated 1900 (fig. 84). In the foreground is the figure of Lorenzo, dressed in a tunic and leggings appropriate for his profession as merchant apprentice. Both Helen and Lorenzo are both clad in a tunic and hose, with hands otherwise occupied—she's cutting her hair, while Lorenzo clasps a tool. While Lorenzo's pointed feet are outlined (as it is a pen drawing), Helen's feet are placed tightly together as she is standing on top of her abandoned garment. Both figures of Helen and Lorenzo share a linear quality that recall Millais' earlier style.

Moreover Brickdale and Cowper's respective works also revive compositional elements from Millais' 1849-50 *Ferdinand Lured by Ariel* (fig. 42). The pointed shoes, tunic attire, saggy knees, moving hands and forward stride of Ferdinand have been obviously copied by Cadogan Cowper. Brickdale's spiraling white flora is a direct quotation from the swirling of bat-like creatures seen surrounding Ariel.

There is a strong argument for adding Millais' *Ophelia* (fig. 14) to a discussion of Brickdale's image. Nunn suggests that the familiar ballad of Helen was "given freshness by the artist's focus on the daring and desperate Helen and the intense details of the natural surroundings which enclose her."[15] It is a long established fact that Millais' painstaking attention to detail provided an extreme amount of botanical accuracy, as well as allowed for floral iconography that is pertinent to the narrative. Ophelia, in her final moments as she floats down the river, is nearly engulfed by nature. The brambles above her head arch to crown her, the tall blades at lower right extend to frame her, and the white flowers above and beneath, are preparing to embrace her. She is a passive figure, floating horizontally to her death.

Meanwhile, Helen, in her vertical position, is an active force within nature. While the tall blades of grass at lower left lean toward her body, the branches and leaves of the surrounding trees flank her head; the white flowers swirl around her body, and yet the viewer is not overcome with a fear that she will become a victim of her lush surroundings. Instead, with the dark, somber and muted palette, the artist has created vegetation to camouflage and protect the heroine. Indeed, the brightest spots of the composition the white of the cast-off veil at lower left as well as the white wildflowers framing her body. Helen, herself, through color and poised position, quite literally becomes one with her surroundings. As the white color allows the viewer's eye to be led in an upwards motion, it is arguable that it was Brickdale's composition intention to ensure that the audience focused on and thereby responded to Helen.

Indeed, it is through the combination of the awkward pose (face directly gazing at the viewer, body in profile, feet unnaturally together) and Brickdale's Pre-Raphaelite interest in faithful representation of botanical nature, that it may be suggested that Helen, presumably caught unawares by the viewer's intrusion/presence, is actually reacting as would a startled wild

---

[15] Nunn, *Pre-Raphaelite Journey*, 50.

animal. Burd Helen's movements have completely frozen in this moment in time; this lack of movement, as well as subdued color palette, actually allows the heroine to become part of the surroundings of foliage and flora. This is a transformative moment in the narrative as well as the composition—she is changing genders (in a manner of speaking) and has gone from being human to part of nature. She stands on her brown and gold discarded robe, with its leaf motif, in her pointed slippers that have strong diagonals in matching hues. Her human form dissolves as the eye follows the curve of her shape, with the pale green hose visually separating figurative element to natural one. The placement of Helen on the golden leaf cloak, a distinguishing symbol of her femininity and identity has allowed the artist to experimented with dualities: pregnant heroine v. male page; identifiable Helen v/ anonymous servant; figure v. botanical element.

JUNE IS DEAD

Fortescue-Brickdale's Diploma work for the Royal Watercolor Society, to which she was elected in 1919, was the 1915 watercolor entitled *June is dead* (fig. 85).[16] It includes a characteristic detail-oriented depiction of natural elements as well as one of the artist's favorite themes, the winged cherub. In this composition, the figure is the personification of the month of June and is surrounded by an abundance of yellow rose bushes, mostly in full bloom with a splattering of now droopy, brown flowers. The cherub lies on its back, eyes and mouth closed, amid loose petals and short grass. The right hand rests atop the rib cage, gently clasping a spring of greenery. Two branches of roses extend to partially cover the right arm, though the flowers are not in full bloom. The nude torso is clearly seen, but the lower portion of the body disappears

---

[16] The election to the RWS may have been delayed because of WW1.; Nunn suggests (*Journey*) that the subject may have referenced Robert Browning's poem "Another Way of Love," which appeared in the second volume of his collection *Men and Women*, illustrated by Fortescue-Brickdale in 1908.

into the darkness of the foliage. The artist has mimicked the swell of the head, torso, and left hand with the curvature of the individual roses on the bushes; thereby creating a botanical outline that mimics the lifeless form.

As the title indicates, this winged cherub is dead. The pallor of the torso indicates death, but the flush to the cheeks and lips suggests a remaining life force. If such is the case, the title is in contradiction with the implication of the poem, which does not explicitly argue the "death" of June: "June was not over/ Though past the fall, /And the best of her roses/ Had yet to blow."

It is possible that the deliberate selection of this particular work to exhibit in 1919 was a conscience choice on the part of Brickdale as a memorial to her friend, Byam Shaw, who died in January of that year (1919). Both artists produced illustrations for Robert Browning poems; there is particular indebtedness on Brickdale's part to Shaw's design for "In a Gondola" (1897; fig. 86) in *Poems of Robert Browning*.[17] It is actually the figure on the border of this particular drawing that is related to Brickdale's later watercolor. Shaw has included a recumbent, nude, winged angel that recalls the figure of June. Shaw's version has the wings meeting at the figure's ankles, with right arm extended and left bent, meeting the turned head. It is uncertain as to whether or not the winged angel is sleeping or dead. There is sufficient reason to believe that, as Byam Shaw and Fortescue-Brickdale had worked together, she would have been familiar with her friend's prior illustrations. The timing of Shaw's death and that of Brickdale's exhibition would suggest that indeed *June* was a dedicatory work to her friend and fellow artist.

Fortescue-Brickdale paid meticulous attention to the depiction of nature—much like of first generation Pre-Raphaelitism. It may be said that Fortescue-Brickdale treated watercolor as if it were oil, getting the same degree of precise detail from each medium. Such attention to the depiction of the natural world, for example, was a technique encouraged by John Ruskin and

---

[17] This idea was suggested in Christian, *Last Romantics*, 131.

realized by the Pre-Raphaelites. Millais' 1851 oil painting, *Ophelia* (fig. 14), has been lauded for its remarkable and painstaking adherence to botanical accuracy. While the entirety of represented flora would not have been in bloom at the same time, Millais included it for symbolism and literary references. For example, the roses placed near Ophelia's cheek and dress, as well as those on the bank, may allude to her brother Laertes calling her the "rose of May." The willow, nettle, and daisy, moreover, are all associated with forsaken love, pain and innocence. The pansy denotes remembrance and love in vain, while the violets Ophelia has strung into a chain symbolize faithfulness, chastity, or even death of the young. The poppies signify death.

The combination of Brickdale's winged cherub placed within blooming rose bushes is reminiscent of Millais' tragic heroine floating to hear death amidst the flora. Millais has chosen to depict Ophelia in her final moments of life, while Brickdale's cherub is arguably already deceased. Both compositions incorporate the death (or in Ophelia's case impending death) of a single figure with nature surrounding the body; both instances also portray nature in a peaceful way as it unobtrusively accompanies the heroine and cherub. The botanical growth is not overwhelming or dangerous but is iconographical to suggest its literary importance.

The position of the cherub in Brickdale's watercolor echoes both Millais' *Spring* (*Apple blossoms,* fig. 73) of 1859, as well as Waterhouse's *Ophelia* (c. 1889; fig. 72). Millais' reclining female figure in *Spring*, seen at lower right, looks directly out at the viewer, with legs supposedly sprawled (as is indicated by her body's outline beneath the yellow garment), and arms bent with hands on either side of her head. Her pose is provocative, and her gaze is sexually charged as she holds a blade of grass across her red lips. Waterhouse's female also stares brazenly up at the viewer in an overtly sexualized manner. Her right arm is outstretched in

the blades of grass and the left has been raised and then plunged into her hair, resulting in a very sensuous tangle of brown tresses. She is aware of the viewer's presence and is hyper-sexualized.[18] Brickdale's image included, all these works are literary based. The main difference is that while June is a nude winged figure of indeterminate sex and a personification of a month and Millais' *Spring* is a mood picture, the others are representations of characters from literature, whose depiction recalls a particular part of the narrative. Millais (*Ophelia*) and Waterhouse visualize their figures as languid, sensual women; Shaw and Brickdale focus on the figure of the winged nude angelic creature.

GUINEVERE (THE SOMBRE CLOSE OF THAT VOLUPTUOUS DAY)

Brickdale's watercolor *Guinevere (The somber close of that voluptuous day)* (1910-11; fig. 87) illustrates a moment which is rarely depicted in the Arthurian legends of Guinevere. Usually, there are images-- as an illustration, drawing or painting-- detailing the love between Guinevere and Lancelot; Lancelot fighting; the death of Arthur, etc. Indeed, Arthurian legend was a favorite among Victorian artists. The Tennyson love triangle between Queen Guinevere, King Arthur, and Sir Lancelot does not have a happy outcome. Guinevere had an affair with Lancelot, thereby destroying her marriage to Arthur. After Arthur's death, she vows never to see Lancelot again and enters a convent. Tennyson's poem recounts that the Queen must

> embrace a life of humility, almost of anonymity. The artist shows her at the repetitive work of serving others and contributing to the convent's daily life. The absolute quiet and stillness of the setting neatly emphasize the contrast between this life and that which Guinevere enjoyed in her heyday.[19]

[18] Cadogan Cowper's *Titania Sleeps* (1928) also uses a similar pose for the main figure.
[19] Nunn, *Pre-Raphaelite Journey,* 69.

Brickdale's Guinevere is represented in full nun attire, carrying a basket of rounds of bread.[20] She stands still momentarily, head down, as if in deep concentration. Her arms are spread out from her sides, palms up, as if in a gesture of repentance or sacrifice. The Queen strolls along a corridor, bordered by the hortus conclusus (Latin for "enclosed garden"), with a pillar emerging from its center with a cross to scale, as well as (most likely) three, figural Gothic niches attached.

This watercolor does not only describe how Guinevere spent the last of her days, but evokes Marian imagery as well as that of the Crucifixion. With her hands spread as such and the banister towering behind her, it parallels the traditional representation of Christ's crucifixion. Additionally, the basket she holds filled with loaves of bread may be seen as a reference to the Christian story of Jesus distributing the loaves and fish. The artist may be commenting on Guinevere's personal reflections on her past actions. If understood in terms of Christ's death, then Guinevere (a female counterpart) is sacrificing her original life with Arthur and Lancelot as she is "resurrected" into this new one. It is telling that "the Queen" is outside of the hortus conclusus, as opposed to being inside, which is usually where the Virgin Mary (Queen of Heaven) can be found in Marian imagery. As nuns are traditionally accepted as "Brides of Christ," this second marriage is guaranteed for Guinevere, as her mortality, passion, and physical desires are no longer an impediment.

Though not a depiction of Arthurian legend, *Guinevere* is reminiscent of Charles Allston Collins' *Convent Thoughts* (1851; fig. 88). The artist here shows a young novice within an hortus conclusus. She is flanked by two groupings of flowers (including lilies, a symbolic reference to the Virgin Mary), and numerous lillipads floating in the stream in front of her. Indeed, Collins

---

[20] This depiction of bread looks surprisingly like that found in Cowper's *St. Agnes.*

has deliberately left an open space between the green pads so that the viewer is able to see part of the young woman's reflection.

As an associate of the Pre-Raphaelites, the artist has taken great care with botanical accuracy and attention to natural detail. The figure holds a missal, her index finger pointing to an illustration of *The Annunciation*; interestingly, the six lilies in bloom are opened, and from the left lean towards the novice at center. Surrounded by different species of lilies, this reinforces to both the viewer and the novice the story of The Annunciation and the part played by the young Madonna. Additionally the figure is holding a Passion flower—symbolic of the Crucifixion—with the missal illustrating the Crucifixion on the facing page.[21]

Fascinatingly, this scene created by Collins represents the full-circle of life as told through botany, a single female figure, and an illustrated manuscript. In *Convent Thoughts*, the young novice stands in the hortus conclusus, a space traditionally associated with Marian imagery. This figure is surrounded by lilies and her index finger marks the page of the Annunciation. She simultaneously holds a Passion flower and the adjacent image in the missal is one of Christ's Crucifixion. These two images, combined with their respective flora, bring Christ's mortal life full-circle. If the novice takes her vows and becomes a nun, she will be a Bride of Christ—or rather, resurrected into her new eternal life; thereby becoming akin to Mary within the hortus conclusus.

By contrast, Brickdale has interestingly allied Guinevere with the mortal Christ with the promise of being analogous with the Madonna. The orange flowers in the hortus conclusus are similar to those in Collins' work, so it seems fair to assume they too are another type of lily. Instead of the emphasis of the female figure being part of the Annunciation (Collins),

---

[21] Paraphrased from "Charles Allston Collins: Convent Thoughts" http://www.artmagick.com/pictures/picture.aspx?id=6113 (accessed February 2016).

Brickdale's Queen is more aligned with the mortal end of Christ's life; her hand gesture, bent head, and wooden column behind her form a typical Crucifixion scene. As she is technically on the outside of the wall to the enclosed garden, as opposed to the novice who was standing directly in it, Guinevere may not yet been given her resurrection into this new life. As Queen, she could be stand-in for Queen of Heaven (Virgin Mary); as mere mortal she could be a personification of the mortal Christ; and in the meantime as Guinevere, she contributes to the monotonous work of serving others and because of her past life as adulteress, is becoming worthy of entering the sacred garden.

As previously mentioned, it is other parts of Guinevere and Lancelot's affair that are usually depicted. For example, Rossetti's *Arthur's Tomb: The Last Meeting of Lancelot and Guinevere* (1855; fig. 89) demonstrates the last meeting of the lovers. Guinevere blames Lancelot and their love for the death of her husband. Presumably saying good-bye to both men, the lady is seen kneeling beside Arthur's sarcophagus, with one arm around it. Lancelot has arrived, leans across the figure of Arthur, and bends in to kiss her. She puts her hand in front of her lips to block his demonstration of affection, vowing to live a life of penitence from this point forward. As Surtees explains, this is Rossetti's "first treatment of an Arthurian subject, though this particular episode does not occur in Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*...This water–colour may have suggested William Morris's poem *King Arthur's Tomb* in *Defence of Guinevere*."[22]

However, in Thomas Malory's *Le Morte d'Arthur*, Guinevere does leave Lancelot and proceeds with her sisters into the nunnery, saying:

> Through this same man and me hath all this war be wrought, and the death of the most noblest knights of the world; for through our love that we have loved together is my most noble lord slain. Therefore, Sir Lancelot, wit thou well I am set in such a plight to get my soul heal. And yet I trust, through God's grace and through His Passion of His wounds

[22] Virginia Surtees, *The Paintings and Drawings of Dante Gabriel Rossetti (1828-1882): A Catalogue Raisonné.* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1971), vol. 1, 34-35.

> wide, that after my death I may have a sight of the blessed face of Christ Jesus, and on Doomsday to sit on His right side; for as sinful as ever I was, now are saints in heaven… for as well as I have loved thee heretofore mine heart will not serve now to see thee; for through thee and me is the flower of kings and knights destroyed.[23]

This passage reinforces concepts alluded to in Brickdale's work, namely yearning for the healing of her soul through "God's grace and through His Passion of His wounds…"[24] It is hard to tell if there is a reference to the stigmata in Guinevere's extended right hand, as leaves and grasses grow forth from the hortus conclusus.

In 1906, Alfred Lord Tennyson published *Guinevere* with illustrations by Byam Shaw, including his "*…There an abbess lived for three years…"* (1906; fig. 90). Similar to that of Brickdale's work roughly four years later, this illustration also shows the part of Guinevere's life after she had entered the convent, become a nun, and ultimately the abbess. Shaw's work presents a profiled abbess with closed eyes, standing presumably in front of an image of the risen Christ. The viewer sees arms extended upwards at forty-five degree angles and a halo. It is possible then, that this could be considered a companion piece to Brickdale's watercolor, linked by the aforementioned text excerpt. The writing indicated that Guinevere wanted to heal her soul; Brickdale's figure was in a crucifixion-like pose; and Shaw's representation that at last, Guinevere has found her peace.

CONCLUSION

Fortescue-Brickdale was prolific during her career, successfully explored different media, and was an artistic triumph from the start. Unfortunately, the First World War brought a demand for memorials. Brickdale designed more than twenty stained glass windows between 1914-40.

---

[23] Guinevere article from Pace University; http://csis.pace.edu/grendel/projs993a/arthurian/guinevere.htm (accessed March 2016).
[24] Ibid.

As a result of cultural and economic changes, there was no longer an insistent market for lavishly illustrated books. She continued to produce watercolor illustrations, however, for the aforementioned exhibitions, as well as exhibit fairly regularly at the RA and RWS.

In 1923, her health began to decline. In 1932, she suffered a stroke and exhibited at the RA for the last time in 1935. Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale died in 1945 and her obituary in *The* Times cited her as

> the last survivor of the later Pre-Raphaelite painters who though—or possibly because—they did not come into contact with the original "Brotherhood" carried some of their principles to extremes… In his "The English Pre-Raphaelite Painters, their associates and successors, " published in 1910, Percy Bates says that Miss Fortescue-Brickdale "should do much in the future to exemplify the still-living force of Pre-Raphaelitism as a school." Whether or not that prediction was fulfilled, she deserves to be remembered for her consistent fidelity to the tradition.[25]

While Cadogan Cowper survived Brickdale by thirteen years, the obituary from *The Times* does help to support the claim that Brickdale's oeuvre was influenced by the nineteenth-century Brotherhood. While some of her works recall a stylized design more in line with the composition of Shaw rather than Millais, Rossetti or Hunt, it is obvious that she maintained a Pre-Raphaelite spirit well into the twentieth-century.

---

[25] "Miss Fortescue-Brickdale", *The Times*, 14 March 1945. (Accessed through *The Times* digital archive, 20 July 2013.)

Chapter 8
John William Waterhouse (1849-1917)

"Mr. Waterhouse was an eclectic painter. He painted pre-Raphaelite pictures in a more modern manner. He was, in fact, a kind of academic Burne-Jones, like him in his types and his moods, but with less instance on design and more on atmosphere. His art was always agreeable, for he had taste and learning as well as considerable accomplishments; he was one of those painters whose pictures always seemed to suggest that he must have done better in some other work. This means that he never quite "came off," that he raised expectations in his art which it did not completely satisfy; and a reason of this, no doubt, is to be found in his eclecticism. He never quite found himself or the method which would completely express him… He painted always like a scholar and a gentleman, though not like a great artist."

-- The Times, 12 Feb., 1917 (obituary)[1]

John William Waterhouse is a problematic figure in the literature on Victorian and Edwardian art. Unlike previous chapters, the focus here will be primarily on Waterhouse's key 1888 work, *The Lady of Shalott*, as examined in the 2008 publication *John William Waterhouse: The Modern Pre-Raphaelite,* to be discussed shortly. This particular painting reveals a pivotal moment in the artist's career, as it marked a shift to a new interest in Pre-Raphaelite themes. In lieu of exploring multiple works by the artist, Waterhouse's image will be compared with multiple examples from the Pre-Raphaelites: Millais, Holman Hunt, Elizabeth Siddal, Rossetti, Burne-Jones, PRB associate Arthur Hughes and Neo-Pre-Raphaelite contemporary Byam Shaw.

As has been the case with other artists previously examined, Waterhouse is often included in publications about Pre-Raphaelitism, as established in Chapter 1, and grouped with them, even if such a classification is described as "loosely associated with." Anderson and Wright, in *Heaven on Earth*, succinctly comment on this: "Waterhouse presents an anomaly in terms of the neat categorization of Victorian artists. His work is, with increasing regularity, described as Pre-Raphaelite…"[2] However, simultaneously to being described as a Pre-Raphaelite,

---

[1] "Mr. J. W. Waterhouse, R.A." *Times* [London, England] 12 Feb. 1917: 6. *The Times Digital Archive.* Web. 3 Sept 2015.

[2] Gail-Nina Anderson and Joanne Wright, *Heaven on Earth* (London: Djanogly Art Gallery, University of Nottingham Arts Centre in association with Lund Humphries, 1994), 120. As the entry continues to indicate, there are problems associated with such a distinction, such as Waterhouse's brushwork and paint handling—both aspects to be discussed in this chapter.

and perhaps more importantly, it needs to be noted that the artist has also been firmly assigned to other artistic groupings by academics, with each author claiming utmost certainty over their respective designations.

For example, according to Christopher Wood's 1998 book *Burne-Jones*, he used the rather ambiguous phrase "late Victorian artist,"[3] to describe Waterhouse, a sentiment that is echoed in Frances Spalding's 1978 *Magnificent Dreams: Burne-Jones and the Late Victorians.* Wood argues this distinction based on "the influence of Burne-Jones [that] can be detected, in terms of both style and Romantic subject matter,"[4] in Waterhouse's work, while Spalding argues that

> his work reveals no clearly identifiable personality, his vivid imagination enabled him to paint Pre-Raphaelite subjects with a liveliness and gusto that made him a leading exponent of medieval romanticism up to and around the turn the century.[5]

Interestingly, in *Victorian Painting*, Wood's publication the following year, the author refers to the artist, along with Cowper, Shaw and Brickdale, as a "last Romantic," in reference to Victorian artists who survived (and produced) into the twentieth-century. Christian's *Last Romantics* lays claim that Waterhouse was part of the "early Academic tradition," as he "began to attempt Pre-Raphaelite themes, often coming close to Burne-Jones in mood, facial types and a tendency to repetition, but continuing to handle paint with the vigour he had learnt from Bastien-Lepage and shared with friends at the Newlyn School."[6]

---

[3] Christopher Wood, *Burne-Jones: The Life and Works of Sir Edward Burne-Jones* (New York: Stewart, Tabori and Change,1998), 143; Wood applies this philosophy to a number of other artists, including: Herbert Draper, Frank Dicksee, E.R. Frampton, J.D. Batten, Byam Shaw, Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale, T.C. Gotch, H.M. Rheam, E.R. Hughes, Gerald Moira, W. Graham Robertson, Robert Anning Bell, Charles Shannon, and "others too minor to mention." (144). As will become apartment, Waterhouse is often linked by association (here as a "late Victorian artist") with artists used as case studies in this dissertation, specifically Shaw, Brickdale and Gotch.

[4] Wood, *Burne-Jones,* 143.

[5] Frances Spalding, *Magnificent Dreams*: *Burne-Jones and the late Victorians* (New York: Dutton, 1978), 73.

[6] "The Early Academic Tradition" in John Christian, ed. *The Last Romantics: The Romantic Tradition in British Art: Burne-Jones to Stanley Spencer* (London: Lund Humphries in association with Barbican Art Gallery, 1989),

Meanwhile, Anthony Hobson's 1989 monograph on the artist, *J..W.Waterhouse*, resolutely denies any Pre-Raphaelite connection, writing

> Waterhouse has been wrongly called Pre-Raphaelite, but he was a Romantic Classicist: he had the Northerner's love of legend and mystery, but his Italian birth lent a warm personality to his rendering of the classical myths, peopled as they were by superhuman beings.[7]

The most recent publication to take a firm stand on exactly how Waterhouse fits into nineteenth and twentieth century British art is the 2008 exhibition catalogue *J.W.Waterhouse: The Modern Pre-Raphaelite* with essay contributions by Peter Trippi, Elizabeth Prettejohn, Robert Upstone and Patty Wageman. The title of both exhibition and accompanying book unequivocally place Waterhouse within the realm of Pre-Raphaelitism. As was explored in Chapter 1, the term Pre-Raphaelitism encompasses several incarnations, and by referring to the artist as both "modern" and "Pre-Raphaelite," the viewer already understands that the artist will conceivably be analogous to the PRB, but with a twist. As Robert Upstone writes in his essay, "Between Innovation and Tradition: Waterhouse and Modern French Painting",

> There is a certain temptation to identify him as some species of "Academic" painter. This is a comfortingly broad categorization, and seem to be supported by Waterhouse's enduring commitment to exhibiting at the Royal Academy over a lifetime's career…But the somewhat reductive connotations that "Academic" brings with it give no sense to his originality and invention, or of his transgression of Academic typological conventions… Perhaps the most common description of Waterhouse is that he is a certain variety of "high" Pre-Raphaelite, and this is a classification that has been supported by his occasional inclusion in modern books and exhibitions about the Brotherhood and their successors.[8]

Though critics and scholars may not have reached a consensus on what *kind* of Pre-Raphaelite Waterhouse was—or even when—they are all in agreement that the early phase of his

---

117. It is important to note that this entry gives reference to Anthony Hobson, *The Life and Art of J.W.Waterhouse, RA* 1980, a source to be discussed shortly.

[7] Anthony Hobson, *J.W.Waterhouse* (Oxford: Phaidon Christie's, 1989), 9.

[8] Robert Upstone, "Between Innovation and Tradition: Waterhouse and Modern French Painting" in *J.W.Waterhouse: The Modern Pre-Raphaelite*, ed. Elizabeth Prettejohn (London: England, 2008), 37. Interestingly, the last sentence is footnoted in the essay, giving credit to Christian's catalogue, *The Last Romantics.*

career was greatly influenced by Lawrence Alma-Tadema, "a pioneer of a new approach to classical subject-matter, which concentrated on the lives of ordinary people in the ancient world, rather than the heroic deeds of generals and statesmen."[9] To that end, Waterhouse ensconced himself in painting works of art dedicated to scenes of ancient life, such as *A Flower Stall* (1868; fig. 91) and *After the Dance* (1876). Like Alma-Tadema, Waterhouse "carefully researched the material culture of the ancient Roman world, but from the start [the artist's] scenes were more spacious and more sparing of antiquarian detail."[10] The decorative details in this early phase of Waterhouse's career are simplified with the action sequences are clearly focused and become the obvious emphasis of the painting.

However, there was a pivotal shift in his Waterhouse's work that occurred in 1888 with the exhibition of his *Lady of Shalott* (fig. 92). Like Abbey, Waterhouse was also familiar with Bastien-Lepage's 1879 *Joan of Arc* (fig. 93), but while Abbey remained only an admirer, the younger artist "experimented with the popular grey-toned painting techniques of the Frenchman…"[11] These two decisions—selecting a Pre-Raphaelite subject but incorporating a French technique—are what ultimately, according to Trippi et. al make Waterhouse a modern Pre-Raphaelite. Trippi's essay argues that this first composition (there were additional versions made in 1894 and 1915 respectively) marked the artist's

> first foray into Pre-Raphaelitism not only because it illustrates a scene from Tennyson's famous poem, but also because it demonstrates the powerful impact that John Everett Millais' drowning *Ophelia* of 1851-52 made when it was shown again in London in 1886 [2 years before Waterhouse's *Lady of Shalott* was exhibited]. Under the spell of that meticulously detailed masterwork, Waterhouse suddenly saw that nature could—

---

[9] Elizabeth Prettejohn, "Waterhouse's Imagination", in *Modern Pre-Raphaelite*, 24.
[10] Ibid.„ 25.
[11] Peter Trippi, "John William Waterhouse: A Biographical Overview" in *J.W.Waterhouse: The Modern Pre-Raphaelite*, 17.

> according to his 1909 biographer Rose E.D. Sketchley—"hold out promise of an imaginative revelation to be won by the faithfulness of sheer sight."[12]

Upstone, in his aforementioned essay, is in agreement with both Sketchley and Trippi's conclusion that the 1888 painting "marked a dramatic new direction for Waterhouse's art."[13] It is important to note that, according to Sketchley, Waterhouse first saw Millais' early pictures at the Grosvenor Gallery in 1886, two years before he produced this innovative painting. As the biographer R.E.D. Sketchley writes, it "prompted him to think."[14] The "intense admiration" Waterhouse had for the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, however, was not tempered by his sympathy for Bastien-Lepage and other French *plein-air* artists.[15]

Therefore, as a decidedly modern Pre-Raphaelite (as Trippi et al. suggest), Waterhouse made an artistic, though perhaps not conscious, decision to chose a subject favored by the Pre-Raphaelites, but "did not follow their meticulous signature technique. Instead he evolved a thoroughly personal mode of expression that contentiously looked to modern French art for inspiration."[16] As Sketchley continues

> This picture was received with much enthusiasm by young painters, as a successful reconciliation of the claims of imagination and realism in art…[The] earnest concentration amid nature on the sentiment of the poem, the sustained attempt to incorporate wholly the inward with the outward, had a fine result…No change in technique was implied by his acceptance of the Pre-Raphaelite theory, with which he thus found himself in accord…*The Lady of Shalott* is specially broad and sustained in execution, and neither in color nor in design is there any approximation to the missal-like intensity of Pre-Raphaelitism…[it] has the cool open-air unity of French naturalism.[17]

---

[12] Ibid., 17; Sketchley quote from R.E.D. Sketchley, *The Art of J.W.Waterhouse, R.A.,* A Christmas Number of *The Art Journal*, 1909, 15.; The author wishes to express much gratitude to Peter Trippi who was kind enough to share a personal transcription of the Sketchley article.
[13] Upstone in *Modern Pre-Raphaelite*, 37.
[14] Sketchley, 15.
[15] Waterhouse was admitted as a probationary student to the RA in sculpture on 28 July 1870, though he ultimately changed his focus to painting, most likely a result of the influence of his "obligatory sponsor…a painter, F.R. Pickersgill." (Hobson, 12). In 1871, Millais was a Visitor at the RA and it is absolutely possible that he was one of Waterhouse's instructors. (Hobson, 20; The speculation that Millais instructed Waterhouse is my natural conclusion. At the very least, Waterhouse would most likely have been familiar with the Pre-Raphaelite, and maybe saw his later work, as he wasn't exposed to the early compositions, as mentioned, until 1886).
[16] Upstone in *Modern Pre-Raphaelite*, 37. This sentiment is also echoed by R.E.D. Sketchley, 15.
[17] Sketchley, 15.; Part of this quote is also on Upstone, 37.

Therefore, the technique Waterhouse employed with the *Lady of Shalott* was not the hyper-detailed, obsessive attention to nature that the early PRB used. Instead, the artist painted the Tennysonian subject in more of a naturalistic manner, influenced by the New English Art Club technique. As Upstone specifies,

> [the] naturalists imitated Bastien-Lepage's way of working, and in *The Lady of Shalott* Waterhouse seems to have partly had in mind their rapid dabs of paint and square-brushing to give a lively rendering of nature. At the Academy such technical practices were an anathema and were condemned in the RA Schools. Its invention attributed to Bastien, square brushing was described by a British critic as a technique where pain was put on rapidly with a square brush: those who practice it in its simplest form leaves the brushmarks and do not smooth away the evidence of the method, thus sometimes insisting on the way the picture is painted, perhaps at the sacrifice of the subtleties in the subject.[18]

It would seem, then, that the primary difference between the early phases of Pre-Raphaelitism's technique and Waterhouse's, for this particular painting, is two-fold. First, it did not include the smooth, continuous, enameled and minute detail surface with the Ruskian interest in depicting each and every nuance of nature. Secondly, there were visible brushstrokes—much like the French Impressionist mode of painting (lasting arguably from the 1870s until the early 1890s)—by which, while offending the British because of its inherent French nature, left a visible trace of the artist.

In 1888, William Powell Frith wrote a scathing article, "Crazes in Art: "Pre-Raphaelitism" and "Impressionism", which ultimately vilified both movements. Since Waterhouse produced *The Lady of Shalott* during this highly critical time, it is no wonder that his change of technique angered many traditionalists and Academics. Frith penned:

> We have now done—long done—with the Pre-Raphaelitic, and another far more dangerous craze has come upon us. Born and bred in France, what is called *Impressionism* has tainted the art of this country. It is singular that this phase of art, if it can be called art, is in exact opposition to the principles of the Pre-Raphaelites. In the

[18] Upstone, 41; Secondary quote from Morley Roberts, "A Colony of Artists," *The Scottish Art Review*, 1889, 72.

> one we had overwrought details, in this other no details at all. So far as my feeble powers enable me to understand the Impressionist, I take him to propose to himself an *impression*—probably a momentary one—that Nature has made upon him.[19]

Unfortunately, Frith has interpreted Waterhouse's technique as a full-on mimicking of French Impressionism, where only fleeting moments in time have been captured or suggestions of figures or nature have been rendered. Seen against Monet's *Impression: Sunrise* (1872) or other truly Impressionist paintings, there is no way that Waterhouse's work could be confused for an Impressionist piece. The artist's lady, boat, and surrounding landscape are all clearly delineated; however, the broad brushstrokes have been used in order to suggest action and movement: the rippling water, the wind blowing through her hair, the intertwining branches and their subtle sway at lower left, as well as the strewn leaves and lillipads floating along the foreground. Even the embroidery of the tapestry that hangs over the side of the boat is rendered with a generalized amount of detail. The representation in each circle is not highly detailed, as a Millais or Abbey composition might be. Instead, these brushstrokes, dabs of color, and Bastien-Lepage-inspired square-brushing all are used to suggest the movement of the boat through the water, as well as a solitude and sense of doom as experienced by the female figure, heightened by the inclusion of a skull/skeleton found under the bird behind the floating funereal pyre.

It is always written of this painting that it a subject-matter loved and used by the Pre-Raphaelites, as Elizabeth Siddal, Holman Hunt, and Arthur Hughes, for example, created works by the same name. There is much comparison, especially in publications by Trippi and Hudson, between *Lady of Shalott* (Waterhouse) and the 1851 *Ophelia* (Millais; fig. 14) in that both compositions show women suffering from doomed love, floating to their death. The representational technique of each is also included—Millais with his masterful detailing of every

---

[19] William Powell Frith, "Crazes in Art: "Pre-Raphaelitism" and "Impressionism" in *Magazine of Art*, 1888, 190-191.

branch, leaf and botanical, not to mention Ophelia herself in the elaborate white dress and Waterhouse with his broad brushstrokes and attention to detail. While it certainly does not offer as much precise visual realism as Millais' example, neither does it express suggestions or mere impressions as would be seen in a fully developed Impressionist composition. Waterhouse, as Trippi and his co-authors have successfully indicated, employed a technique which is somewhere in between these two extremes.

Tennyson's poem was used by many Pre-Raphaelite artists as a subject for their work, including Holman Hunt, Elizabeth Siddal, Arthur Hughes (PRB associate), Millais and Rossetti.[20] However, these artists oftentimes used different parts of the narrative for their respective illustrations. For example, Hunt's sketches from 1850 focus on the lady at her seated at her loom (fig. 94); standing with hand out and not looking into the mirror (fig. 95); and finally, leaning back in her boat (fig. 96). His 1857 (fig. 97) engraving for Moxon's edition of Tennyson's poems is a variation on his standing lady and would become the foundation for his finished oil of 1886-1905 (fig. 98). Siddal made a drawing (pen and ink on paper; fig. 99) in 1853 of the lady sitting at her loom, perhaps the most accurate representation to Tennyson's prose with the starkness of the room and Lancelot's reflection in the cracked mirror. Unlike her Pre-Raphaelite counterparts, the artist illustrated the penultimate moment of the woman's fate—while seated at her loom, she looks over her shoulder through the window to the outside world. The web bursts, the mirror cracks and the Lady's destiny is sealed. The following year in 1854, Millais drew the lady floating in her boat (fig. 100), a composition strikingly similar to his earlier *Ophelia*. Moreover, in 1873 (fig. 101), Hughes produced an oil painting along the same lines as

---

[20] In 1898, Byam Shaw produced his own version of *The Lady of Shalott* where she is seen having come down from her tower to write her name on the boat that will take her to Camelot. This coincides with the following stanza: "Down she came and found a boat./ Beneath a willow left afloat./ And round about the prow she wrote/ The Lady of Shalott."

Millais' drawing of the dead woman arriving in Camelot. Finally, in 1857, Rossetti made a wood engraving (fig. 102), though unlike his Pre-Raphaelite counterparts, the focus was on Lancelot, as he gazed down to admire the Lady, echoing the final stanza of the poem, "He said, "She has a lovely face;/ God in His mercy lend her grace,/ The Lady of Shalott."

As Upstone suggests, *The Lady of Shalott* marked a departure in subject matter—away from the Alma-Tadema inspired works of Greek and Roman scenes in which he received much negative criticism; for example, "critics occasionally made unfavorable comparisons and, much to Waterhouse's irritation, pedantically found fault with minor details of archeological accuracy, rather than absorbing the dramatic subject-matter of the picture itself."[21] As George Bernard Shaw is quoted as writing, "Giving reminders of other artists is quite a specialty with Mr. Waterhouse."[22]

Waterhouse's change in subject matter to Tennyson's poetry and the Arthurian myths and legends may have been a reaction to the repeated critiques of his earlier work. Regardless, these stories of doomed women were at the height of their popularity and artistic renderings of them were saleable. Moreover, as Pre-Raphaelitism was considered a British movement, as discussed in Chapter 1, and Tennyson a British poet, it could be argued that with this new thematic direction was a way to show the critics the artist was in effect, returning, to his nationalistic roots.

As several of the essayists submit, "[the] personality of John William Waterhouse was rarely mentioned by his contemporaries in their correspondence. His papers remain un-located, and his scarce surviving letters to others suggest a man of few words."[23] It is left to the viewer, then, to consider his oeuvre in total and come to their own conclusion. Did he chose Pre-Raphaelite subjects, such as *The Lady of Shalott*, *Ophelia, Mariana of the South, Isabella and the*

[21] Upstone, 38.
[22] Quoted in ibid., 38.
[23] Trippi, 15.

Pot of Basil, Fair Rosamund or even *La Belle Dame Sans Merci* because of an overwhelming interest in the PRB and British poetry? Or did he change subject matter merely as a way to garner positive press?

As Trippi emphasizes, the artist's paintings

> reveal a man who *felt* very deeply…Several contemporary observers called his pictures poetic, not only because they are scenes imagined from poetry, but also because they are lyrical in the truest sense of the word—imbued with the same hypnotic power possessed by the ancient poets who sang their stories.[24]

This comment that Waterhouse's imagery was referred to as "poetic" recalls the aforementioned 1889 letter written by Abbey about Ruskin and the older man's opinions about the PRB and their transcription of nature, that: "the representation of events not as they might be supposed *poetically* to have happened, but as they really might have happened."[25] Sketchley addresses Waterhouse and his "poetic pictures" as well, by asserting,

> It is art which for its appreciation needs at least a capacity for realizing the alliance between our thought and the romantic vision gathered in literature from Homer to Tennyson. The conformity of the artist's mind to that vision is unusually close; his sense of the past is, indeed, a poetical sensation. Therein lies the source of the tender vividness of his art, its power to renew for modern sight and imagination a beauty lost from the common apprehension of life.[26]

The biographer further insists that Waterhouse

> occupies a place between the PRB and their artistic descendants of the first and second generation. The spirit of poetry does not signal to him in the terms of keen reality, of detail become spiritually momentous, which are the concrete symbols of the Pre-Raphaelite inspiration.[27]

Even the author situates the artist after the early phase of Pre-Raphaelitism, with its intense observation of nature, hyper-detailed representations, and the philosophy to omit, select,

---

[24] Ibid., 15.
[25] Lucas, 189.
[26] Sketchley, private transcription, n.p.
[27] Ibid., n.p.

and scorn nothing, but before the embowered women of Rossetti, for example, whose interest in beauty and sensuality became the focus of his works.

The main argument presented by Trippi, Prettejohn and Upstone revolves around Waterhouse's unprecedented change in subject matter and technique with the 1888 *Lady of Shalott*. Not only did it mark the start of a commitment to Pre-Raphaelite themes, it also essentially redirected his technique, now inspired by French methods, and abandoned the influence of Alma-Tadema that had become so evident in the early years of his career.

However, what the publication did not address was the span of Waterhouse as Pre-Raphaelite. In 1899, a year after the pivotal *Lady of Shalott*, he exhibited the first of three treatments of *Ophelia* (fig. 103). Like his previous doomed heroine, Ophelia's representation was also done in a naturalistic manner. It too reveals broad brushstrokes and an interest in a PRB subject, particularly echoing Millais' famous painting. In 1890, the artist's

> father died, and he did not exhibit at the Academy for the first time in sixteen years. Like so much of the artist's life, this hiatus is undocumented, but it seems to have encompassed a self-reinvention, possibly while visiting Italy: in 1891 he reappeared in the London exhibitions with a new fascination for classical enchantresses drawn from Homer and Ovid, and with a more jewel-toned palette.[28]

How to categorize Waterhouse's career after 1890 differs according to each scholar. Trippi is adamant that this began a time when the artist specialized in "wistful, mildly eroticized maidens—their singular beauty both natural and unattainable—posed in timeless settings that evoke a vaguely other-world."[29] Sometimes alone and sometimes in groups, Waterhouse concentrated on moments of stillness that expressed a pivotal moment in the respective narrative.

---

[28] Trippi, 17.
[29] Ibid., 17.

The Times considered these pictures to be "pre-Raphaelite… in a more modern manner."[30] The Editor of the *The Studio* argued that the works Waterhouse produced in the early 1890s were

> decorative panels of color, less conventional than tapestry, less flat than if they were mural decoration, but all the same, not openings through a wall looking into the real world or the world of fancy, but panels self-replete with the beauty of line, beauty of mass, and beauty of color.[31]

This decade was particularly important to the different incarnations of Pre-Raphaelitism because not only was this type of decoration considered to be the latest phase of Pre-Raphaelitism, but also because by the turn-of-the-century, founders such as Ford Madox Brown, Millais, and Burne-Jones were all deceased. Along with other young artists in their thirties and forties, Waterhouse was "championed by some conservatives as one of their natural successors."[32] Critic Claude Phillips considered Waterhouse to be among "the moderates of modernity', those who embraced 'the modern French standpoint' without disregarding the "face of English art."[33] It was in this decade, the 1890s, that Waterhouse was hailed as having chosen a "pre-Raphaelite subject, and yet has treated it in such a way that is not pre-Raphaelite any more than it is impressionist, or touched with any other affectation."[34]

The author notes that during the 1900s, when critics were "turning against explicit narrative," Waterhouse began to paint women seated by steams or picking bright flowers. Trippi suggests that these canvases, though seemingly "plotless" may have actually been alluding to the Ovidian abductions of Oreithyia and Proserpina.[35] The duration of Waterhouse as a "modern Pre-Raphaelite" is not quantified or articulated in terms of dates or spans of his career. The 1888 *Lady of Shalott* stands alone in Waterhouse's oeuvre, but it may be argued that each time he

---

[30] Quoted in Trippi, 17.
[31] Quoted in Trippi, 18; Gleeson White, *The Master Painters of Britain*, London, 1898, vol. 4, p.10.
[32] Trippi, 18.
[33] Quoted in ibid., 18.; *Academy* 1201, 11 May 1895, p. 407.
[34] Quoted in ibid., 18.; *The Times*, 4 May 1895, p.12.
[35] Trippi, 20.

returned to a Pre-Raphaelite subject, such as themes from Tennyson, Keats or even Ovid, he was revitalizing his modern take on Pre-Raphaelitism. He continued to revisit selected imagery from the PRB through the twentieth-century until his death in 1917. While Trippi ultimately alludes to the artist's Pre-Raphaelite stage as being set over a two-year period, and picked up each time he did another version of *Shalott* or *Ophelia*, for example, it may be possible to posit that Waterhouse's Pre-Raphaelite tendencies ran through his career, *starting* with the 1888 composition. While it makes strategic sense that he would focus on compositions that would do well at exhibitions and earn profit, he never seemed to stray completely away from the PRB inspiration and source material found especially in the early work of Millais. Even the beautiful women in fields of wildflowers are reminiscent of Rossetti's stunners in what may be arguably considered the second phase of Pre-Raphaelitism.

Upstone, on the other hand, presents a different viewpoint of Waterhouse's Pre-Raphaelite period. He agrees with Trippi that 1890 began a new phase for the artist but claims that it was due to the fact that there was no buyer for the 1889 *Ophelia*. The aforementioned critic Claude Phillips saw the image only in nationalistic terms. He complained that:

> If the English painter is to attempt the interpretation of English humanity and English nature… from the French standpoint, art of serious and enduring work can hardly be the result. It is not possible to emulate the pictorial thoroughness, the technical energy and inventiveness of our neighbors without sacrificing national sincerity.[36]

He received much negative criticism and without a buyer for *Ophelia*, perhaps with the combination of the death of his father, he shifted his subjects to mythological ones and abandoned the naturalistic technique altogether, the criticism of painting based on French prototypes having become too extreme. The changes he made in theme and technique ultimately led to critical favor until his death in 1917.

---

[36] Quoted in Upstone, 48; "The Lady of Shalott," *The Art Journal,* 1889, p. 142.

Patty Wageman's essay, "Dream or Reality? Waterhouse's Women and Symbolism" presents yet another alternative view to the artist's career phases. She argues that he likely encountered French academic classicism early in his career (to explain the interest with Alma-Tadema), the Impressionists in the 1870s (to account for his technique change), and the Symbolists in the 1880s and 1890s (to describe the final phase of his career). As Wageman writes

> Bearing in mind the position of nineteenth-century women, one can appreciate that Waterhouses's sensual, magnificent, and seductive females must have had a particular power for his contemporaries, arousing feelings of both excitement and fear. Because he drew on literature that was widely known and selected compositions that resembled the work of his contemporaries, while using a Symbolist approach that everybody in his age could interpret… It was his freer manner of brushwork that distinguished his work from that of… contemporaries.[37]

Wageman's argument ultimately links Waterhouse with Symbolist Fernand Khnopff. She supports her theory based on the combination of beauty, theatricality, and death found in their respective works.[38] Moreover, Waterhouse and Khnopff's shared a concern for a certain type of face—the women they used had the same pensive face and self-absorbed expression.[39] The Symbolist movement "aimed at achieving meaning and beauty in a modern world in which the spiritual had to take on the challenge of materialism."[40] Both artists wanted to unite the literary and the visual, and like Waterhouse, Khnopff was an admirer of the early Pre-Raphaelites.[41] Perhaps the contemporary writers said it best: Knopff's first biographer wrote in 1886, "In the end he had to resort to the symbol, this ultimate union of observation and

---

[37] Ibid., 59; Wageman suggests that for more about Waterhouse's method of painting, see Robert Upstone's "Between Innovation and Tradition: Waterhouse and French Paining" in this catalogue.
[38] Wageman, 59.
[39] Ibid., 54.
[40] Ibid., 54.
[41] Ibid., 54.

feeling"[42]; while A.L.S. Baldry wrote of Waterhouse in 1908, "He lives in a world of his own imagining… [and the pictorial world was one] which knows nothing of the stress and turmoil of modern life."[43]

What is lacking from *Waterhouse: Modern Pre-Raphaelite* is that the relationship between Waterhouse and Burne-Jones is never actually addressed. On several occasions, the catalogue mentions Burne-Jones, but fails to specifically articulate the artists' connection or its importance, if it was even significant. In fact, Burne-Jones was only mentioned in the text a handful of times and even then, it was in used to describe the younger artist, saying, "He was, in fact, a kind of academic Burne-Jones, like him in his types and his moods, but with less instance on design and more on atmosphere."[44] This quote is included in several instances, but none of the scholars chose to elaborate on the comparison. And yet, in Prettejohn's entry, she recalls an anecdote about a private letter and its adjustment written by Ezra Pound. In the 1909 version, the author

> made reference to the beauty of Waterhouse's paintings, but denied them precisely the further dimension that distinguished them for Sketchly… In a revised version of the passage from the letter, published in 1910, Pound substitutes the name of Burne-Jones for that of Waterhouse, but makes the same distinction: "there are works of art which are beautiful objects and works of art which are keys or passwords admitting one to a deeper knowledge, to a finer perception of beauty." For Pound, then, Waterhouse and Burne-Jones had not made the transition from Aestheticism, the creation of beautiful objects for their own sake, to the deeper significance he finds in the art of his own compatriot, James McNeill Whistler, and the poetry of Dante.[45]

---

[42] Wageman, 54; Exhib. Cat., *Fernand Khnopff (1858-1921)*, Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten, Brussels 2004, p. 13 (note 3).

[43] Prettejohn, "Waterhouse's Imagination", 23; Unsigned article, probably by Alfred Lys Baldry, "Some Drawings by J.W. Waterhouse, RA," *Studio*, vol. XLIV, September 1908, p.250.

[44] "Mr. J. W. Waterhouse, R.A." *Times* [London, England] 12 Feb. 1917: 6. *The Times Digital Archive.* Web. 3 Sept 2015.

[45] Prettejohn, 33.; See Rebecca Beasley, "Ezra Pound's Whistler," *American Literature,* vol. 74, no. 3, 2002, p. 498-499.; Ezra Pound, *The Spirit of Romance*, Lodon: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1910, p. 162. Perhaps, in the published version, Pound was avoiding a disparaging reference to a living artist (Burne-Jones had died in 1898).

Linking Burne-Jones to Waterhouse in a manner that alludes to these two individuals working contemporaneously, and by extension, similar in both style and technique seems to be a peculiar choice. Burne-Jones (1833-1898) has been firmly considered one of the frontrunners of the second phase of Pre-Raphaelitism (along with Rossetti and William Morris) in much of the literature on the subject. John Christian classifies him as a "father-figure [and] clearly in a class of his own. Not only was he the crucial link with the immediate past, being the last of the great Pre-Raphaelites and a vital source of inspiration for a large proportion of… artists."[46] Waterhouse, on the other hand, is usually referenced as an "early Academic", a "last Romantic" or even as a member of the "younger generation." But yet, it is clear that the two men knew each other, both being elected as Associates of the RA in 1885.[47]

Wageman includes the sentiment that Waterhouse's treatment of the reclining woman, "typical of the way that many nineteenth-century painters depicted them," relates to compositions of his contemporaries, including Burne-Jones.[48] Nowhere, however, does the writer explicitly indicate a pattern of indebtedness between Waterhouse and Burne-Jones or even offer examples or analysis to support the claim. After reviewing a broad selection of each artist's work, is does seem abundantly clear that Waterhouse was often using Burne-Jones' earlier compositions as inspiration for his own work. Figural representations, including gestures, profiles, as well as subject matter are quite obvious. The illustration included in Wageman's essay, Burne-Jones' *Laus Veneris* (1868; fig. 104), suggests a visual link with the reclining female figure with winged attendants to Waterhouse's *St. Cecilia* (1895; fig. 105).

---

[46] Christian, *Last Romantics*, 11.
[47] Waterhouse was proposed for full Membership in 1893 (Hobson, 55) but was elected full Academician after the acclaim of his *St. Cecilia* in 1895, while Burne-Jones resigned from the RA in 1893.
[48] Wageman, 53.

However, one reference is not enough to prove a conscious pattern. In 1865, Burne-Jones produced *Astrologia* (fig. 106), a depiction of a red-haired woman in a voluminous red-sleeved gown, staring intently at a crystal ball. The reflection on the orb-like object reveals the viewer's space within the space—filled with two large windows at a perpendicular angle. Waterhouse's *Crystal Ball (without skull)* of 1902 (fig. 107) elaborates on that composition. There is a full-length portrait of a dark-haired woman, again dressed in a crimson gown, gazing fixedly at a crystal ball. She stands in front of a circular mirror which reflects the opposite side of the room. Both artists' renderings include an opened book in front of the women.

Waterhouse's *Tristan and Isolde Sharing the Potion* (1916; fig. 108) harkens back to Burne-Jones' wood engraving for the Dalziel Brothers, *Sigurd the Crusader* (1862; fig. 109). Both compositions show the male and female figures in profile aboard a ship. Tristan steps towards Isolde with his left foot to take the cup she offers, while Sigurd, a figure in Norse mythology, also extends his left leg as he reaches out to embrace the woman. Ironically, at this time, Burne-Jones had no experience in producing drawings for wood engravings. He was highly recommended to the Dalziels by Holman Hunt, who supposedly commented, "He is perhaps the most remarkable of all the younger men of the profession for talent, and will, undeniably, in a few years fill the high position in general public favor which at present he holds in the professional world."[49]

Moreover, Burne-Jones and Waterhouse depicted *Sleeping Beauty* (1871; fig. 110) and *Ariadne* (1898; fig. 111) respectively in much the same way. Each is a horizontal portrait of a reclining female figure with right elbow up and hand behind the head. Sleeping Beauty's body is

---

[49]Quoted from Tate Britain's website. Display caption for *Sigurd the Crusader*, engraved by the Dalziel Brothers published 1862. (accessed September 26, 2015). http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/burne-jones-sigurd-the-crusader-engraved-by-the-dalziel-brothers-n04046

suggested beneath the classically-inspired robes she wears. Semi-circular brambles are placed behind her (in a similar fashion as his *Briar Rose: Rose Bower,* 1890*)* and her bed is more of a horizontal dais which separates her from the landscape below. Ariadne, too, is lifted above the grasses and flowers. Her bare feet show beneath a loose and flimsy gown, with exposes her bare breast. The recumbent figure is not aware of the viewer's presence but the leopards that flank her protect their mistress. In the background is Theseus' ship, suggesting, as Chaucer's *Legend of Good Women* indicates, that he deserted his wife while she slept.[50] [51]

As far as the argument presented by Wageman that there was a definite link between Waterhouse and Symbolist Khnopff, both of whom aimed to unite the literary and visual, there is also a connection to be made with Burne-Jones. Khnopff, having first seen Burne-Jones' work at an exhibition in Paris in 1878 and then again in 1889, was profoundly affected by it.[52] In fact, Christopher Wood argues, in his publication *Burne-Jones*, that the artist, along with Rossetti and Watts, was a forerunner of European Symbolism. It was Wood's opinion that there are elements of Burne-Jones' work that are Symbolist, but that it is wrong to classify him as such. From an English standpoint, he was a Pre-Raphaelite and considered himself one until the end of his life; yet interestingly, from a European standpoint, he is being claimed for Symbolism.[53]

---

[50] Entry for John William Waterhouse, *Ariadne*, 1898
http://www.artmagick.com/pictures/picture.aspx?id=5625&name=ariadne-1898
(accessed 26 September 2015).
Quote [sic] from Geoffrey Chaucer: 'Whan Adryane his wif aslepe was/ For that hire syster fayrer was than she, / He taketh hire in his hond and forth goth he / To shipe, and as a traytour stal his wey, /Whil that this Adryane aslepe lay.'
[51] Additional examples: Burne-Jones, *Baleful Head* (1886-7) and Waterhouse, *The Danaîdes*; Burne-Jones, *March Marigold* (1870) and Waterhouse, *Gather thee Rosebuds while ye may* (1909).
[52] Wageman, 54.
[53] Wood, *Burne-Jones*, 150-151.

CONCLUSION

There is most assuredly, then, ample fodder for a more thorough examination between Waterhouse and Burne-Jones. While it is out of the scope of this dissertation chapter, it would be a worthwhile addition to any study on Waterhouse and his identity as a "modern Pre-Raphaelite." The obituary passage relating Waterhouse to his predecessor ultimately implies that he was a follower in the traditions and established techniques of the Academy. Yet, as Trippi and his co-authors established, the artist broke away from the stylistic preferences of the RA, and even the detail-driven Pre-Raphaelites, in favor of a different type of brushstroke as found in the work of nineteenth-century French artists.

It remains clear that Waterhouse *was* a modern variation on Pre-Raphaelitism. His modernity came from the combination of choosing literature and themes found among the PRB oeuvre, while adopting a different style, and it was this "freer manner of brushwork that distinguished his work from that of such contemporaries as Burne-Jones…and Khnopff."[54] And yet, the bold statement that, "He painted always like a scholar and a gentleman, though not like a great artist" from his obituary was misinformed. It is precisely because of this innovative and artistic union that he was a "great" artist. From the crucial moment in 1888 with his *Lady of Shalott* until his death in 1917, he found a way to create yet another incarnation of Pre-Raphaelitism.

[54] Wageman, 59.

Chapter 9
Thomas Cooper Gotch (1854-1931)

"*In the 1890s, as both the Victorian era and the century grew to a close, art itself would turn in search of new directions*."[1]

"*The increased concentration on the values of form and colour [sic], as against the Hogarthian virtues of description and storytelling, mark the later phase of Pre-Raphaelitism*."[2]

"*Mr. Thomas Cooper Gotch…has a claim to be remembered as an artist who, at a time when realism was in the fashion and in the very bosom of its most active school in England, boldly struck out a line for himself in decorative composition."*[3]

"…that most difficult of figures to categorize, T. C. Gotch, a Newlyn symbolist dedicated to expressing the sacramentality of childhood."[4]

Thomas Cooper Gotch, born in Kettering but eventually settled in Newlyn (England), is perhaps the most paradoxical artist of all the Pre-Raphaelitizing artists discussed in this entire dissertation. It has been asserted in many scholarly publications that he ought to be categorized as a Newlyn artist, a Symbolist, an Imaginative Symbolist, a Decorative, a blend of Pre-Raphaelite and Italian Renaissance, and now I add "Neo-Pre-Raphaelite" to the nomenclature. Even when he lectured about his work in 1887 and interviewed in 1895, he never answered about to which group he belonged or from whom he gathered inspiration. In fact, based on the extensive research done for this chapter, it appears that no scholar has taken the risk of trying to clarify the distinct phases of Gotch's oeuvre. Additionally, his obituaries mention basic facts about the life and exhibited works of this man who was described as "gentleman and artist."[5]

---

[1] Lionel Lambourne, *Victorian Painting* (London: Phaidon Press, 1999), 459.
[2] Tim Barringer, *Reading the Pre-Raphaelites* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 138.
[3] Pamela Lomax, *The Golden Dream*: *A Biography of Thomas Cooper Gotch* (Bristol: Sansom & Co., 2004), 9.; Quoted from part of the artist's obituary from *The Times.*
[4] John Christian, ed. *The Last Romantics: The Romantic Tradition in British Art: Burne-Jones to Stanley Spencer* (London: Lund Humphries in association with Barbican Art Gallery, 1989), 12.
[5] H.T., "Tribute to a Newlyn artist: The late Mr. T. C. Gotch," accessed from the archive of the Alfred East Gallery in Kettering.

One such obituary includes that "his widow and daughter claim with truth that "To know him was to love him."[6] One of these notices claim him as a Newlyn artist, while another refers to him as part of the Newlyn colony and suggests that he was eventually led to Symbolism.[7]

Why classify T.C. Gotch as a Neo-Pre-Raphaelite ?

While the reasons for these variant categorizations will be examined, it will also be made clear how and when exactly Gotch exhibited patterns of indebtedness that qualify him as a Neo-Pre-Raphaelite. Up until this point, each artist demonstrated inspiration by primarily drawing from the early phase of Pre-Raphaelitism, as well as revealing a direct connection to hybrid artist Abbey. Gotch's art reveals indebtedness to the PRB, particularly Millais, as well as to his own contemporaries, especially Cowper. And there is reasonable evidence to speculate that he was either known by or knew of the American Abbey. To fully appreciate Gotch's work, connections, and originality, it must be kept in mind that he was older than the other Neo-Pre-Raphaelites. Gotch, along with Waterhouse and Abbey, was born in the late 1840s-early 1850s; the younger contemporaries (Cowper, Shaw, and Brickdale) were born in the 1870s. Gotch, being born in 1854, was actually "birthed" around the time the original PRB dissolved and moved in different directions.

This begs the question, then: how did Gotch know Abbey? While there is no mention in the Gotch or Abbey scholarship indicating a direct connection, there is enough evidence to make a speculative argument that they either knew each other personally or at least knew *of* each other via their respective work exhibited at the Royal Academy. It is rather feasible that the two artists were familiar with the other, as Gotch began to exhibit at the RA in 1880 and Abbey in 1885

[6] Ibid., n.p.
[7] The first obituary is ibid., the second obituary, also found in the archives in Kettering, does not include any publication information.

with a drawing and begins to send oil paintings in starting in 1890. Gotch never achieved membership to the RA schools; likewise, the artist was never elected as Academician, being denied twice (1897, 1899). Abbey, on the other hand, was elected Associate of the Royal Academy in 1896 and full Academician in 1898. However, both artists exhibited regularly in the RA exhibitions so there is every reason to believe that sometime in the overlapping twenty-five years, their paths must have crossed.

Moreover, both Gotch and Abbey shared a mutual friend in John Singer Sargent. Sargent and Gotch were both co-founders and exhibitors at the first exhibition in 1886 for the New English Art Club. The NEAC was an alternate exhibition venue to the Royal Academy; and in its early years, was intended to be an exhibiting society by artists influenced by Impressionism and whose work was rejected by the RA. Four years later, in 1890, both Sargent and Abbey were commissioned to create murals for the Boston Public Libraries. They studied and sketched together during the winter at Abbey's home. Abbey's mural scheme detailed *The Quest for the Holy Grails* (1890-1902), while Sargent focused on *The Triumph of Religion* (1890-1919). Sargent even completed the Harrisburg murals when Abbey died in 1911. Based on correspondence left by Abbey, he and Sargent enjoyed a close friendship. Sargent, therefore, may have provided a formal introduction between Abbey and Gotch. While speculative, I believe that the presented evidence strongly suggests that on some level—social or professional—Gotch knew Abbey. This link, therefore, satisfies the requirement of Gotch as an Abbey-centric Neo-Pre-Raphaelite.

In 1887, T.C. Gotch gave a lecture at the Penzance Institute and imparted the closest answer recorded as to how *he* believed he should be classified:

> he belonged to a modern school of painting, which shared some of the principles of the Pre-Raphaelites, but did not carry fidelity to Nature to the same extreme. The more

> important influence came from lessons about light from France. "The light out of doors is quite different from the light in a studio…the former coming from all parts of the sky, while the latter comes in at the window and only lights a figure on one side. The painters of the old school painted their landscapes out of doors and painted the figures in them from models in the light and shade of the studio; thus they had two totally different effects of light, which should not exist together in one picture.[8]

ACCEPTED SCHOLARLY CATEGORICAL PHASES OF GOTCH'S CAREER: NEWLYN, SYMBOLIST, "IMAGINATIVE SYMBOLIST / DECORATIVE"

As previously mentioned, the artist has been attributed to being a member of the Newlyn School as well as a Symbolist. Additionally, it was his most vocal critic, A.L. Baldry, from *The Studio* that first distinguished Gotch as an "imaginative symbolist" and "decorative."[9] Despite being written in 1898, Baldry continued to refer to any image produced for the rest of Gotch's career that bore any resemblance to anything painted in Italy (1891) or after his return to Newlyn as Imaginative Symbolism or Decorative. Other critics and scholars in succession of Baldry did the same thing; while some claim it ended around the start of the century, other observe that if you look at the entire scope of the artist's career, there were "these" types of paintings executed until the end of his life in 1931. As an alternative to Baldry's audacious terminology, it could be argued that the Symbolist / Imaginative Symbolist / Decorative distinction can be condensed to an extension of Pre-Raphaelite Symbolism.

---

[8] Quoted in Lomax, 87.; T.C.Gotch, "An Artist on Art," Penzance Institute Lectures, *The Cornish Telegraph*, Thursday December 15 1887.

[9] A. L. Baldry, "The Work of T.C.Gotch," *The Studio* Vol XIII, March 1898, p. 73-82.

EDUCATION

Gotch started studying at Heatherly's to become an artist at the age of twenty-one, ultimately a starting point of his fifty-five year career.[10] He enrolled in The Heatherly's School of art in 1876, a time in which

> the middle classes had become an important market… their taste in art favored historical, religious, and narrative painting, and was [catered] to by Academicians like Leighton (1830-1896) and Poynter (1836-1919)… their attitude towards academic art was dominating the teaching in art school, and any foreign influence was strongly resisted.[11]

Ultimately, he decided to leave, as it failed to provide him with the skills necessary to gain entry to the Royal Academy Schools of Art. As a result of this lack of training, he applied to the RA and was denied on three separate occasions.

In 1877, the artist enrolled at Verlat's Academy in the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Antwerp. Gotch was originally attracted to this institution because of his need for better instruction in drawing. Though Verlat's eventual

> preference that students study nature and engage in "open air" work had not yet been established, so that the students spent a good deal of time drawing from casts rather than examining the natural world. The School was popular with English students because it promoted traditional subject matter and a dark palette.[12]

This did not appeal to the artist, as he favored brighter colors and a more decorative approach. A letter dated 18 November 1877 emphasized that "on the whole it seems to be a good foundation, for before all things, light and shade is taught here—things for which beginners, I think, do not see."[13] His commentary about his experience was paradoxical: on one hand, he had come for more vigorous lessons on drawing, yet he complained that "he spent too long in the drawing

---

[10] The Alfred East Gallery, "Thomas Cooper Gotch: The Making of an Artist", copyright retained by Patrick Bruce Hepburn, 1994, p.6
[11] Ibid., 7.
[12] Lomax, 35.
[13] This excerpt of letter is reproduced in ibid., 8; Lomax, 9; The Royal Cornwall Museum (exhibition), "Thomas Cooper Gotch: The Last of the Pre-Raphaelites" (Royal Institution of Cornwall, Cornwall: 2001), n.p.; Gotch panel text courtesy of the Alfred East Gallery archives in Kettering.

classes and when he tried his beloved colors, and painted himself…the result was failure and misgiving."[14]

In correspondence he continued with one particular classmate and friend, Jane Ross, he wrote that he "envied her the liberty to paint, to draw hands or to do what you will."[15] It would seem, then, that the curriculum in Antwerp (and any school associated with the Royal Academy) was much more vigorous than his previous instruction. He continued, "here we must do what we are told…and if we break the rules are reminded that we are only allowed in the school as a favor," On the whole, the letters between them reveal "an [exchange] of views on art, philosophy, and the meaning of life…[and] showed a temperamental empathy with the Pre-Raphaelite movement."[16] According to a 2001 exhibition on T.C.G. as "The Last of the Pre-Raphaelites," the time spent in Antwerp was rewarding to his continued career because it was under this rigorous training that he learned about the use of tone and an interest in classical mythology and contemporary stories, including the likes of Homer, Shakespeare, and Dante. It is arguable, then, that these sources contributed a strong influence over his so-called "symbolist" work.[17]

After the painting and drawing exams in Antwerp, the artist enrolled at the Slade School in 1878, where he stayed for two years. Gotch's intent was to receive more training, thereby increasing his chances for admittance at the RA schools. Unfortunately, the third and final rejection notice arrived in 1879. While at the Slade, he studied under the newly appointed Professor of Fine Art, Alphonse Legros.[18] Gotch's time at Slade was profitable—not only did it

---

[14] Lomax, 36.
[15] Ibid., 8.
[16] Ibid., 9. There is no footnote or bibliographic information about the location of the letter. From the bibliographic information provided in the catalogue, my best guess is that it is held either privately by the Gotch family or at the Tate Archive. The specifics of the Tate findings is "two letters."
[17] Paraphrased from Royal Cornwall Museum, n.p.
[18] Legros had been persuaded to travel to London in 1863 by Whistler, who encouraged him to teach etching at the South Kensington Schools of Art. The Slade School opened in 1871and the former took over the posting at Slade after the previous professor, Poynter, had died.

focus his studies on technical skills, it also allowed for tutelage from Legros. While he did not know it then, Gotch would never be accepted for membership to the RA as a student or Academician, but he would start exhibiting his work with them starting the following year in 1880.

Lomax indicates that the artist's time at the Slade School was remarkably happy:

> He made friends with deeply committed young artists who explored the meaning of art at the same time as they developed their technical skills. Tom's first success was in the etching class where he produced work that was exhibited and sold.[19]

It was here that he and Henry Tuke became the best of lifelong friends. Tuke believed that clearly, Gotch was "the catalyst figure of that generation of students."[20] The two classmates went on a sketching holiday in 1879, eventually visiting current colleague Caroline "Carrie" Yates. She and Gotch enjoyed a strictly platonic relationship, but would be married two years later.

His time at the Slade was a positive experience, in part because of Professor Legros, who, as argued by some, "probably exercised the first significant influence on Gotch."[21] Legros, a "product of Paris" was a member of the realist school and close friend to Bastien-Lepage.[22] He remained consistent in the "style he had developed which found its inspiration in the French peasantry,"[23] even encouraging his students to go to Paris (which would be Gotch's next artistic stop) to learn from the masters there.

As Lomax speculates, Gotch would likely have warmed to the "delicate line work with the pale grey Italian chalk that Legros preferred to the stumped and fully shaded drawing that Verlat, the professor [from] Antwerp, had thought was a better training and preparation for tone

---

[19] Lomax, 10.
[20] Quoted from Alfred East Gallery, 12.; the quote itself is quoted in the catalogue but there is no indication of an original source.
[21] Alfred East Gallery, 11.
[22] Ibid., 11.
[23] Ibid., 11.

and color."[24] The artist continued to practice the art of etching, as "he had learned to handle the technique with both confidence and skill."[25] One description of that time claims that "Legros had rigged up the top floor of the building [at the Slade] as an etching room, and there, every Saturday, Goulding the master printer attended and some of us started cheerfully on spoiling many copper and zinc plates."[26]

By the end of his first year, Gotch had experienced much success, undoubtedly as a result of the rigorous training and extra practice. In February of 1879, his pictures had been accepted for exhibition at the Albert Hall. His works, most likely etchings, were in the upper galleries surrounding the great hall where artists such as Alma-Tadema and Leighton were also represented. In June, two of his etchings were "accepted for the prestigious 7th Black and White exhibition at Dudley Hall."[27]

After these successes, he was invited by the Messrs. Dowdeswell to submit proofs "with a view for business."[28] Dowdeswell, as mentioned in Chapter 7, was known to have the finest collections of etchings in London. Goulding, the aforementioned master print maker from Slade, agreed to print proofs and when the young man commented that he was expecting a great demand for his works, the instructor replied, "Accept my best wishes for an immense success—at the same time don't count upon too extensive a brood of chickens."[29] Despite the lackluster response, Gotch continued to have success with his etchings and submitted them to Goulding for printing. Although it is impossible to know exactly how many plates were printed, it has been recorded that four were submitted to the RA and Goulding bought sixteen! Goulding wrote in

---

[24] Lomax, 39. I'm not sure if I necessarily agree that he "would have" immediately taken to this new style, but am in agreement that, as mere speculation, it is quite possible that he did.
[25] Lomax, 40.
[26] Ibid., 40.
[27] Ibid., 40.
[28] Quoted in ibid., 40 with no indication of its source.
[29] Quoted in ibid., 40; again with no bibliographic reference.

April 1880 that he had "taken three *Keats*, four *Girl on Sea Shore,* three *Repas,* and three each of the two *Heads*… [each] cost a pound sterling: "so draw a huge cheque on your banker."""[30] Popular among his classmates, his contemporary, Walter Sparrow, "noted that Gotch had become a firm favorite of his professor, Alphonse Legros." His praise continued

> Gotch stood out among the students. We regarded him as a true Tolstoyan, always eager to everything for himself, except cooking his own means during the hours of work in the torrid life class.[31]

At term's end in June 1880, Gotch decided to go to Paris in the autumn, following advice from Legros, who often encouraged his students to continue their education in Paris. Once there, he was set to attend the atelier of Jean-Paul Laurens, a move that would prove most useful to his career.

PARIS: ATELIER OF JEAN-PAUL LAURENS AND INTRODUCTION TO BASTIEN-LEPAGE'S IDEAS

Jean-Paul Laurens was a respectable instructor who "painted large formal historical pictures in the tragic manner, which suited Tom's interest in figurative work… [Another student believed Laurens to be the only sound teacher, indicating] "He seems to know so exactly what each man wants and how much to give."[32] Gotch, meanwhile, admired Lauren's interest and originality in composition, but adjusting from etching to painting proved difficult.

While Gotch was in Paris, so too was Jules Bastien-Lepage. As one of the most powerful and influential advocates of naturalism, "he promoted the aesthetic of the "sketch" without going

---

[30] Ibid., 40; the remark about the banker is quoted in the text, again with no reference.
[31] Quoted in ibid., 40.; My best guess is that it came from Maria Tuke Sainsbury, *Henry Scott Tuke: A Memoir,* (London: Martin Secker), 1933.
[32] Quoted in ibid., 47.; No bibliographical information provided.

to the extremes of Impressionism…"[33] Though criticized by many, Bastien-Lepage received great praise in a 1904 Royal Academy Lecture, saying "Bastien as a painter was incomparably more able and skillful… giving the true effect of people in the open air with the light and actual color of nature…more beautiful than any other."[34] Ironically, he was friends with Alphonse Legros (previous instructor of T.C. Gotch) and together, their influence

> carried the message of naturalism across the channel to London, [and] was to be seen later in the work of a small group of English painters who settled one by one in Newlyn during the '80s, eventually including Gotch, and which became known as the Newlyn School. Several of these had been working in Paris when Bastien-Lepage was at the peak of his authority and had already, like Gotch, been under the influence of Legros at the Slade in London.[35]

VISITS TO NEWLYN – PARIS – RETURN TO NEWLYN

Thomas Gotch married Carrie Yates in Newlyn on 31 August 1881. With Gotch now in Newlyn, it was there that he produced arguably the first of his "Newlyn works" during the rest of summer. His marriage gave his work a new confidence and direction. As a result, he set out with renewed vitality to paint from Nature, by default en plein air, and sought a persistent attention to detail (realism). The area was indeed a dream for the artist—there were plenty of subjects from which to choose and the fine weather provided the perfect atmosphere.

> The pictures were painted with the strong anecdotal content that was to become associated with "Newlyn" paintings…Tom Cross writes that the style of these pictures was "tonal and silvery, combining accuracy of detail that had been dear to British art since the Pre-Raphaelites. Authenticity was important and local people were often used as models, set against the background of their homes and streets."[36]

---

[33] Alfred East Gallery, 13; See also Dennis Farr, *English Art 1870-1940* (Oxford Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 1984), 33.
[34] Quoted in ibid.
[35] Ibid., 14.
[36] Lomax, 51.

The Gotches returned to Paris for the continuance of their education and these months were extremely productive for Gotch. Among other works, he produced and submitted two separate pictures to the Royal Academy, *Phyllis*, an oil of a girl reading and *A Quiet Snooze* depicting a sleeping boy. They returned to England for Easter, and it wasn't until their return to France when the received a letter from a friend, "I went to the Academy and lo and behold in the first room was *Phyllis*, looking very nice on the line…" The painting was sold on the first day for £35.[37]

Unfortunately, Carrie became quite ill after the birth of their daughter Phyllis, with the French doctor expressing grave concern about her lungs.[38] Henry Tuke, among other friends, believed her illness was related to overworking, yet Lomax suggests that they were all echoing an earlier warning about "all that standing and being shut up in such a hot atmosphere."[39]

It was at this time they returned to Newlyn and his wife "responded well to the sea air and slowly mended. During her recovery, Tom continued to paint and soon realized that "the beaches were covered with tall easels and ingenious contrivances and appurtenances'."[40]

NEWLYN AND STANHOPE FORBES

On a visit to Penzance in 1885, the Gotches and Stanhope Forbes met for the first time. Forbes was the leading figure among artists who had settled in Newlyn in the early 1880s who were devoted to plen-airism and the example of Bastien-Lepage with the square-brush technique. Although both men had been studying in Paris at the same time, their paths never crossed. Forbes' diaries recounted his impressions of the first time he met the couple, describing him as "a week

[37] *A Quiet Snooze* was rejected by the RA.; I have not been able to locate an image of *Phyllis.*
[38] Phyllis was named after the aforementioned painting which hung on the line at the RA.
[39] Quoted in Lomax, 54. This information is also available in any biography about Thomas, Carrie, or their relationship and careers.
[40] Ibid., 54.

sort of creature [and likened him to] an unmade bed; [and Carrie he regarded as] very aesthetic and untidy."[41] Luckily, the friendship between the three grew and together they collaborated on a number of Newlyn societies, including the New English Art Club (1886).

Over the years, more artists frequented Newlyn; the Gotches loved the area as a peaceful place in which to practice new techniques and live a slower paced life. When Stanhope Forbes visited in 1884, he wrote home immediately to say that "Newlyn is a sort of English Concarneau and is the haunt of a great many painters."[42] Sometime later, he wrote to *The Cornishman*, that "they are flocking in here each day," and suggesting that there were about twenty-seven artists were currently *residing* there, again suggesting that they were spending stretches of time in Newlyn but would be moving on or returning to studios, like Tom and Carrie had done several times.[43] Interestingly, there wasn't necessarily one specific individual advocate for the group that was slowly forming and would eventually be known as a collective group. Instead, as fellow artist and resident of the area, Norman Garstin, wrote, it was

> the friendship and *camaraderie* of the ateliers of Paris and Antwerp, a sympathy with each others' intentions, a mild climate suitable for out of door work, a gray roofed village overhanging a lovely bay—these were the determining causes that led to the young artists setting up their easels hard by the Cornish sea, and the same causes, aided by that cumulative sedative called habit, have held many of them ever since.[44]

In 1885, Gotch was interviewed for an article from *Black and White* about his work, career, and the obvious changes of style over the years. In answer to questions about his status as one of the original settlers in Newlyn, he answered,

> I first saw Newlyn in 1879, and did much work here in 1881 and 1883, which was before the original settlement. Then I came here to settle in 1887, and for a time did a good deal

[41] Quoted in Alfred East Gallery, 16-17,; no original source provided.
[42] Quoted in Caroline Fox, *Artists of the Newlyn School: 1880-1900* (Newlyn Cornwall: Newlyn Orion Galleries, 1979), 13.; Concarneau, roughly the equivalent of a township, is part of Brittany, located in northwestern France.
[43] Quotation from Ibid., 13.
[44] Quoted from ibid., 15; Norman Garstin, *The Work of Stanhope A Forbes, ARA, Studio I,* vol.23, 1901, 88.

> of work which might, more or less inaccurately, be described as belonging to the Newlyn School. That is, I painted, or endeavored to paint, what I saw.[45]

What a very Pre-Raphaelite comment! An artist endeavoring to paint what is seen in nature was one of the characteristics of the early phases of Pre-Raphaelitism.

As a seaside town and fishing port of Cornwall, Newyln's principal industry was fishing, and as such was the main contributor to the residents' livelihoods. For the artist, the area provided idyllic coastal views, a close observation of the demanding physical labor surrounding the entirety of the fishing process, along with local villagers and their daily comings and goings which provide ample subject matter for all in-coming artists. When exhibited at the RA in 1885, Forbes' work *A Fish Sale on a Cornish Beach* brought attention to this movement and its members.

In the early to mid 1880s, the artists saw themselves as a distinct group. In 1886, Forbes wrote, "The RA this year may best be described as the 'triumph of Newlyn'"; and the following year he proudly announced that "Newlyn has come off wonderfully."[46] In 1888, reference to the so-called "Newlyn School" was first used publicly,[47] with a critic, articulating, that "The Newlyners are the most significant body of painters now in England."[48] An 1889 newspaper clipping confirmed their success, "… the applause has not been stinted and the Newlyn School can surely not complain of want of recognition."[49] Throughout the 1890s, the title "Newlyn School" was used regularly.[50]

---

[45] T.C. Gotch, "Realist as Mystic: an interview with Mr. Thomas Cooper Gotch," *Black and White: a weekly illustrated record and review,* September 21, 1895.
[46] Fox, *Artists of Newlyn*, 11.
[47] Ibid., 11.; No footnote provided.
[48] Ibid., 11.; Marion Hepworth-Dixon in *Magazine of Art*, 1892, 181.
[49] Quoted in ibid., 11.; The references in the back of the book only attribute this to "a newspaper cutting of 1889 quoting 'Mr. Quilter' in the Forbes' family papers.", 69.
[50] Paraphrased from ibid., 11.

The Newlyn School had certain characteristics, many of which were in accordance with that of Pre-Raphaelitism. They worked en plein-air and held a strong belief that a "direct inspiration of nature was the creed of the day, and a feeling of reaction from academic traditions, and studio work as opposed to work on the spot, actuated most of the students."[51] Similarly, as argued, these artists were inspired and influenced by Bastien-Lepage and his pedagogy. His supporters admired the "uncompromising realism" in his works as well as "an absolute fidelity to nature", both qualities noted by his devotees and critics alike.[52] A great believer of realism, Bastien-Lepage's most important contribution to his preferred style of realism was a "loving, yet impartial presentation..."[53]

In 1891, Gotch was working on *Sharing Fish* (fig. 112). Considering it a major "Newlyn" picture, it details fishwives dividing a catch on the beach. For the artist, he referred to it as a "story picture," in that it demonstrates an old custom called "casting lots." In this tradition, several fishwives would jointly purchase a quantity of fish and then proceed to divvy it up into equal amounts (lots). When a passerby appeared, the women would each give a token to identify each woman. The onlooker would then haphazardly throw the identifying markers on each of the individual lots.[54]

As a "Newlyn" painting, it includes the basic tenets of the school and even some of Bastien-Lepage's principles. The out of doors scene has been produced en–plein--air, focusing on the daily activities of the fishwives, and dedicated to a very particular color palette. Newlyners usually concentrated on nuanced greys and green, yet there a great amount of blue in this painting. Formally, Gotch was playing with the contrasting colors of blue and brown: the

[51] Ibid., 15.
[52] Both quotes from ibid., 18.
[53] Ibid., 18.
[54] A description of "casting the lot" has been paraphrased from Lomax, 98.

position of the blue fish versus the brown sand and the color of garments compared to the surroundings. As a stylistically "Newlyn" work, it is more bright and airy than some of the other "traditional" imagery produced during this time.

1891-1892: TRIP TO FLORENCE—FROM NEWLYN SCHOOL TO "IMAGINATIVE REALISM/DECORATIVE TO SYMBOLISM" [PRE-RAPHAELITE SYMBOLISM]

Art critic Lewis Hind proposed that the pivotal trip to Florence the family took in 1891-1892 which "stimulated the artist's sense of color and led to his forsaking "the realities of modern life [for] the realism of allegory."[55] He further advocated that 1896 was the artist's most notable year. Hind's articles created the myth the trip to Italy was a "right of passage from "Newlyn" to "Symbolism.""[56]

Moreover, as Lomax points out in *A Winter in Florence 1891-1892*:

> Art historians seem agreed that the visit was a turning point in both his method of painting and his subject matter. They say that until 1891, Tom Gotch had mainly worked along traditional Newlyn lines, treating local subjects in a realistic manner, owing much to Bastien-Lepage. In his early work, Baldry recognized Tom's undeniable faculty for being exact and his search for realism as if it were worthy to be the one supreme aim of all modern artists.[57]

Finally, Baldry's article confirms that not only did the trip to Italy coincide with the greatest change in his methods, an observation agreed upon by all scholars, the:

> Italian color seems to have convinced him, and to have urged him to strive for a strength and variety of chromatic arrangement which he never before attempted.[58]

---

[55] Lomax, 111.
[56] Ibid., 111.
[57] Pamela Lomax, *A Winter in Florence* (Penzance: Shears & Hogg Publications, 2001), 9-10.
[58] Baldry, 82.

EARLIER VS. LATER PRE-RAPHAELITES AND SYMBOLISM

In the winter of 1891-1892, T.C. Gotch took his wife and daughter to Florence, an idea suggested by Tuke a decade earlier. The trip turned out to a true turning point in Gotch's work and would begin the second half of his career—for which he is most arguably known. Gotch, like the Pre-Raphaelites before him, found inspiration not from the landscape or the city, but in work by such quattrocento artists as Fra Angelico, Gozzoli and Giovanni Bellini. Ironically, it has been claimed that these three artists were some of the greatest of all Madonna painters, and works by these artists were accessible for viewing in Florence at the Uffizi, the San Marco convent and the Medici Palace. It is reasonable to believe that Gotch was attracted to this imagery and these particular artists because of his intrinsic love of

> color, rich brocade, embroidery, ornament and pageantry, and responded to the spiritual grace of the human figure, was overwhelming and immediate; the contrast to the melancholy grey of the Newlyn genre must have been shattering, and it shaped the course his painting was to take for the next twenty years and beyond.[59]

The other influencing factor on his work from 1891 and beyond was his daughter, Phyllis. On the trip, it is argued in nearly any scholarly writing on this point in Gotch's career, was that he saw his nine-year old daughter "as she grew to maturity, embodying for him all the mysteries, innocence and beauty of childhood and adolescence."[60] It could be claimed, then, that the result of this pivotal trip to Gotch's work production was a previously unexplored interest in the notion of transition, particularly as it pertains to coming-of-age; Motherhood (Madonna and Child imagery); and spirituality.

---

[59] Ibid., 19.
[60] Ibid., 19.

MY CROWN AND SCEPTRE

My Crown and Sceptre (1891; fig. 113) was Gotch's first painting of this new "genre" where he explored an interest in creating portraits of children, a decision which disregarded all Newlyn subjects. The painting displays his daughter Phyllis in Renaissance costume, seated in a straight-back chair, wearing a crown of red berries, holding a small bouquet of red flowers in her right hand and a cornstalk (the sceptre) in her left. Behind her is a tapestry, orange in color like her dress, with the repeated pattern of golden fleur-de-lis, again to bring out the golden qualities of her garment. Red is repeated in the crown, and flowers, as well as the necklace of beads (or murano glass as they were in Tuscany) strung around her neck. She looks straight at the viewer, with bold eyes, a regal expression, and calm demeanor.

One of the things this composition revealed about this visit to Italy was that it could be considered as

> a very outspoken protest against the grey monotone affected by the West of England painters. Italian color seems to have convinced him, and to have urged him to strive for a strength and variety of chromatic arrangement which he never before attempted. Ever since, he has been a lover of sumptuous combinations, and has reveled in the representation of the gorgeous textures, the brocades and embroideries, the laces and adornments, which are so lovingly treated in the works of the Italian masters. Here, apparently, he found the revelation which he wanted to divert him from the grey melancholy of realism into the glowing sumptuousness of decoration, and here he was taught to understand himself.[61]

Gotch described this work as "a straightforward portrait of Phyllis, she holds a reed in her left hand and wears a crown of red berries."[62] It has been put forward that with the artist's newfound recognition that innocence of childhood was transitory, he recognized that his daughter was

---

[61] Baldry, 82.
[62] Lomax, *Winter in Florence,* 5,; Philip Saunders, unpublished catalogue raissone [sic], entry C90.

growing from childhood to girlhood. Given that lens, the "crown of berries reflected Christ's crown of thorns; the child and its innocence would have to die to become the adult."[63]

The title alone indicates that this image is presenting Phyllis as a princess, due to the determiner of "my" in reference to the crown and sceptre, tools usually relegated to royalty. Yet, the viewer sees her as a young, nine-year old girl, acting more like a tiny adult. This direct stare and straight posture (emphasized by the vertical cornstalk) reveal the sitter to a model of girlhood rather than childhood. The artist's portrait of his daughter acknowledges her maturation process. Yet, much like Cowper's *Erasmus* mural (Chapter 4), this, too, could be considered an image of a child reenacting adult behavior.[64] Hence, her crown is made of berries, the sceptre is no more than a stalk of corn, the bouquet of berries on her lap is perhaps an orb, an object usually accompanied by the sceptre, and in lieu of the extravagant jewels worn by kings and queens, she is adorned by a simple string of beads that lay atop a collar buttoned completely up to the neck. Gotch's portrait allows for a visual translation of Phyllis' transition between childhood and girlhood, but she has yet to mature to adulthood.

There is visual Pre-Raphaelite precedent for such an image.[65] Ford Madox Brown's 1860 *English Boy* (1860, fig. 114) is a portrait of the artist's son. Though considerably younger than Phyllis, he is rosy cheeked and has bright blue eyes. He, too, is wearing a tilted straw hat (crown), holding a whip (sceptre) and a top (orb), as if he was about to play a game of croquet. His collar is also buttoned to the neck and the alternating red buttons surround his neck in the same manner as Phyllis' necklace. Instead of embroidered drapery behind the child, he has been placed against an unarticulated green background. This oil is different from that of Gotch

[63] Lomax, *Golden Dream*, 99.
[64] For additional examples, please refer to Hunt's *King of Hearts* (fig. 36) as seen in Chapter 4.
[65] Additionally, Holman Hunt's *King of Hearts* (1862-1863) also shows a small boy, wearing an outfit close in resemblance to the *Henry VI* by Holbein. The croquet ball in his hand is the orb and the sceptre is the pole with heart decoration above it.

because Brown's represents more of an image *playing at* being royalty, instead of re-enacting or parodying it. Note that in both titles, the names of the sitters, though known in scholarship, are not indicated. This removes each of the youths one step from being given the perceived adult role as king or queen.

Furthermore, returning to the idea that the crown of berries was an allusion to Christ's crown of thorns and the knowledge that the innocence of childhood would have to die so that adulthood could be reached, *My Crown and Sceptre*, in addition to a portrait of the sitter, may indeed be an exploration of the Christian faith and God's rule over the world. If that is the case, then Gotch was undoubtedly channeling Millais' *Christ in the house of his parents* (1849-50; fig. 115). A canonical work of Pre-Raphaelitism, it shows the young boy immediately after he has injured Himself while trying to remove a nail from a board with pincers. The blood from His injured palm has dripped onto the tops of both his feet, undoubtedly foreshadowing the stigmata. Though he is portrayed as a young boy being tended to by His mother and cousin (John the Baptist), the detailing of the painting indicate an entire biblical typology indicating that ultimately, his childhood will end so that the adulthood can begin. In a twist of irony, Christ began his sermons at the age of thirty-three, obviously in his adult years, but according to Christian catechism, he needed to literally die so that the believers would be free of Original Sin. Unlike Phyllis and the English boy's innocence of childhood to die for adulthood to begin, Christ's rite of passage was for the adult body to perish in order to protect the innocence of the believers, reiterating Galatians 3: 26, "So in Christ… you are all children of God."[66]

Along with that biblical quote could be Burne-Jones' *The Merciful Knight* (1863; fig. 116). The subject was taken from the life of "the Florentine knight St. John Gualberto, founder of the Valombrosan Order in 1039, who was miraculously embraced by a wooden statue of

[66] Galatian's 3:26; New International Version

Christ when praying at a wayside shrine, after forgiving the murder of his kinsman."[67] Though this may not be an obvious choice for a comparison with Gotch's work, the knight does indeed bring with him his crown (helmet) and sceptre (sword). The statue of the crucified Christ has come to life, leaning over to kiss the knight's forehead and embrace him in a gesture of protection.

EXTENSION OF PRE-RAPHAELITE / NEO-PRE-RAPHAELITE SYMBOLISM

One of the statements that has been made, and many scholars feel comfortable with this assumptions, is that post-Italy, Gotch became a Symbolist, or as Baldry declared in *The Studio*,

> Our younger artists have long inclined rather towards the realization of facts than towards the expression of abstractions...[and they are not concerned] with those intellectual subtleties which are capable of inspiring the painter's art with noble individuality and definite distinction. [68]

The Alfred East Gallery in Kettering held an exhibition *The Magic Web* (n.d.) which included a selection of Gotch's categorized Symbolist works: *Death the Bride* (1895), *The Flag* (1910), *The Vow* (n.d.), *The Exile* (1895), *A Jest* (1902/1903), *The Child Enthroned* (1894), *Holy Motherhood* (1892) and *They Come* (n.d.), not all of which will be discussed here. The argument for claiming these works (and others) as Symbolist is most likely due to the movement's rejection of naturalism and narrative; instead, there was a focus on a subjective representation of an idea or emotion. By contrast, Baldry upheld the belief that Gotch,

> In his fidelity to Nature, and in his regard for the facts which she supplies, he is exact enough to please the most uncompromising believer in realistic accuracy; but in the suggestion of his later pictures he makes a persuasive appeal to the thoughtful lovers of poetic art, and touches a chord to which the idealist is always ready to respond… Not until he had tried many forms of realism, and of dramatic subject-painting, did he turn to the combination of symbolism and decoration that has, by its originality and definite

---

[67] Quoted in Wood, *Burne-Jones*, 42.
[68] Baldry, 73.

> character, distinguished him as a worker in art who has a rare faculty of invention and a really intellectual motive in everything he attempts.[69]

While it is true that these aforementioned images deny any reference to narrative and emphasize an idea-- such as the transition between childhood and adulthood, and all the rights of passage in between—the artist oftentimes used a mixture of symbolism and decoration.

Essayist Robert de la Sizeranne for *Le Correspondant* declared in 1892 that there were "kindred traits of the Pre-Raphaelites and the Rosicrucians, emphasizing both groups' common goal of revitalizing art with serious subjects and of trying to discover eternal symbols behind everyday—even fleeting or intangible—appearances."[70] Millais' *Ophelia* (fig. 14) proved to be the most evocative images essential to the Symbolist preference for a female protagonist "floating in a literal or metaphoric state of repose, suspended in a twilight zone of inner vision and sensuality."[71] It comes as no surprise, then, that the Symbolists were great admirers of Rossetti's *Beata Beatrix* (fig. 65) and Burne-Jones' *Beguiling of Merlin* (fig. 64). By the 1880s, they were considered the "new" Pre-Raphaelites and to that end, were revered as frontrunners for Symbolism. These artists, which also included (Neo-Pre-Raphaelite) Marie Spartali Stillman and John Melhuish Strudwick, "generated a visionary quality" which appealed to the Symbolists, "These figures have an immobility, a silence, a pose almost suspended, a slow hesitation in their rare movements, which make them resemble something like sleepwalkers."[72]

---

[69] Baldry, 74.
[70] Quoted in Susan Casteras, "The Pre-Raphaelite Legacy to Symbolism" in Susan Casteras and Alicia Craig Faxon *Pre-Raphaelite art and its European Context* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1995), 39.
[71] Ibid., 34.
[72] Quoted in ibid., 37.

CHILDHOOD & RITES OF PASSAGE

The importance of *My Crown and Sceptre* is now very clear—not only was it the first picture in this new style, it led the way to one of his most talked about oils, *The Child Enthroned* (fig. 117). It has been said that *this* image was the center of all his new work. It is not only a portrait again of Phyllis, but also a representation of an Idea—childhood as a Child Madonna.[73] As such, she is a virginal representation of child/ womanhood. As writer Charles Caffin infers, the artist

> [borrows] the beautiful imagery of medieval piety, he represents childhood as a Child Madonna… For the child, though Madonna, is of this earth; veritable flesh and blood, wholesome … For this child, though momentarily exalted…It is a child with a childhood's special charm of simplicity…[74]

At the time of its exhibition in 1894 at the Royal Academy, it created a "real sensation," insisting that this work was "the most original."[75] According to the Alfred East Gallery exhibition catalogue, the critics reacted immediately after seeing this painting:

> The Magazine of Art in its review wrote, "Among the younger men it is Mr Gotch who succeeds in conquering the spectator… the refinement of the drawing… carries it in triumph;" and in The Times: "One of the most original (works) in the whole exhibition," and F.G. Stephens in The Athenaeum: "A remarkable and notable outcome of that mood of which Bastien-Lepage is the most popular representative… Bright, pure beautifully drawn…[76]

When the Gotches opened their studio for New Show Day, the artist described *Child Enthroned* as a:

> picture of Phyllis treated freely as a Madonna and inspired by his visit to Italy. This picture marked the true moment of transition in his art, rather than the visit to Italy. In it, a number of ideas come together: that the artist should paint what he saw rather than what was there, and that once the early sketches were made he should look deeper to find the essential beauty within; then he should use all his experience as an artist to explore this

---

[73] Charles H, Caffin, "A Painter of Childhood and Girlhood" in *Harper's Monthly Magazine* (American Edition), no. 720 (1910): 927.
[74] Ibid., 928.
[75] Quoted from *Black and White*, 379.
[76] *Alfred East Gallery*, 19.

> beauty; his growing skills as a portrait painter, his joy in painting children, his fine sense of detail in depicting antique fabrics, his joyous sense of color, and delight in experimentation.[77]

This enthroned child is Phyllis, again seated on a high–backed chair. With copper colored hair cascading past her shoulders, she wears a red and gold gown, and dark blue robes. There is repeated decoration, showing intricate embroidery, on all her garments. The satin green and gold sash around her waist repeat her green shoes peeking out from below the red dress and are placed on an elaborate green pillow. Her feet are comfortably at rest, as she sits upon her throne. The runner coming from beneath her form indicates that there are stairs below. She appears to be pushed up against the wall behind her, divided at mid-plane with wooden panels below and green walls above. Claustrophobically flanking her figure is a green and gold tapestry (dossal) hanging behind her, effectively enclosing the enthroned child off from her surroundings.

Furthermore behind Phyllis' head is a golden disc, an allusion to a halo, thereby confirming the idea that she, or rather the idea of her, is both holy and innocent. These two works actually provide a compositional indebtedness *to* Abbey, rather than *from* him. Like Gotch, Abbey's methods were also changing in the 1890s; he found a new interest in pastels and in the mid-1890s "developed that late pen drawing manner, with its consciousness of medium, emphasis on individual lines in the pattern, and the cultivation of surface design elements."[78] Abbey's *A Celtic Queen* (1898; fig. 118) is a pastel, intended to emphasize the quality of an unfinished work on paper. Like Gotch's representation, Abbey has represented an older queen than either representation of Phyllis, seated in a straight-back throne, dressed in gold with blue robes, crown and blue veil. She holds her sceptre in her left hand, sitting calmly expectant.

---

[77] Lomax, *Golden Dream*, 104.

[78] Kathy Foster and Michael Quick, *Edwin Austin Abbey,* (New Haven: Yale University Art Gallery, 1973), 26.; In the catalogue, it is called *A Viking's Wife* but was not found on the Yale Art Gallery Website. The image that will be described, *A Celtic Queen* 1898, appears to be a later sketch of the same image.

Both representations of Phyllis emphasize the fact that she is enthroned. As a beautiful young girl, she could be likened to *Regina Cordium* (1860; fig. 76), one of Rossetti's embowered stunners. This "girl stunner" waits for an audience, while Rossetti's Queen of Hearts is literally boxed in by the device of the frame. Regina Cordium, an adult woman, allows her reddish tresses to flow past her shoulders and she wears strands of red beads similar to *My Crown and Sceptre*. This bust-length portrait of a Queen is detailed with red and gold markings, emphasizing both colors as in Gotch's work. The Symbolists would have greatly admired this work, as, without a visible body to accompany the head, it represents the ideal "floating in …a metaphoric state of repose, suspended in a twilight zone of inner vision and sensuality."[79]

CHILDHOOD TO GIRLHOOD (TRANSITION)

There are two objects which refer to the change from childhood to girlhood: *The Awakening* (1898; fig. 119) and *Dawn of Motherhood* (1900; fig. 120). Each composition includes a young girl with the same outstretched arm and hand position, angelic figure(s), and is representative of some sort of revelation.

The Awakening shows a young brown-haired woman in flowing robes, sitting on the side of the bed, an elaborately decorative blanket trailing off the bed and mimicking the gestures of her knees and extended foot. She raises her arm and extends her hand almost in a symbol of prayer towards the three floating angels on the other side of the room. Titled, *The Awakening*, the girl is met with this vision of winged figures; she stares at the angel in the middle with an expression of recognition; meanwhile the central angel, to whom she extends her hand, has her own hands clasped and eyes closed.

[79] Ibid., 34.

> The angel has awakened in her the sudden realization of beauties and possibilities not hitherto within her ken, yet even now veiled from her knowledge. But the girl's own eyes have been unsealed to the vision of what will be, and it is a vision of the beauty of life and living.[80]

As the artist described his painting, "Here the limit of Childhood is nearly reached, and the painter endeavors to show in pictorial form the moment, which sooner or later occurs to most, when the child awakes to the serious responsibilities of life."[81]

Compositionally, this is most related to Rossetti's *Ecce Ancilla Domini (Annunciation)* of 1849-1850 (fig. 46). In it, one sees a cowering Madonna, still representational of girlhood. The single, non-winged angel Gabriel extends a branch of lilies to the terrified girl. Flames come from the messenger's feet, as a holy person does not touch the ground. Both figures, Gabriel and Madonna, have haloes around their heads, indicating holiness. The girl looks at the extended lily branch with a look of realization of what is to happen and the responsibility with what will come with it. Unlike Gotch's painting, Rossetti's figure is seated up in bed, wearing a non-descript tunic of white. The reaction of the figure makes sense as Rossetti's full title "Ecce Ancilla Domini", when translated from Latin means "Behold the handmaiden of the Lord."

Similarly, John William Waterhouse's *Annunciation* (1914; fig. 121) also presents a view of this occurrence with the Virgin Mary startled at what Gabriel has just announced. A subject unusual for an outdoor scene, the figure of Mary, herself a young woman, is dressed in robes of blue and red. Her right hand pushes her hair back—though the artist has included a golden disc suggestive of a halo—while the other is splayed across her breast. She bears an expression of overwhelming shock and stares dumbfounded at the standing angel. As if Gabriel realizes her reluctance, one hand is extended with a stem of lilies, while the other is extended either in greeting or as a calming gesture.

---

[80] Caffin, 932.
[81] Quoted from a document from the Alfred East Gallery archives.

The work received praise. *The Studio* published that "Mr. Waterhouse does himself full justice with his delicately treated Annunciation…"[82] In addition, scholar Anthony Hobson comments

> It is certain however, from a drawing that this figure was studied from life. The composition of the picture divides it between nature (and super-nature) and architecture, and separates effectively the angel and the Virgin, whose figure is not surprisingly treated with skill and some imagination.[83]

Instead of accepting her fate, Gotch's *Dawn of Womanhood* (1900) main figure tries to push away the inevitability of growing up. Once again, the artist represents another enthroned girl. Her companion at right is a winged child angel, with clasped hands and red rose petals at its feet, indicative of love and respect.[84] The primary figure sits in front of a sealed door, which bears the inscription of "Adolescence," indicating that she is not ready to go on to the next stage of life. She extends her hand, in the same manner as the girl in *The Awakening*, towards a ghostly form with hands close to the neckline of the pink robes she wears. Her head, illuminated by the suggestion of a halo, is cocked to an angle. She looks directly at sumptuously clad girl on the throne, who continues to push her away. As Caffin describes in Harper's Monthly (circa 1909/1910),

> The sunniness of her thoughts is suddenly diverted by the vision of a figure, not winged, in whose gestures and expression she may read the message of responsibility and preparation for pain…It embraces…the general idea of physical, mental, moral and spiritual evolution of the child into the adolescent.[85]

---

[82] *The Studio*, Vol LXII, no. 254, 1914, p.21

[83] Anthony Hobson, *The Art and Life of J.W. Waterhouse RA, 1849-1917* (London: Studio Vista/ Christies, 1980), 133.

[84] Kate Greenaway, *Language of Flowers* (originally published London: Routledge, 1884; republished New York: Dover Publications, 1992).

[85] Caffin, 932.

MOTHERHOOD

Gotch often employed the Renaissance religious format for the mother and child in order to depict Motherhood. His first composition of this nature was *Holy Motherhood* (1902; fig. 122).[86] There is an adult female at center (mother), dressed in red and blue robes, has her knees spread, as evidenced by the suggestion of her body beneath the garments, with a nude child laying across her lap, with his arm outstretched in an effort to reach toward her. She has been placed, like so many before her, on a throne and dais with banner behind her. Just like *The Child Enthroned*, her space is structured by the architecture of the Renaissance niche.[87] She is flanked by four women; the two immediately to her left and right are playing stringed instruments and the two sitting at the bottom of the stairs have stopped from reading their books.

This basic composition of Madonna and Child is indebted not only to Italian precursors, but Ford Madox Brown's *"Take your Son, Sir*" (1851-1892; fig. 123), Frank Cadogan Cowper's *Morning of the Nativity* (1908; fig. 124; as well as his 1917 *Our Lady*, not to be discussed). Brown's work shows a modern twist on the Madonna and Child theme. Not only is this woman with the strained expression in the process of handing over the newborn—the supposed father reflected in the mirror--, it does not seem to be a joyful or blessed moment. It would suggest, therefore, that this might be an illegitimate child who is "introducing" father to son. The woman is obviously kept, and the babe is a result of the affair.

Cowper's *Morning of the Nativity* is a more traditional representation of the Madonna and Child motif. While she is not enthroned, the vertical column behind her replaces the religious dossal that usually hangs behind the seated figures. The setting appears to be inside a barn, in accordance with the biblical story, and the sheep in the pen are looking in at the sleeping

---

[86] It is the same format and theme as *Mother Enthroned*, which could be compared with FCC's *Lucretia Borgia* for compositional reasons.
[87] The niche can be found in other TCG images; for example *The Jest*.

child. Indeed, their heads are tilted so that they can catch a glimpse of the tiny child. At the lower left are the gifts of gold, frankincense and myrrh from the Three Kings. Unlike Brown's unfinished work, this image presents "a picture" of a peaceful mother, enjoying a tender moment with her newborn. Assuming *The Awakening* could be interpreted as an annunciation, the two artists have come full-circle within the biblical narrative.

CONCLUSION

The obituary for Gotch in *The Times* stipulated that:

> Mr. Thomas Cooper Gotch, the artist, died on May 1, 1931, in his seventy-seventh year. He has a claim to be remembered as an artist who, at a time when realism was the fashion in the very bosom of its most active school in England, boldly struck out a line for himself in decorative composition.[88]

How very interesting, as Lomax suggests, that he is being lauded for what was considered his "major act of descent" by abandoning the Newlyn traditions and ultimately presented *The Child Enthroned*. For the entirety of his career, especially after 1891, he had received negative comments towards his new style that incorporated color, abstract ideas rather than a specific narrative, and focused ultimately on the stages of childhood to adulthood.

There are solid reasons why T.C. Gotch has been labeled a Newlyn artist, a Symbolist, and Baldry's terminology "Imaginative Symbolist" will be exchanged for "Extension of Pre-Raphaelite Symbolism," referencing paintings from 1892-1896. When associated each movement, he did concede to their respective characteristics; but it seemed as though he was always looking for his own true, pure form of art. The pivotal moment came during the Florence trip that officially broke the ties with the Newlyn artists. It is my belief that because the artist ultimately focused his energies as depiction "child" as "idea," the identity of Symbolist and

[88] Quoted in Lomax, *Golden Dream,* 9.

extension of Pre-Raphaelite Symbolism merged. The argument I have hoped to achieve is that he belongs to no one school for the duration of his career, but each phase can mostly be categorized. And to those classifications, I believe him to also be a part of the Neo-Pre-Raphaelites. His fidelity to nature was always part of his artistic mode, and several compositions—many more than have been discussed in this chapter for the interest of length—are based on previous works from the PRB and associates as well as other members of the NPR.

Although titled as "Tribute to a Newlyn Artist," of which certain excerpts have been quoted earlier in the chapter, it is fitting to end with the accolades written by H.T.:

If I tried to epitomize the qualities of Mr. T.C. Gotch…I should say: "He was a gentleman and an artist." A man may be a genius…yet never merit that fine word which is so often lightly and ludicrously misused…The word "gentleman" should never have been allowed to become hackneyed or meaningless…It implies something more than that—a refinement of mind and high standard of conduct…It is because I rank T.C. Gotch, the Man, as greater than any or all of the works which made him an artist of distinction and repute, that I remember and honor him, first of all as a gentleman.[89]

Later critics, such as the esteemed Christopher Wood, proposed that Gotch's pictures actually were a

> blend of Pre-Raphaelitism and the Italian Renaissance. Tom Gotch himself thought that it was his "realism" rather than his "imaginative symbolism" that was affiliated with Pre-Raphaelitism: "Strange as it may seem, a movement which is the reverse of Pre-Raphaelitism, which may perhaps be caught smiling at [its] subjects, treatment, and workmanship… is yet of the same family, for it has its birth in a sincerity of purpose and a reverence for Nature."[90]

So it was that Gotch changed his method, experimenting with the use of more color and a change of subject matter. The problematic argument in referring to the artist as belonging to

---

[89] Obituary from Alfred East Gallery archives, no documentary information provided.
[90] Quoted in Lomax, *Golden Dream*, 15.

separate and numerous categories is that these compositions after Italy, regardless of interpretation, are compositionally related to various phases of Pre-Raphaelitism, as well as Gotch's Neo-Pre-Raphaelite contemporaries. The artist expressed a belief that "he belonged to a modern school of painting, which shared some of the principles of the Pre-Raphaelites, but did not carry fidelity to the same extreme."[91]

[91] Ibid., 86.

Chapter 10
Outliers

"No matter what the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood actually meant, or what Mr. Ruskin put forward as their creed, the movement we see today [1898] is deeper and broader than they guessed. It began before them, and it has lasted beyond them."[1]

OUTLIERS: THE INFLUENCE OF BURNE-JONES

As Allen Staley wrote in his 1996 essay, "Art Is upon the Town!: *The Grosvenor Gallery Exhibitions,"* viewers of the Millais and Hunt exhibitions in 1886 were able

> to see for the first time how different the dazzling colors and scrupulous naturalism of early Pre-Raphaelite pictures were not only from Millais' mature style, but also from the later Pre-Raphaelitism which in the hands of Burne-Jones had evolved into the Aestheticism dominating the summer exhibitions of the summer exhibitions of the Grosvenor Gallery.[2]

In another excerpt, he asserts that

> When links were looked for that might explain the disparities between the current form of the style and its original, the female artist perversely came into her own, assumed as she still was to be a natural imitator. De Morgan, Spartali, and later, Bunce and Brickdale were frequently cited as confirmation of the survival of Pre-Raphaelitism on the ground that their work resembled or took from the earlier Pre-Raphaelites.[3]

These excerpts are neither meant to imply that all outliers were women; nor is the assertion being made that working in a Burne-Jonesian style naturally led to placement within the larger concept of Aesthetics. The limited scope of this dissertation allowed for selected outliers have a personal or professional connection to the artist Burne-Jones. Those that attended the Birmingham School of Art would have had contact with the artist, as he often visited the school to give lessons. Kate Bunce and Sidney Meteyard were advanced enough to take advantage of this opportunity, while

---

[1] Quoted from Jan Marsh and Pamela Gerrish Nunn, *Pre-Raphaelite women artists* (Manchester: Manchester City Art Galleries, 1998), 70.; "The Lay Figure and Pre-Raphaelitism," *The Studio*, 1898, xiii.
[2] Allen Staley, "Art Is Upon the Town!: The Grosvenor Gallery Winter Exhibitions," in *The Grosvenor Gallery: A Palace of Art in Victorian* England, eds. Susan P. Casteras and Colleen Denny. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 70-71.; also quoted in Marsh and Nunn, *Pre-Raphaelite Women Artists,* 90.
[3] Quoted in Marsh and Nunn, *Pre-Raphaelite Women*, 90.

concurrently belonging to the so-called Birmingham Group, a circle of young artists emerging in the 1880s as a distinct local off-shoot of Pre-Raphaelitism. John Melhuish Strudwick, moreover, was a temporary studio assistant to J.R. Spencer Stanhope and then to Burne-Jones in the 1870s. Likewise, Evelyn Pickering de Morgan had the artistic and moral support of her uncle, J.R. Spencer Stanhope. Finally, she was one of the few painters invited to be an exhibitor at the new Grosvenor Gallery in 1877, with her painting *Ariadne in Naxos* displayed alongside works by Spencer Stanhope and Burne-Jones.

OUTLIERS: CRITERIA

The previous chapters have followed a certain set of criteria to establish how each individual artist "fit" into the working definition of Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism. While not a definitive list of every potential "member," the aforementioned men and woman all remained within particular boundaries: they were producing / exhibiting works similar in style, technique, composition or subject matter of Pre-Raphaelitism from the late 1880s to the twentieth century; an association to Abbey, who, himself, had direct ties to the original PRB as well as this newer generation, thereby positioning him between these two groups.

This is not meant to imply that Cowper, Shaw, Waterhouse, Brickdale and Gotch were the *only* artists who could be associated with Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism. Indeed, this is just one possible circle that could be recognized by the art historical canon and related scholarship. As will be demonstrated, there are other artists who could also meet the conditions noted above, with the exception of an Abbey partnership. This chapter will examine the most prominent artists in such an alliance, namely Marie Spartali Stillman, Kate Bunce, Sidney Meteyard, John M. Strudwick, and Evelyn Pickering de Morgan. Select samples of these artists' work will be

examined through the filter of Rossetti and Burne-Jones, and to a lesser extent, Millais. By default, they all must meet the established criteria—from Pre-Raphaelite themes and style to exhibiting contemporaneously with Abbey's circle.

This duration (1880s-1890s) coincides with Marsh and Nunn's definition of the third generation Pre-Raphaelites. For them, Rossetti had been a "newly revealed hero" until his death in 1882.[4] It was during this period that

> Ruskin's artistic influence declined, and it was above all Burne-Jones who became the main living influence or leader of Pre-Raphaelitism. His developing style gave comfort to those reluctant to reject the entire classical tradition, while his famous words "I mean by a picture a beautiful romantic dream of something that will never was, never will be—in light better than any light ever shone—in a land no-one can define, or remember, only desire" clearly encouraged Pre-Raphaelitism's final withdrawal from portrayal of the modern world into the realms of imagination…[5]

This chapter is simply intended to illustrate that there is more than one combination of artists who have the ability to be related to one another through the earlier generations of Pre-Raphaelitism and to continue it from the late 1880s to at least the turn-of-the-century, and often beyond. It is an on-going demonstration, therefore, that the multi-phased Pre-Raphaelite movement did not end when the PRB dissolved or when Ruskin and the original members, save Holman Hunt, died by 1900.

WHERE DO YOUNGER ARTISTS LIKE MARIE SPARTALI STILLMAN FIT?

Marie Spartali Stillman (1843-1827) is a name most often associated with Pre-Raphaelitism, as well as a great female Pre-Raphaelite contributor. In fact, she has been labeled as belonging to several distinct categories: in *The Last Romantics*, she was considered (only) as a "follower of Burne-Jones"; in *Painting Women: Victorian Women Artists* by Deborah Cherry,

---

[4]Ibid., 19-20.
[5] Ibid., 20.

the emphasis for Spartali Stillman is her indebtedness to Ford Madox Brown (associate of the PRB); and in *A Pre-Raphaelite Marriage*, it is her relationships with Brown, Rossetti and Burne-Jones which are examined. Gerrish and Nunn's *Women artists and the Pre-Raphaelites* place her in the second generation of Pre-Raphaelitism, along with Evelyn Pickering de Morgan. Finally in the most recent (2015-2016) exhibit and publication *Poetry and Beauty: The Pre-Raphaelite art of Marie Spartali Stillman* at the Delaware Art Museum, examines the so-called "underrepresented artist of the British Pre-Raphaelite circle."[6]

Perhaps the most surprising portrayal of Spartali Stillman's relationships to Pre-Raphaelitism is found in her obituary published by *The London Times*, March 8, 1927:

> She was the last of the small circle of women who contributed significantly to the Pre-Raphaelite movement… she was an important friend and colleague in the studios and households of Burne-Jones, Morris, Rossetti and others.[7]

She exhibited well into the first quarter of the twentieth-century and had a unique connection to the Pre-Raphaelites. What differentiates Spartali Stillman from the other Neo-Pre-Raphaelites is that she had a rare social and professional connection with several principal members from early Pre-Raphaelitism; her future husband, William James Stillman, was already "connected to the Pre-Raphaelite circle through his earlier friendship with John Ruskin."[8] In 1872, she visited Kelmscott Manor, "the vacation home jointly leased the year before by William Morris and Dante Gabriel Rossetti…Marie's relationship with…William [Morris'] wife, Jane, in particular, signaled her assimilation into this latest aesthetic development."[9] She also enjoyed a

---

[6] Margaretta S. Frederick and Jan Marsh, *Poetry in beauty: The art of Marie Spartali Stillman* (Wilmington: Delaware Art Museum, 2015).
[7] Jan Marsh and Pamela Gerrish Nunn, *Women Artists and the Pre-Raphaelite movement* (London: Virago, 1989), 106. The authors critique the artist's obituary (I am assuming they are referencing that published in *The Times* (London), 8 March 1927), commenting that, "the last survivor, as her obituary put it, of an almost legendary group of women associated with Pre-Raphaelitism. With such remarks her reputation as Pre-Raphaelite in her own right was eclipsed."
[8] Frederick and Marsh, *Poetry in Beauty*, 18.
[9] Ibid., 19.

professional relationship with: Ford Madox Brown, her first mentor; Rossetti, as one of his models, friend, and fellow Dantean-themed enthusiast; and Burne-Jones, both friend and counselor to this already established artist. As Henry James noted in 1875, she

> inherited the traditions and the temper of the original Pre-Raphaelites, about whom we hear nowadays so much less than we used to; but she has come into her heritage by virtue of natural relationship. She is a spontaneous, sincere, naïve Pre-Raphaelite.[10]

In the 1860s, Marie Spartali Stillman was in search of a tutor, "having attained the low standard set by her drawing masters."[11] She originally wanted Rossetti to be her mentor, though they would not meet until 1872, and unfortunately, "he had always refused to take pupils, being better aware than most of his technical limitations."[12]

Ironically, it was he who suggested she train with Ford Madox Brown. Their work began in 1864, and later she recalled her indebtedness to Brown, "testifying that 'if it had not been for his encouragement and help she might never have summoned the courage to attempt being an artist."[13] It has been suggested that the main influence on her style and technique throughout her career reflected the five years she spent as Brown's pupil, and for his role as "artistic advisor" for the duration of his life. The artist's

> method of teaching was well-suited to her temperament, and it is interesting to speculate what might have been the direction of her work if she had first attached herself to Dante Gabriel Rossetti as his pupil as she, and her father, had hoped. "Ruskin said Mr. Brown was equal to Mr. Rossetti as a painter, but would probably be superior to him as a teacher… Mr. Brown's teaching was systematic as Mr. Rossetti's had been free. Mr Rossetti always objected to students making a firm outline, he wished the work to be free… Mr. Brown on the other hand insisted on a firm outline. 'Do not scrabble around in the hope that the effect you seek will appear by chance. Be clear in your own mind and you'll best advance your work.'"[14]

---

[10] Quoted in Marsh and Nunn, *Women Artists*, 98.; Family Papers.

[11] Quoted from Ibid., 99; Family papers; See also Ellen Clayton, *English Female Artists* (London: Tinsley Bros., 1876.)

[12] David Elliott, *A Pre-Raphaelite Marriage: the lives and works of Marie Spartali Stillman and William James Stillman* (Woodbridge; Easthampton, MA: Antique Collectors Club, 2006), 22.

[13] Deborah Cherry, *Painting Women: Victorian Women Artists* (London; New York: Routledge, 1993), 62.

[14] Elliott, *Marriage*, 208; Quote inside is J Philips Elmslie, a Working Men's College pupil, quoted by Ford Madox Heuffer (later Ford).

Not unexpectedly, it was during this apprenticeship that she began to sit for several artists, including Brown, Rossetti, and Burne-Jones, among others. A comparison between her thematic choices and those of Rossetti allow for the suspicion that it was perhaps Rossetti, and not Ford, who was the most influential to her lengthy career.

In 1869, William Rossetti praised her production and exhibits, voicing, "Miss Spartali, having a keen perception of the poetry which resides both in beauty, and in the means of art for embodying beauty, she succeeds in transfusing that perception into the spectator of her handiwork."[15] His opinion did not change, writing in January 1870, "Miss Spartali has a fine power for fusing the emotion of her subjects into color and giving aspiration to both; beyond what is actually achieved, one sees a reaching towards something ulterior."[16]

SELF-PORTRAIT (1871, 1874)

Brown painted a portrait of his pupil in 1869 entitled, *Marie Spartali at her Easel* (fig. 125). This work presents Marie Spartali as an artist. To indicate her profession, the figure is shown facing the viewer, perpendicular to the easel and canvas. As if unaware of a spectator's presence interrupting this quiet, pensive moment, she hunches forward in her seat, fingers intertwined and her hair up and braided. She has been caught in a moment of intense concentration, momentarily ignoring her sketch of a girl. It has been argued, "Although she sat to Rossetti on many occasions in the years that followed, it was Ford Madox Brown who captured

[15] Quoted in Frederick and Marsh, *Poetry in Beauty*, 19; *Westminster Review* 35, no. 2 (April 1869): 594.
[16] Quoted in Ibid., 52; W.M.Rossetti, "English Painters of the Present Day," *The Portfolio*, January 1870: 118.

both Marie's beauty and her air of reserve, even of shyness, that is intensely appealing in a particularly fine likeness."[17]

By contrast, Spartali's own self portrait (1871; fig. 126) made with charcoal and chalk, and dates three years after her marriage to William Stillman, presents herself in a variation of the Rossetti stunner style. A bust-length portrait, it reveals Stillman leaning against a ledge with arms folded, holding a partly open fan and dressed in a Venetian styled Renaissance garment with flowing sleeves and a deeply cut neckline. As Susan P. Casteras observed in "Pre-Raphaelite Portraiture: a strangely distorted vision," unlike the typical Rossetti stunner, the artist "does not coyly withdraw her gaze or distract viewers with an elaborate, even over-wrought, symbolic setting or accouterments; instead she indirectly yet firmly looks outward."[18]

Stillman's *Self-Portrait* (also called *On a Balcony*) (1874; fig. 127) is a near identical composition to the 1871 composition, though it is bright with color. Again, the figure is wearing a striking garment with billowing sleeves of reddish-orange, low-cut ivory frilled neckline—which coincidentally draws attention to her pale chest and neck—and partially opened fan with deep hues of orange, red, blue, and green. The posture is identical to the earlier self-portrait, as evidenced by this work's alternative title, *On a Balcony*. The ledge is no longer unadorned; instead, covered by an ornate tapestry with the colors repeated in the figure, and just wide enough for the artist to comfortably rest her arms and protect the drapery of her sleeves. This embowered woman also confronts the viewer. Though the artist chose to compositionally describe herself in the fashion of a Rossettian stunner, it is not a representation of an overtly,

---

[17] Elliott, *Marriage*, 24.

[18] Susan P. Casteras, "Pre-Raphaelite Portraiture: a strangely disordered vision," in *Collecting the Pre-Raphaelites: the Anglo American Enchantment*, ed. Margaretta Frederick Watson. (Aldershot, England; Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1997), 144.

sexualized figure. Perhaps, based on gender of the artist, she has "turn[ed] down the volume…a few notches while simultaneously turning up sensitivity to other underlying factors."[19]

Rossetti's *Regina Cordium* (1866; fig. 128) with model Alexa Wilding presents his traditional sensualized stunner, with details that have been echoed by Stillman's later work. This Queen of Hearts, also with red hair, stares directly at the viewer. Unlike *On a balcony*, Alexa Wilding is dressed in robes of orange-red that are less voluminous, the cream-colored neckline is modestly cut and her long neck is decorated with golden chains and a pendant. Physically, her body is more modestly displayed; but yet she exudes sexuality, flirtation and perhaps some degree of coyness with the presumably male viewer. In lieu of a fan, Regina holds a branch of flowers, with a repeating floral motif in the space behind her. Unlike the titular balcony, Surtees suggests that it is a parapet separating the figure and spectator. It too is decorated in repeating square shapes with ornate detailing. Three pink roses and a bud curve up to meet her. She is an idealized figure of Beauty and, with the addition of the cherub at right, Love.

BEATRICE

Stillman and Rossetti shared a common interest of Dantean themes. Indeed, an overview of both their oeuvres reveal numerous sketches, watercolors and oils on the subject. Stillman was a sitter for several of Rossetti's oils, including but not limited to *Dante's Dream* (1871, fig. 129); *Bower Meadow* (1872; fig. 130); *Vision of Fiammetta* (1878; fig. 4).

Stillman made two watercolors of *Beatrice* (1896, 1898; fig. 131, 132) though it is the later one to be discussed here. The composition is of an embowered woman in a claustrophobic space. The viewer is presented with Beatrice against a parapet in the same fashion as the two

[19] Ibid., 144; also discussed in conversation with Susan P. Casteras January 2016.

discussed *Self-Portraits.* Another bust-length image, the figure is dressed in heavy robes of deep blue-green, cuffs and neckline with fur in shades of green and grey, using a darker palette. The curve of the neckline is intricately beaded and follows the swooping motion of the veil which cascades under one arm and over the other. Beatrice leans her head against one hand while she unconsciously points to an illustrated passage in the missal before her. She is framed, quite literally, by a trellised archway of red roses, though only a few at far left have bloomed. Placed precariously near the edge of the ledge are some plucked pansies.[20] The inclusion of roses and pansies, symbolic of passion and remembrance respectively suggest that Beatrice may be daydreaming of the object of her affection, presumably Dante.

By comparison, the aforementioned oil, Rossetti's *Dante's Dream,* is not only a replica of the "original" watercolor of 1856, but also shows both figures of Dante and Beatrice.[21] The artist includes: two attendants, dressed in green for hope, as they hold drapery over the dying Beatrice, who is being kissed on the cheek by the angel of Love. Dante holds hands with Love, who in turn is holding spring blossoms to signify purity. These two figures stand amidst scattered poppies, the traditional Victorian symbol for death. The red doves flanking the figures in the foreground represent the sleep of dreams and death.[22]

By the 1880s, Spartali Stillman had already been sitting for Edward Burne-Jones and a friendship developed. It was during this time that he took up the role of "counselor, but it was as the supporter to an established stylist. There is little evidence of mentoring in their correspondence; rather, of the encouragement of a friend and suggestions freely given only when

---

[20] Frederick and Marsh, *Poetry in Beauty*, 138.
[21] In accordance with Pre-Raphaelites using friends as models, all figures are identifiable and include, among others, Mrs. William Morris ("Janey") as Beatrice; William Stillman as the head of Dante; Alexa Wilding as the left attendant, and Marie Spartali Stillman as the right attendant.; See Surtees, vol. 1, 148.
[22] Most information previously known, but confirmed by the entry at the Walker Art Gallery in Liverpool. See http://www.liverpoolmuseums.org.uk/walker/collections/paintings/19c/item.aspx?tab=summary&item=wag+3091&hl=1&coll=8 (accessed December 6, 2015).

asked."[23] To that end, she did more modeling for him and was interpreted according to his particular stylistic tendencies rather than she using him as influence. In 1888, he exhibited his third version of *Danaë,* also called *The Tower of Brass* at the New Gallery (fig. 133). Stillman sat for the head of Danaë, a figure draped in red, peering around the corner and observes the soldiers building her prison. Burne-Jones' choice of subject depicts the fate of the female heroine; an oracle had warned her father, the King, that Danaë would kill him. The tower was her confinement, but his grandson, Perseus, ultimately fulfilled the prophecy. The narrative from Morris' *Earthly Paradise*, as well as that of choice of model was a

> delicate tribute to her refusal years before to contemplate confinement in an arranged marriage. It is perhaps the truest likeness of her either by Burne-Jones or Rossetti. She was by now forty-four years of age and the image is rather an account of her beauty than a portrait at that date; but it was seen as the time as faithful as well as lovely, and it is clear that she had lost none of her clarity of features or her poise.[24]

Ford Madox Brown died in 1893; in a letter to Samuel Bancroft dated 1903, Spartali Stillman recollected that

> It is always flattering to me to be taken for a pupil of Burne-Jones for of course I have loved his work of all periods as few others have, and he was always most helpful to me when I was in need of advice of my own work, especially these latter years, but it was Madox Brown who encouraged me to become an artist and who taught me to paint. I can never feel sufficiently grateful for his having given this immense interest in my life…[25]

At the time of Brown's death, Stillman turned to Edward Burn-Jones regularly for advice, discussions about her work and sent him early sketches and ideas. He wrote once, "I LOVE HELPING YOU and it is kind of you to pretend that I can. Send me over tracings later on for final correction and warnings…"[26]

---

[23] Elliott, *Marriage*, 208.
[24] Elliott, *Marriage*, 151-152
[25] Quoted in Ibid., 208; Marie Spartali Stillman to Samuel Bancroft, 19 September 1903. Delaware Art Museum, Bancroft Archive.
[26] Quoted in Ibid., 183; The letter is in reference to *How the Virgin Mary Came to Brother Conrad of Offida and Laid her Son in his Arms* (1892).

It was fitting, then, that when Spartali Stillman died in 1927, her obituary from *The Times* read, "She was the single survivor, since the death of Lady Burne-Jones seven years ago, a group of women remarkable alike for beauty and ability, for gifts and character."[27]

OUTLIER: KATE BUNCE (1856-1927)

Like the Neo-Pre-Raphaelites contemporary to her, Kate Bunce cannot be pigeonholed into one particular art historical movement. The limited scholarship about the artist attempts to label her in a variety of ways: *Last Romantics* classifies her as belonging (solely) to the Birmingham School; *Pre-Raphaelite Women Artists* also suggests she was a student of Birmingham, had an association with the Birmingham Arts and Crafts circle, as well as belonging to the Pre-Raphaelite Sisterhood. Moreover, the authors declare that her work is "characterized as largely figurative drawing, and moderated color."[28] Finally, *Women Artists and the Pre-Raphaelite Movement* places her in the third generation of Pre-Raphaelitism (1880-1910) along with Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale, while Marie Spartali Stillman and Evelyn Pickering de Morgan are considered second generation (1865-1880).

Bunce was indeed born in Birmingham and attended the Birmingham School of Art not only as a student (1880s), but also as an elected Associate of the Birmingham Society of Artists (1888). The artist's father, John Thackray Bunce, "took pride in his complete set of Ruskin's works, while his obituary records "a steadily deepening love and admiration of the work of the Pre-Raphaelite School and especially in its later developments."[29] The city had been "predisposed" towards Pre-Raphaelitism because "Burne-Jones, the movements' greatest living

---

[27] Frederick and Marsh, *Poetry in Beauty*, 26; "Mrs. Stillman," *Times* (London), 8 March 1927, 21.
[28] Marsh and Nunn, *Pre-Raphaelite Women Artists*, 145.
[29] Quoted from the obituary in Marsh and Nunn, *Women Artists*, 121; *Birmingham Daily Post*, 26 September 1899.

exponent in the 1880s and 1890s, had been born and bred in the city, and indeed became honorary president of the Royal Birmingham Society of artists in 1885."[30] Moreover,

> The New Gallery was opened with an exhibition of work by… Burne-Jones, followed by two major Pre-Raphaelite exhibitions in 1891 (at which two of Rossetti's medieval subjects were shown…in 1895… acquisitions created "one of the finest Pre-Raphaelite collections in the world," containing Millais' *Blind Girl* and Madox Brown's *The Last of England*.[31]

For Bunce, Birmingham was a fulfillment of her artistic desires. Drawn to the Pre-Raphaelite mode of painting represented by both Burne-Jones and Rossetti, her birthplace and education offered her unfettered access to work by both artists. An older teacher at the school, E.S. Harper recalled how the visit of Burne-Jones in 1885, "altered the current of the School's work, and for a time wrested the control of that current … we had a large number of students working in a Burne-Jones style, though most of them recovered their individuality after a while."[32]

As early Burne-Jones work imitated that of Rossetti, and Bunce was an admirer of both, it seems only fitting that her *How may I, when he shall ask?* (RA 1887, unlocated) and *The Keepsake* (1989-1901)*,* chosen as "picture of the year" *by the Pall Mall Gazette* when it exhibited at the New Gallery in 1901, was created in a style that reflected an influence from both male predecessors.

THE KEEPSAKE

The Keepsake (fig. 24) was shown with an excerpt from Rossetti's poem, "The Staff and Scrip." In it, the artist-poet tells the story of how a pilgrim visiting the destroyed lands by the

[30] Ibid., 121.
[31] Ibid., 121.
[32] Quoted in Stephen Wildman, *The Birmingham School: Paintings, Drawings and Prints by Birmingham Artists from the Permanent Collection* (Birmingham: Birmingham City Museum and Art Gallery, 1990), 10; *Birmingham Mail*, 9 January 1920; Bunce studied under E.R. Taylor during her student days.

evil Duke Luke. The pilgrim calls on the Queen, they fall in love, and the valiant pilgrim pledges to defeat her enemies. He is victorious, but dies in the process. The passage shown with the painting elucidates the moment when the Queen realizes the pilgrim is dead: "Then stepped a damsel to her side,/ And spoke and needs must weep:/ 'For his sake, lady, if he died,/ He prayed of thee to keep/This staff and scrip."[33]

Bunce's image illustrates this tragic snapshot in time. Waiting for her love's return, the Queen, described as a "soulful female perched on a strange medieval seat in front of a tapestry loom," is surrounded by her female attendants. The loom is immediately behind the main figure, and work on the tapestry has been forgotten. The attendant immediately to the right of the loom is seen holding a lengthy (presumably) rosary, with her hands clasped in prayer. The solemn attendant in the foreground carries the staff and scrip (pouch) that the Queen was to receive upon the pilgrim's death. The Queen looks away, as if in a trance-like state (á la *Beata Beatrix*), while the woman approaches with what may be considered as "the keepsake(s)."

There is a visual indebtedness to Rossetti and his stunners in this work. As far as figural representation is concerned, Bunce's regal woman with the soulful expression, much like that of Rossetti's *Helen of Troy* (1863; fig. 12). Rossetti's composition is a bust-length portrait of the mythological blonde enchantress who inadvertently caused the Trojan War. Her hair is down and ironically parted in the middle, a nineteenth-century tradition for representing a Madonna-type figure. She is dressed in golden garments with red detailing. Her hands curl gently around the green beaded necklace. The pendant, to which she points, is a depiction of a three-flamed

[33] Dante Gabriel Rossetti, "The Staff and Scrip"; Excerpt accompanying the painting is quoted in Marsh and Nunn, *Women artists*, 123. To read the poem in its entirety, see Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *The Poetical Works*. 2 vols.,ed. William Michael Rossetti. (Boston: Little, Brown, 1887, reprinted 1913), I, 47-57.

torch. On the back of the panel, the Rossetti inscribed "Helen of Troy, destroyer of ships, destroyer of men, and destroyer of cities."[34]

However, Bunce's *Keepsake* represents the injured party in Rossetti's poem. Whereas Helen could be held responsible for the destruction, the Duke had already ravaged the Queen's lands. Both artists have represented their female figures in a reflective moment of the respective after-events. Bunce's woman looks away from the attendant with the possessions of her deceased love. The pilgrim's belongings include a scrip (pouch) decorated by two conch shells—a Renaissance tradition for those having taken a pilgrimage. Immediately next to the figure is a crucifix, and the stained glass window behind her shows a representation of Madonna and Child. Considered together, it may be an allusion to the mortal death of both the pilgrim and the Queen, but the eternal life they will share in Heaven. This is not a completely peculiar interpretation, as the artist herself was very devout.

The style of Bunce's work, particularly in the treatment of the Queen, is very reminiscent of Burne-Jones' female figures. He tends to focus on medieval type dress, with the drapery of the garments suggesting the elongated body beneath. Burne-Jones' women are always slender, modestly attired, and thoughtful. For comparison purposes, Bunce's *Keepsake* echoes the maidens processing down a spiral staircase in Burne-Jones' *The Golden Staircase* (1872-80; fig. 134). Whereas Bunce's dress is more medieval in fashion with long sleeves, ornamental belt, and decorative design on the bust, the *Golden Stairs* figures also are clad in flowing robes, most of which have some decoration to bring attention to the upper torso. While some carry various types of vertical instruments (similar in spirit to the attendant with the staff and scrip), others' heads are tilted, in a gesture reminiscent of the Queen to indicate their expressions. All these

---

[34] Virginia Surtees, *The Paintings and Drawings of Dante Gabriel Rossetti (1828-1882): a catalogue raisonné* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1971), vol. 1, 92 (cat. 163).

female figures appear to be carbon copies of one another, though the hair color subtly ranges from blonde to light brown.

MELODY/MUSICA

Of Bunce's three known easel paintings, *Melody* (1895-97; fig. 135) has been called "the best."[35] [36] The artist has created an incredibly claustrophobic depiction of a half-length portrait of a black-haired woman, hair parted in the center á la Madonna, strumming a lute. She is outfitted in a green dress with rose detailing complete with draping crimson sleeves. The delicate gold necklace with a crystal embedded in the pendant completes the attention to decoration and texture. The simple gold ring she wears on her forefinger to strum the lute continues the subtle, yet ornate, designs of the inlaid metal on the musical instrument.

Behind the figure at upper left is a circular mirror, similar to the one in Jan van Eyck's *Arnolfini Wedding Portrait* (1434; fig. 136, 137). Flanking the woman is a silver-gilt vase filled with branches of apple blossoms at right (Victorian symbols for Preference; Better Things to Come; and Good Fortune), and depictions of haloed angels at left. As with *The Keepsake*, Bunce has chosen to avoid direct eye contact between the sole figure and the viewer. At first glance, it appears as if she is staring in our general direction, but the eyes are actually focused on some point behind the viewer. The mirror behind her reveals both her location and that of the viewer. She is seated in a private chapel; close inspection (fig. 138) reveals a crucifix at far left and a stained glass window at the top of the mirror with a representation of the Madonna and Child. It

[35] John Christian, ed. *Last Romantics: The Romantic Tradition in British Art: Burne-Jones to Stanley Spencer* (London: Lund Humphries in association with Barbican Art Gallery, 1989), 103.; This theme of woman playing a lute is also portrayed in Bunce's earlier composition *The Minstrel* (1890), now lost.

[36] *Melody* is also comparable to fellow Neo-Pre-Raphaelite Cadogan Cowper's later composition (1906; fig. x), *Mariana of the South*. It too presents a woman leaning back in elaborately detailed dress, strumming a lute. There is also a mirror on the wall that shows where she is focusing her attention. She too is in an interior space and appears that unlike Bunce's figure who is in a private chapel, Cowper's scene is inside a home.

is evident that both objects are in her space, potentially the subjects her intense focus and concentration. Since she does not acknowledge the viewer, the reflection of this private space and the world beyond, as evidenced by the trees and sky, could be for our benefit. As our presence is not visually depicted, it stands to reason that the viewer's space is on the other side of the window. Such a compositional device—mirror, reflection, and window— pictorially echoes Holman Hunt's *Awakening Conscience* (1853; fig. 139). This canonical interior scene reveals this kept woman looks out the window. The admiration of nature allows her to realize the error of her ways and resolves to live a good, moral life.

Scholarship has established that Bunce was an ardent admirer of Rossetti, so it is reasonable to assume that she may have been influenced by his work. To compare, his *Veronica Veronese* (1872; fig. 140) will be examined. Rossetti has put his stunner (model and mistress Alexa Wilding) in a windowless, cramped space. Seated at a desk with paper and pen on the desk and yellow flowers scattered across its top, Veronica holds the bow of the violin with one hand and lightly strums the strings with the other. Dressed in green brocade, with patterns on each cuff, her red hair has been coiffed in a stylish chignon. Perhaps, rather poetically, there is a caged bird in the background. The inscription on the frame reads:

> Suddenly leaning forward, the Lady Veronica rapidly wrote the first notes on the virgin page. Then she took the bow of the violin to make her dream a reality; but before commencing to play the instrument hanging from her hand, she remained quiet a few moments, listening to the inspiring bird, while her left hand strayed over the strings searching for the supreme melody, still illusive. It was the marriage of the voices of nature and the soul—the dawn of a mystic creation.[37]

The inscription helps to provide context for Veronica and establishes a connection with *Melody*. Both women are making music (a violin and lute, respectively) and are seated entranced;

---

[37] Surtees, vol. 1, 128. Surtees explains that this translation is from the *Bancroft Collection Catalogue*, 13. In the catalogue entry, she includes an excerpt of a letter written from Rossetti to F.R. Leyland, 25 Jan. 1872.; *Art Journal*, 1892, 250.

Bunce's figure by the representation of Mother and Child above her, while Rossetti's stunner listens to the chirping of the bird. Though the contemplation for Bunce is religious in nature, Rossetti's is secular.

SIDNEY METEYARD (1868-1947)

Sidney Meteyard was born thirteen miles west of Birmingham, and as an artist has been regarded as belonging to the Birmingham Group. [38] Like Bunce, Meteyard was also a pupil of the (Birmingham) School of Art.[39] In 1886, he joined the staff (ultimately teaching for forty-five years) and was responsible for enameling, gesso, leatherwork, and other crafts. It has been suggested in academic scholarship that Meteyard may have met Burne-Jones while at the Birmingham School, another instructor who undoubtedly was influential on the artist-teacher's style and choice of subject matter. Additionally like Bunce, he was elected as an Associate to the Royal Birmingham of artists in 1902, made full member in 1908 and was later their honorary Secretary.[40]

When considering his work as a whole, there are two objects that allow for obvious inferences that the artist was channeling either the original PRB or Burne-Jones. His *St. Cecilia* (n.d.) and "*I am Half-Sick of Shadows"* (1913) will be discussed and compared to comparable imagery produced Rossetti, Burne-Jones, and others.

---

[38] Little is known about Meteyard's personal life. He did continue to teach at the School of Art until 1933. However, unlike his Birmingham Group contemporaries, Meteyard never moved away from the Birmingham area and died there in 1947. See *Last Romantics*, 109

[39] Both were students of E.R. Taylor.

[40] The same suggestion and information is included in many of Meteyard's biographies. For examples, see Christian, *Last Romantics*, 109; Wildman, *The Birmingham School*, 64-65.

ST. CECILIA[41]; [42]

Meteyard's *St. Cecilia* (n.d.; fig. 141) represents the patron saint of Music and is often shown playing a small organ. Meteyard's undated work presents the saint playing the organ, the angel listening and leaning against the side of the instrument, all happening in a private room with windows divided by blue circles of glass.[43] In alignment with the wooden partition between the windows stands this organ. The haloed angel is wearing long flowing robes of green with some floral embellishments. Her wings engulf her; the tip of one passes over the organ, the tip of the other covers her golden halo, and the bottom sweeps in a diagonal, intersecting with a pot of lilies, in alignment with the organ. The musical object separates the two women. Cecilia is flanked by more lilies (placed in the immediate foreground at right) a well as a bush of blooming flowers near the window-panes. A dark blue curtain has been pushed back in order for sunlight to stream in and illuminate the angel. For color cohesiveness, Cecilia is clad in robes of blue with purple sleeves beneath. She plays confidently, while her fingers press the white and black keys and the other fingertips begin the act of turning the page, most likely sheet music, but looks suspiciously like an illuminated manuscript. This is an intense scene, as the angel gazes intently at Cecilia, and she meanwhile concentrates on the music and pays no attention to her surroundings.

The earliest example of a Pre-Raphaelite rendering of the St. Cecilia theme is by Rossetti. His 1856-57 pen and brown ink design for Moxon's illustrated edition of Tennyson's *Poem's* provide a visualization to the poet's lines from *The Palace of Art*: "Or in a clear-wall'd city on

---

[41]William Morris also produced a similar composition, *The Organ Player* (early 1860s).
[42] Newly found information (Dec. 15, 2015): Meteyard also made a stained glass image of *St. Cecilia.* There is no good image available online and I have yet to come across it in any book. This could be kept as additional information and used in future writing. I came across it at: http://www.invaluable.com/auction-lot/sidney-harold-meteyard-1868-1947-,-st.-cecilia-346-c-gsdcn7916s (Lot 346 in an auction held in 2008).; Marie Spartali Stillman also did a variation on this subject, *The Childhood of St Cecilia* (1883)
[43] This format for glass windows is often seen in Marie Spartali Stillman's work, specifically her *Mariana* (1867).

the sea/ Near gilded organ-pipes, her hair/Wound with white roses slept St. Cecily:/ An angel look'd at her."[44] However, Rossetti's version has taken some artistic liberties. First, the angel is seen kissing the forehead of the sleeping saint. This exterior space-- the medieval city, harbor and wall from the original poem-- places Cecilia, the organ, and the angel atop a type of crossing, with a soldier eating an apple at lower left and a dove flying directly below the intersection of the two figures' heads. The patron saint of music is not playing. Her hands rest atop the organ keys, as she leans back on bended knees into the embrace of the angel.[45] Rossetti made these changes purposefully in his composition. According to documentation provided by William Michael Rossetti, the artist

> has chosen to represent the subject from a more special point of view. He supposes Cecilia, while kept a prisoner for her Christian faith, to be taking the air on the ramparts of the fortress; as she plays on her hand-organ an Angel gives her a kiss, which is the kiss of death. This is what Rossetti meant.[46]

Burne-Jones' stained glass image of *St Cecilia* (1897, fig. 142) was made a year before his death. The bar tracery divided the window into smaller squares, in essence creating a squared composition. Above the centered figure is a banner with the inscription "S*Cecilia" to clearly identify the haloed woman below. The artist has created a rendering of the Patron of Music as a tall, thin woman in the characteristic folding and creased robes that are so unique to his work. She is dressed in green robes with an underside of red. It is suggestive of an exterior scene with Cecilia standing atop small green mounds, indicative of lush landscape. Burne-Jones' *St. Cecilia* is no longer accompanied by an angel or in a naturalistic earthly realm, regardless of the inclusion of landscape. She tilts her head against the instrument. With her bannered name and

---

[44] Quoted in Surtees, vol. 1, 48, entry 83.
[45] This particular pose is reminiscent of Holman Hunt's *Hireling Shepherd* (1851).
[46] Quoted in Surtees, 48; *Permanent photographs after works by Dante Gabriel Rossetti*, ed. W.M. Rossetti, 1900, 15.

obvious halo, perhaps the artist is suggesting that St. Cecilia is once again preparing to play the heavenly music, although this time from the spiritual realm.[47]

LADY OF SHALOTT

Another thematic favorite of the Pre-Raphaelites was the Lady of Shalott, based on Tennyson's poem. Holman Hunt's famous version (1886-1905; fig. 98) depicts the moment where the cursed woman has looked out the window and seen Camelot and Lancelot. It illustrates the last stanza of part five:

> She left the web, she left the loom,/ She made three paces through the room/ She saw the water lily bloom/ She saw the helmet and the plume/ She look down to Camelot./ Out through the web and floated wide; the mirror cracked from side to side;/ "The curse has come upon me," cried/ The Lady of Shalott.[48]

Hunt's Lady has activated the curse—her hair is blown upwards as if a great wind was blowing; the mirror is cracking; and all the materials used at her loom are spiraling about. It is the beginning of the end for Tennyson's character.

By contrast, Meteyard's work represents a moment in the poem which is not often illustrated.[49] Part four of the poem indicates that that she can only see the world through her mirror—knowing that actually gazing upon the outdoors will trigger the curse. The artist's painting, "*I am half-sick of shadows"* (1913; fig. 144) presents a quiet moment for the Lady as she laments over her predicament that by experiencing the world through a looking glass is no existence at all. Using the loom to weave the sights she sees through the intact mirror offers a certain amount of delight. She witnesses the "magic sights" second-hand that occur in and

---

[47] Strudwick produced two images, *St. Cecilia* (1896; fig. 143) and *Summer Hours* (1901) that are compositionally and thematically similar to Meteyard's work.

[48] Tennyson's poem; text accessed through http://www.victorianweb.org/authors/tennyson/los1.html (accessed December 16, 2015).

[49] John Melhuish Strudwick also produced a painting along these lines, simply called *Elaine.*

around Camelot. Meteyard's work presents the Lady of Shalott reclining against a chair and pillow, once again peering into the mirror, revealing a sight of "two young lovers lately wed."[50] To their reflection she muttered, "I am half-sick of shadows." This momentary pause in her needlework allows the viewer to see what images she has seen of late: the upper portion is suggestive of three figures, but her threads of various colors mask it; the middle section is filled with depictions of roses; and below that, presumably where she has stopped working, details a knight riding a horse, most likely her first glance at Lancelot.

Two years later (1915; fig. 145), Waterhouse created an oil of the same title. Here, the viewer looks into this claustrophobic space, where the Lady, seated at her loom with arms bent back, is again reflecting on this predicament with which she has been cursed. Dressed in a plain gown of pinks and gold belt, the mirror reveals that it is daylight outside (unlike Meteyard's work). Again, the lovers are strolling along a path, and the city of Camelot lay just beyond. The loom shows her embroidery—three circles with individual sights in them. There are balls of thread laying on her lap and scattered across the floor. In this moment, as with the previous example, she is not delighting in her work. Instead, her expression is one of ruefulness and discontent.[51]

John Melhuish Strudwick (1849-1937)

Strudwick was not part of the Birmingham Group, but did have a direct connection to Burne-Jones, having been a studio assistant in the 1870s. He can thusly be categorized as a follower of Burne-Jones, as well as someone whose

---

[50] Tennyson's poem.

[51] J.L. Byam Shaw depicted the eventuality of the prophecy being fulfilled. In accordance with his *Lady of Shalott* (1898, fig. 146), she has found the boat she will take to Camelot and is inscribing her name on its side.

> themes were original and his compositions well-considered... A gradual preoccupation with melancholy subjects reflected his own attitude towards society. Thus, his Pre-Raphaelite style perfectly fits in the Rossetti-tradition, which he carried into the twentieth century.[52]

Strudwick was the subject of an article written in 1891 by George Bernard Shaw. According to the writer, the artist told him that, in terms of the first phase of his artistic career, "he could not draw—never could." Shaw interpreted this statement as being "a priceless gift," which would save him from an "empty virtuosity".[53] Though it would seem that Strudwick lacked the basic technique, there is no question that he was tenacious, painting *Songs without words* (1875; fig. 147) and continuously submitting it to the Royal Academy until it was accepted in 1876. Whereas it was the first and only work the artist would ever exhibit at the RA, it was a turning point for him—from then on, he considered himself a professional artist. In the same article by Shaw, he paid the artist a compliment, writing that "there is no such thing in existence as an unsold picture by Strudwick."[54]

In the early 1870s, Strudwick was first a studio assistant to Spencer Stanhope and then Burne-Jones. It has often been conceded that the artist was indebted to Burne-Jones, but when describing the aforementioned work, the claim has been made that:

> the picture shows his [Strudwick] style fully formed, and it underwent little development from then on. While clearly owing much to Burne-Jones, it lacks his nervous intensity and intellectual vigor, relying for its effect on surface decoration and often evoking a mood of cloying sweetness.[55]

He exhibited, along with other adherents of Burne-Jones, at the Grosvenor Gallery and the New Gallery, all the while enjoying considerable success.

---

[52] Steven Kolsteren, "The Pre-Raphaelite Art of John Melhuish Strudwick," in *Journal of Pre-Raphaelite Studies*, vol. 1, issue 2, 1988, 1.
[53] Ibid., 92.
[54] Lot notes from Lot 13/ Sale 6831; Christie's Auction, *Important British and Irish Art*, 26 November 2003; (accessed February 2016)
http://www.christies.com/LotFinder/lot_details.aspx?from=salesummary&intObjectID=4194471
[55] Christian, *Last Romantics,* 92.

ISABELLA

Strudwick's oeuvre is limited, as he spent much time choosing each subject and executing it. He was known to slowly and continuously add extra details to his works before they were completed. His art, therefore, was "part of the Pre-Raphaelite tradition, combining detailed symbols and immaterial dreams, and reflecting the influence of Burne-Jones."[56] The artist's interpretation of the figure of Isabella (1879; fig. 148) from Keats' poem differs greatly from the canonical example executed by Hunt.

Millais' *Lorenzo and Isabella* (1849; fig. 83) illustrates the two lovers dining with Isabella's family, but it is obvious from the men's gestures that Lorenzo, a mere servant, is not worthy of their sister. The two lovers huddle together for a private moment, while the brother seated across the table from them extends his leg to kick the dog nuzzling Isabella's leg.

Hunt's iconic *Isabella and the pot of basil* (1869; fig. 82) continues illustrating the the narrative of Keats' tragic lovers that Millais had produced twenty years earlier. The poem describes a love found and then lost: Isabella fell in love with Lorenzo, a servant of her brothers', and they murdered him to prevent a union between the two. Exhuming the body, Isabella takes her beloved's head and buries it in a pot of basil that she waters with her tears. The brothers discover her deed, steal the pot and she dies of a broken heart. In Hunt's version, the viewer sees Isabella holding the pot, in a gesture of putting her arms around Lorenzo, and watering it with her tears. As the basil has grown to exquisite heights, it is correct to assume that she is distraught by the murder of her beloved.

Strudwick's canvas presents the viewer with a woman clad in a red dress, its drapery similar in fashion to the style of Burne-Jones. The shoulder of her dress has fallen, revealing her bare skin and white chemise. She holds herself up with one arm against the partially covered

[56] Kolsteren, 5.

chest, on which depicts a nude female in bas-relief. Her other hand presses against her body, below her breast, as if to indicate the shock, grief and bewilderment as she realizes that the silver pot with Lorenzo's remains has been stolen from her private quarters. The interior space in which she finds herself is significantly less ornate that Hunt's composition. The tiled floor retreats into the background, bringing attention to the open windows.[57] This is most suggestive of the narrative that her brothers had taken the pot, previously held by its now vacant pedestal. Perhaps the hand over her heart is indicative of Keats' poem which stipulates she is to die of a broken heart.

This particular portion of the poem, the intrigue and continued betrayal from Isabella's brothers, is not the norm as far as representations of Isabella is concerned. Like Hunt's example, the lovers are usually shown together in the guise of love-struck female cradling Lorenzo vis-á-vis the pot of basil. Waterhouse's *Isabella and the Pot of Basil* (1897) and Fortescue-Brickdale's illustration, *Isabella,* (1898) both represent a moment and composition quite similar to that of Hunt. The focus remains on the solitary female with her arms draped around the flourishing pot of basil. Brickdale's interior details, particularly the windows, are reminiscent of Strudwick's composition. Strudwick's work of art then, thematically, is reminiscent of the early Pre-Raphaelites (Millais, Hunt), stylistically inspired by Burne-Jones, but the particular instance he decided to represent sets his work apart from the rest.

GOLDEN THREAD

The other work worth considering is Strudwick's *Golden Thread* (1885; fig. 149), first exhibited at the Grosvenor Gallery in 1885 with the accompanying lines, "Right true it is that

[57] This use of tiled floor is compositionally similar to Evelyn Pickering de Morgan's *Medea* (1889).

these/ And all things else that under Heaven dwell/ Are changed of time."[58] The theme of Time is explored through the double-registered painting.[59] The bottom section (fig. 151) reveals the figures of the three Fates, all swathed in dark blue robes. Two of the three are actively measuring out the lifespan and happiness of the mortals above. These two Fates in the foreground spin the thread of life, including spindles of gold and grey threads, while the third, hooded Fate, looks on uninterested.

The top register (fig. 152) displays four narratives happening concurrently: a woman sits in a one-room structure, talking to a man on the other side of the window; a winged angel to the right stands in a contrapposto position, with a horn brought up to his lips; to the left of the structure is a bell tower, in which an old, bearded man (presumably Father Time) is to ringing the bells; while the upper portion of the composition reveals a winged horse and empty golden chariot (supposedly Love's car)[60], with five cherubim waiting.

As a whole, the viewer is to understand that the notion of Time is ticking away in both registers: the Fates' work will determine the lovers' happiness and amount of time they have together; the tolling bells signify the passage of time; and the Personification of Time waits patiently with a scythe, in anticipation of cutting the thread.[61] The title *Golden Thread* and the repeated use of gold, including one of the spindles, offers hope to the viewer that it is the artist's way of visually suggesting that lovers will enjoy a long and happy life together.

Though Rossetti or Burne-Jones never specifically addressed the passage of Time in a composition like this, per se, they did all create dramatic imagery depicting Queen Eleanor and

---

[58] Tate Museum, Display Caption, (accessed November 2015) http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/strudwick-a-golden-thread-n01625

[59] The theme of Time has not, to the best of my knowledge, was not a topic explored by the selected Neo-Pre-Raphaelites. However, Fortescue-Brickdale did produce *Time the Physician* (1900; fig. 150), which shows the personification of Time bandaging up a wounded knight.

[60] Ibid., http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/strudwick-a-golden-thread-n01625/text-display-caption

[61] Paraphrased from ibid.

Rosamond, the mistress of Henry II; although these paintings are based on legend rather than historical fact.[62] The link between Strudwick's *Golden Thread* and both Rosamund works is the pictorial usage of the golden thread. Nevertheless, all three artists employ it as a way to represent love and time. In Strudwick's depiction, the fiber was part of the thread of life and its purpose was to represent love and time. Rossetti and Burne-Jones also use it to represent these two universal concepts, though its presence was included as a detail in the legend of Henry II and his mistress, Rosamund.

According to folklore on which these comparative images are based, Henry II created a hidden chamber for his mistress at the center of an elaborate maze. The Queen navigated this labyrinth, and with the aid of thread, thereby discovering the young Rosamund, whom she would later poison.[63] The pictorial representations of this narrative offer a more theatrical perspective on the tale.[64]

The earliest Pre-Raphaelite treatment of this subject is Rossetti's *Fair Rosamund* (1861; fig. 153). As was common with his artistic preference in the 1860s, Rossetti has portrayed this mistress as a stunner, with red hair streaming down around her face and a red flower in her hair.[65] She is separated from the viewer and her lover by a ledge decorated with hearts and roses. The red, silk cord is tied in a looped knot, anchored to a three-dimensional golden flower, appearing to be part of the wall's architecture. This cord brings attention to the low neckline of

---

[62] History stipulates that Henry imprisoned his Queen from 1174-1189 for supporting the rebellion of her two sons against their father. Rosamund entered a nunnery around 1174 and died two years later. The DeMorgan Center for the Study of 19th Century Art and Society http://www.demorgan.org.uk/collection/queen_eleanor.htm (accessed 15 May 2008).

[63] Tate Britain Museum, *Queen Eleanor and Fair Rosamund* www.tate.org.uk (accessed 15 May 2008).

[64] Fellow Neo-Pre-Raphaelite, Frank Cadogan Cowper, also made a version of this story, *Fair Rosamund and Eleanor* (1920). As with Burne-Jones' vision, Cowper has also focused on the moment the Queen found the mistress. With the strings around Rosamund, the dagger in Eleanor's hand becomes a significant detail. The artist has chosen a far more dramatic and dangerous moment than Burne-Jones, since it appears Eleanor is debating the timing of the actual killing of Rosamund.

[65] The text for this image in Surtees' catalogue raisonné does not indicate the type of flower in model Fanny Cornforth's hair. If it is indeed a poppy, that would foreshadow Rosamund's death.

her floral dress which echoes the red flower in her hair, as well as the double-stranded red necklace tightly bound around her throat. The thread at right appears to be tightening, an indication of the imminent arrival of her secret lover, Henry II.[66]

In Burne-Jones' *Queen Eleanor and Fair Rosamund* (1862; fig. 154), the Queen has found the young woman within the maze, and has victoriously entangled her with the restricting fiber. The artist has chosen to represent Rosamund as a girl, rather than the adult beauty seen in Rossetti's work. Burne-Jones has clad her in a simple, white garment, visually indicating her innocence and perhaps an ironic sense of naiveté. As a visual contrast, the girl in white turns her head towards the evil, dark-haired Queen, who is dressed accordingly in black robes. The captor holds the filament, stepping on the lowest part that touches the ground in order to stop the fleeing prisoner. The reflection of the Queen's face is repeated, in full or profile, in the mirror along with the six roundels encircling it. Rosamund looks back uneasily and realizes there will be no escape. She is trapped by the magical thread, conveniently tied in a looped knot at one wall and running across her legs and torso to the clasped hands of the betrayed wife. The tied thread, meant as a means for the lovers to secretly rendezvous, has become her undoing.

This use of thread by Strudwick, Rossetti and Burne-Jones remains true to the notion of love and time. For Struckwick, it was part of the Fates' ritual to determine time and love for the two figures. Rossetti primarily focuses on the sensuality of the mistress, yet the red chord, tightening but not yet taut, presumably indicates the arrival of Henry II, and not Queen Eleanor making her way through the passageway to confront the seductress. Rossetti is much more interested on representing Rosamund as an ideal beauty and one of his stunners. Unlike the others, Burne-Jones incorporates the thread to depict the moment when the Queen has captured

---

[66] The idea of the tautness be equated with the arrival of her royal lover is suggested in Surtees' brief catalogue entry (vol. 1, cat. 128), 81.

her prey. The inevitability of Rosamund's untimely demise is at hand. With Rosamund dead, the Queen, presumably, has no more competition for her husband's affections; hence the title *Queen Eleanor and Fair Rosamund*.

EVELYN PICKERING DE MORGAN (1855-1919)

"My sister began painting as soon as she could hold a brush," recalled Pickering de Morgan's youngest sibling, while her mother complained, "I want a daughter not an artist!"[67] As a way of discouraging the young girl's excessive artistic talent, "the drawing master was instructed to tell her she had no talent; she was also forbidden to paint in her free time… when lessons resumed, [the tutor] refused to allow her to study anatomy."[68]

In 1877, she exhibited *Ariadne in Naxos* the newly opened Grosvenor Gallery. It was observed that the canvas showed a "grieving classical figure on the seashore, was much admired for its blend of assured handling, depth of color and intense color."[69] Perhaps she decided to present this work at this time because her father had died a year earlier (1876).

Yet, the commentary about this image provided an avenue to bring to light the Pre-Raphaelites and Burne-Jones, indicating:

> Miss Pickering had barely scraped acquaintance with the most noted men of genius who had been influenced by the modern Pre-Raphaelite movement. She had not seen the pictures that Millais painted in his first period, nor had she a chance of becoming familiar with them till they were brought once more to public notice by the Millais exhibition of 1886. With Rossetti's poetry, in 1887, Miss Pickering was well acquainted, but of his genius in painting she knew scarcely anything at all, and it remained almost unknown to her till she visited that fine show of Rossetti's pictures which was held after his death. A regards Burne-Jones, she had certainly been moved by their particular greatness; but the influence of Burne-Jones had not yet then appeared in her work…[70]

[67] Quoted in Marsh and Nunn, *Women artists and the Pre-Raphaelite Movement*, 107.
[68] Ibid., 107-108.
[69] Ibid., 108.
[70] Quoted in ibid, 108.

Her closest connection to Pre-Raphaelitism at the time was her aforementioned uncle, J.R. Spencer Stanhope. She continued to exhibit and gained attention and criticism in the press. Though there are some artistic similarities between Pickering de Morgan and Burne-Jones, their own styles, respectively, are unique. She was commonly referred to as a follower or disciple of Burne-Jones; yet when she was labeled a Late Victorian artist, her work is described as "stylistically at the intersection of the loosely defined Aesthetic, Symbolist, and Classical movements… Consistent, careful and polished, her paintings are beautiful even elegant but superficially rather bland."[71] Regardless of critiques, positive or negative, she continued to be a proficient artist.

QUEEN ELEANOR AND FAIR ROSAMUND

Burne-Jones' previously discussed *Queen Eleanor and Fair Rosamund* revealed the moment where the maiden realized she had been discovered; Pickering de Morgan's representation (n.d.; fig. 155) also brings to light the evil deed the Queen intends. Her version, unlike those of her predecessors, is filled with bright colors, graceful poses and meticulous attention to detail. In general terms, the artist's female figures usually were idealized beauties or representations of seductive predators. In this work, the infamous labyrinth of which the King set up so that Rosamund would be protected is visible in the exterior, behind the looming figure of Eleanor. There is a glass window above Rosamund with a depiction of two lovers embracing, most likely meant to represent she and the King. Eleanor holds up the red thread victoriously, quite literally above Rosamund's head. Each are dressed in classical robing and ironically, Rosamund's is red, the color of passion as well as the thread which instead of keeping her safe,

[71] Elise Lawton Smith, *Evelyn Pickering de Morgan and the allegorical body* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2002), 13.

has brought inevitably caused her death. Along with a small flask of poison brought in by the Queen, so too do shadowy, evil forms enter—"dragons, apes and blood red roses lie at her [Rosamund] feet."[72] In contrast, red-winged cherubim are prostrate on the floor, mourning what is to come. White doves, representative of peace, as well as white roses, suggestive of purity and innocence, surround her. Rosamund does not run, but instead focuses on the flask of poison. True to the artist's philosophy, she has shown woman as both predator and idealized beauty, but instead of representing a single figure at a time, she has included both extremes of womanhood in the same composition.

THE GILDED CAGE (1900-1919)

By the start of the twentieth-century, the artist was very much aware of and in support of Women's Suffrage. *The Gilded Cage* (1900-1919; fig. 156) is a double portrait in an interior scene with window structure to separate the two figures (perhaps man and wife) and the festivities beyond.[73] The woman is dressed in lavish gold, cream and pink robes and has discarded jewels and books in favor of being freed from this "gilded cage." She is trapped; the male figure droops as if to acknowledge the utter uselessness of her enthusiasm. It is important to know that one of Pickering de Morgan's core beliefs was that women were prisoners of materiality (luxury) and yearned for the freedom of nature.[74] Additionally, she believed that women were to operate as "assertive agents in the world and were actively in control of their own destinies."[75] It would seem, however, that the title indicates the destiny of the woman. She

[72] DeMorgan Foundation Website
http://www.demorgan.org.uk/Queen%20Eleanor%20and%20the%20Fair%20Rosamund
(accessed March 2016).
[73] I refer to it as a window structure because the roses appear to be on either side of the metal divider. Alternatively it could be a mirror reflecting what is in the viewer's space.
[74] Smith, *Allegorical body*, 58.
[75] Ibid., 13.

will remain trapped unless she somehow can find the strength to escape. This golden clad women, therefore, becomes the personification of women's suffrage / right to vote. Ironically, the spines of the books on the shelf read : Poseia / Musica / Arte / Mors / Tratta-to-Della / Medicin / Omare which translates to poetry, music, art, death, interpretations, medicine—books appropriate for a classical education.

Compositionally, this work relates to Burne-Jones' *Dorigen of Bretagne longing for the safe return of her husband* (1871; fig. 157). Like the figure in *Gilded Cage*, Dorigen has also spread her arms across the entirety of the window ledge. She watches the ocean in hopes of the safe return of her husband, and in the process, has abandoned the standing organ and have books strewn on the ground and in opened compartments. Her gesture is a dramatic one and her figure drastically takes up the majority of the composition. Such an action, as well as being in a claustrophobic, enclosed interior and could be a visual manifestation of feelings of hopelessness, despair and loneliness. The ghost-like figures on the opened organ door, moreover, suggest that her husband will not return in this life, but that the two will be reunited after death.

CONCLUSION

This chapter began with questioning how to situate Marie Spartali Stillman within a working definition of Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism, explored the work and relationships of her younger colleagues Bunce, Meteyard and Strudwick and ended with Pickering de Morgan, whose first and closest encounter with the PRB was through her uncle, Spencer Stanhope. As it was revealed in the aforementioned 1877 article, unlike the others, she had not been actively seeking out compositional indebtedness to the original PRB. Both Rossetti and Burne-Jones seemed especially influential on Spartali Stillman, Bunce, Meteyard and Strudwick; all involved were interested in Pre-Raphaelitism's themes, composition, styles, and phases.

While it is obvious that Pickering de Morgan's figures, along with those of Burne-Jones, are elongated, striking, and classically robed, the artists' particular approaches to figural representation remain distinctly different. Additionally, the de Morgans were very much in tune with Swedenborg's spiritualism and engaged in automatic writings, concepts which are beyond the scope of this dissertation. Of all the artists discussed in this chapter, it is obvious that for Evelyn Pickering de Morgan, her figural representations were in fulfillment of a personal and spiritual agenda. For Swedenborg, art offered analogies between material objects and spiritual states.[76] Along those same lines, the artist dictated in one of the automatic writings

> Science can only reveal the physical either in your world or ours. The spiritual can only be seen by spirit, and the reason Art is of vital importance in the scheme of life is that it de[ends for its very existence on certain spiritual laws not known on Earth, only guessed at… Art is entirely of your spirit. It does not exist in your natural state. Only as the spirit grows does it become possible.[77]

Yet, in consideration of the larger scope of Pre-Raphaelitism, Ruskin declared in 1856, "the battle is completely and confessedly won…animosity has changed into emulation, astonishment into sympathy."[78] This was apparently a strategic understatement, for in the next decade, artist Florence Claxton created a hyper-detailed satire of Pre-Raphaelitism entitled *The Choice of Paris: An Idyll* (1860). It indicated "how good a joke the style and its movement still seemed to some sectors of the gallery-going public, proving at one and the same time how familiar and yet how alien to the public its production must have been."[79] Most assuredly, Claxton must have sensed that Pre-Raphaelitism was "neither so passé that it was not worth making fun of, nor so generally approved that it could not be acceptably ridiculed."[80]

---

[76] Paraphrased from Smith, *Allegorical Body*, 107-08.
[77] Quoted in Ibid., 147-48.
[78] Marsh and Nunn, *Pre-Raphaelite Women Artists*, 68.
[79] Ibid., 68.
[80] Ibid., 68.

Chapter 11
Conclusion

"It doesn't matter how beautifully a thing is painted, it is no good if it isn't right - it's got to come out... What does it matter how you do it? Paint it with a shovel if you can't get your effect any other way."
-- John Everett Millais[1]

The legacy of the primary three Pre-Raphaelites (Millais, Hunt and Rossetti) has not ended. It has endured, evolved, and continued until at least the middle of the twentieth-century. Additional research, out of the scope of this dissertation, may provide new scholarship demonstrating that Pre-Raphaelitism has been successfully brought into the twenty-first century via new artists, themes, and technology.

Chapter 1 examined the paradoxical nature of the term “Pre-Raphaelitism.” Hence, the historiography of this word suggested that it was vague, ambiguous, controversial, and at times, un-definable. While several academics’ views on the subject are investigated in this dissertation, some of the main arguments presented are a lack of cohesive style as well as the artists’ individuality and absence of a formal alliance. While the original members of 1848- roughly 1853 were called the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, there were still irregularities on subject, technique, and style. Inevitably, each artist evolved and by the mid 1850s, Millais, Rossetti and Hunt had gone in their own artistic directions in order to develop and advance their own personal style.

Additionally, it acknowledges the challenge of how to define/divide the broad term of Pre-Raphaelitism, especially once the Brotherhood had dispersed. The general consensus of key scholars Barringer and Rosenfeld was that Pre-Raphaelitism only included two generations of British artists. Prettejohn suggested that in the most constricted way, the movement ended when

[1] “Famous Artist Quotes,” *Collage in Art* http://collageinart.net/famous-artists-quotes/ (accessed January 27, 2016).

the PRB stopped gathering regularly; yet recognized in a broad scope, that Pre-Raphaelitism survived into the twentieth-century. Therefore, it can be claimed the above-mentioned scholars, in addition to Wood, Lambourne, Marsh and Nunn, remain at the very least in agreement that there were at least two generations of Pre-Raphaelites. It remains undisputed that the original PRB was the first generation. The literature agrees up to a point that the start of the second generation was characterized by the leadership of Rossetti, Burne-Jones and William Morris: Lambourne and Parris believe it to be with the 1858 Oxford Murals; Barringer and Hilton contend that it coincided with the leadership of Burne-Jones (1865-80); and for Prettejohn, the second generation was signaled by the collaboration of Burne-Jones and Morris directly after their acquaintance with artists like Hughes, Spencer Stanhope, and Prinsep.

It is argued primarily in Marsh and Nunn's work of the existence of a third generation (1880-1910), including female artists Bunce and Fortescue-Brickdale, both of whom began exhibiting in the 1880s. Such a generation admired Rossetti's work through his retrospective exhibitions; biographies newly released in 1889 and edited by his brother William Michael Rossetti; and the publication of the artist's correspondence and poetry. The authors speculate that interest in Ruskin's ideals was diminishing but that the still-living Burne-Jones became the leader of Pre-Raphaelitism and advocated for a new generation of artists to explore their interpretation of what had come before.

With only Marsh and Nunn championing for a third generation, scholars admittedly did not know how to classify anything produced in the late-nineteenth century, let alone the twentieth, that was remotely produced in a Pre-Raphaelite mode, spirit, or technique. Art historians understand the fluidity of such terminology as movement, period, or style. Consequently, academic literature attempted to place artists and their works (or stages of their

oeuvre) into "appropriate" categories. The artists which have been investigated for this dissertation, including Cowper, Shaw, Brickdale, Waterhouse, and Gotch, have been deemed revivalists, realists, neo-Italians, Neo-Romantics, sons and heirs of Pre-Raphaelitism, the last Romantics, Early Academics, late Victorianists and my preferred appellation of "Neo-Pre-Raphaelites."

The goal of my opus is not only to suggest another manner in which to categorize those artists exhibiting in the late 1880s and beyond, but also to create a vital grouping of individuals with deliberate artistic ties to the original Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. There also had to be a contemporary artist who bridged the fifty-year span as well as having an influence over the newer generations' work.

My research initially links and establishes each of the selected Neo-Pre-Raphaelites' specific desire to consciously emulate certain aspects of the PRB, which incorporated some degree of the Ruskinian ideal of truth to nature. Cadogan Cowper wrote that, "I understand the theory of Pre-Raphaelitism perfectly now, and as far as the method of painting is concerned [I] understand it better than all the P.R.B. … did themselves…[2] Byam Shaw's obituary asserted: "He was not a "modern" as the word is now understood, but belonged by temperament and taste to the Pre-Raphaelite period, leaning towards the Rossetti rather than Millais and Holman Hunt side of the movement."[3] Likewise, Waterhouse's obituary read that the artist "painted pre-Raphaelite pictures in a more modern manner…"[4] as attested to Peter Trippi's book *John William Waterhouse: The Modern Pre-Raphaelite.* Furthermore, in June of 1901, the *Morning Leader* described Fortescue-Brickdale as "the latest adherent to Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism," a term

---

[2] Royal Academy Archives, COW/2/1.
[3] Frank Rutter, "Obituary" *The Sunday Times,* March 23, 1919 quoted in Rex Vicat Cole, *The Art and Life of Byam Shaw* (London: Seeley, Service & Co. Ltd, 1932), 204-05.
[4] "Mr. J. W. Waterhouse, R.A." *Times* [London, England] 12 Feb. 1917: 6.

which until then had not been used. Moreover, T.C. Gotch's oeuvre includes imagery which is compositionally indebted to early Pre-Raphaelitism. After the fortuitous trip to Italy, critic Christopher Wood described Gotch's pictures as a

> blend of Pre-Raphaelitism and the Italian Renaissance. Tom Gotch himself thought that it was his "realism" rather than his "imaginative symbolism" that was affiliated with Pre-Raphaelitism: "Strange as it may seem, a movement which is the reverse of Pre-Raphaelitism, which may perhaps be caught smiling at [its] subjects, treatment, and workmanship… is yet of the same family, for it has its birth in a sincerity of purpose and a reverence for Nature."[5]

These artists, then, all have claims to the PRB, be it through correspondence, obituaries, or contemporary critics, thereby ultimately bringing the first phase of Pre-Raphaelitism into the late nineteenth and early twentieth-centuries. It shows that even with the deaths of Millais, Rossetti, and Ruskin before the turn-of-the-century, Ruskin's philosophy of select, reject and scorn nothing, as well as its application by Millais, Rossetti and Hunt was still at play. Scholars Wood and Christian, among others, linked Shaw, Cowper and Brickdale together, calling them the "younger generation who see [Pre-Raphaelitism] as a living tradition … and tended to regard it as a phenomenon ripe for revival, going back to the early work of Millais and Rossetti and reinterpreting it in a more academic spirit."[6]

Now that the relationship with the PRB had been firmly established, I believe it was critical to identify an "anchor artist" who would act both as linchpin between these vast chronologies of Pre-Raphaelitism as well as hybrid artist in order to visually connect the latter grouping to the former. Edwin Austin Abbey was the ideal person for this role, though no scholar has posited this in the past. He was influenced and inspired by the PRB, as mentioned in chapters 2 and 3, particularly Millais when it came to composition. He also enjoyed a friendship with Millais—the artists exchanged letters and even attended the same social events. Millais

[5] Quoted in Lomax, *Golden Dream*, 15.
[6] Christian, *Last Romantics*, 12.

expressed his praise for Abbey's career and congratulated him on his acceptance as a Royal Academician. Abbey was devastated by the death of Millais, and it is perhaps with this in mind, that he fell into the roll of molding later Pre-Raphaelite artists into their PRB predecessors. Despite this, Abbey was an excellent fit for linking together these two different groups of artists who worked nearly a half-century apart. His personal relationship with the PRB allowed him to bring the PRB and NPR together in an authentic way.

With the advocacy of Abbey as the link between the two "schools", as established in Chapter 2, it was only right that Abbey's own images be examined in Chapter 3. This was an important choice because there needed to be irrefutable evidence that Abbey was artistically indebted to the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood (Millais and Rossetti), their associate Ford Madox Brown, and the younger generation of Gotch, Brickdale, Bunce and Pickering de Morgan.

Chapter 4 inspected the 1908 Parliament murals with Abbey as artistic advisor. This commission was an incredible coup for Abbey, as well as Cowper. Of the six murals, Cowper and Shaw executed two of them; Cowper's figures are indebted to the likes of Holbein and Holman Hunt, while Shaw approached the project with more of an illustrative style. While there remains no confirmation from Parliament at this time (2016) as to Commissioner Harcourt's intended installation and in what order the murals were meant to be understood, they remain admirable for their beauty, skill and subtle political messages.

Chapter 5 took a closer look at Frank Cadogan Cowper, who from his early years was convinced he understood Pre-Raphaelitism better than the entire Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. His assistantship to Abbey prior to the mural commission allowed them to have a companionable professional relationship as well as friendship. Abbey helped Cowper when he could with sales, but CC's *Erasmus* mural in Parliament opened new doors to the young artist.

Chapter 6 focused on John Liston Byam Shaw, who was a student, teacher, painter, illustrator, draughtsman, watercolorist, muralist, cartoonist, and theater designer. He started an art school with friend Rex Vicat Cole, and his colleague and friend from the RA, Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale, eventually became an instructor of watercolors. His motto, of which I think Ruskin would admire, was "Try very hard!"[7] For Shaw as student, I believe his inspirations to primarily be Rossetti, Waterhouse, and Abbey. As a professional artist, Shaw is often linked with Cowper and Brickdale, many times going so far as to claim Brickdale's indebtedness to Shaw. Instead, it is more likely to be a situation of circumstance in that their time at the RA as students overlapped as well as the time when Abbey was a Visitor (instructor) there. It is no wonder that their work is aesthetically similar.

Chapter 7 was dedicated to Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale who was not only associated with the aforementioned classmates, but with John Ruskin directly! She, too, was student and teacher; and found immediate success through her work in paint, watercolor, and book illustration. It was noted that she paid meticulous attention to detail, much like the first generation of Pre-Raphaelitism. Her compositional indebtedness relies primarily on her contemporaries: Abbey, Cowper, Shaw, and Waterhouse.

Chapter 8 centered on John William Waterhouse and one oil painting *The Lady of Shalott* (1888) that marked a turning point in his career from a follower of Alma-Tadema to Pre-Raphaelitism. As indicated within the Introduction and chapter, this approach to the artist was deliberate. By focusing on this particular image and comparing it to other Pre-Raphaelite themes and artists, it became obvious that the identity of "modern" Pre-Raphaelite assigned by Trippi was true. His technique, moreover, recalled a letter penned by Abbey about the older Ruskin,

---

[7] Cole, *Art and Life of Byam Shaw,* 204.

"the representation of events not as they might be supposed *poetically* to have happened, but as they really might have happened."[8]

Chapter 9 concentrated on the work of Thomas Cooper Gotch. While his association to Abbey was through their mutual acquaintance with John Singer Sargent, and eventually the participation by Gotch and Sargent in the NEAC (New English Arts Club). Gotch never satisfactorily presented his audience with an answer to "which movement do you belong?" As mentioned in the chapter, an interview in 1887 revealed, "he belonged to a modern school of painting, which shared some of the principles of the Pre-Raphaelites, but did not carry fidelity to Nature to the same extreme."[9] His early works aligned him with the Newlyn School but an accidental trip to Italy inspired him to paint in the manner of an extension of Pre-Raphaelite Symbolism. The works selected explore themes of transition and rites of passage from girlhood to adulthood. His daughter Phyllis was his inspiration and was his model on many occasions.

Though this concluded the discussion of Abbey-centric Neo-Pre-Raphaelites, it did not mark the end of the examination of these late Victorianists. As there were strict parameters set at the start of this dissertation with Abbey linking the five artists, Chapter 10 continued these restrictions with the common denominators of Burne-Jones, and to some extent, Rossetti. These artists, termed "Outliers" provide an alternative for yet another collection of Neo-Pre-Raphaelite artists: Marie Spartali Stillman, Kate Bunce, Sidney Meteyard, John Melhuish Strudwick and Eveyln Pickering de Morgan. What is particularly important to the content of this chapter is that while Rossetti at this time was producing his "stunners," the female artists (Stillman, Bunce, and Pickering de Morgan) completely toned down the sensuality and sexuality of their solitary female figures. They did not represent woman as an object for (male) admiration and attention.

[8] Edward Verrall Lucas, *Edwin Austin Abbey, Royal Academician: The Record of His Life and Work,* vol.1 (New York: Charles Scriberner's Sons, 1921), 189.
[9] Quoted in Lomax, *Golden Dream,* 87.

Instead, their women were used to convey the theme of the image at hand. As neither Strudwick nor Meteyard treated their females like those of Rossetti, it is not a gendered artist trait, but rather a differentiation between Rossetti's Aestheticism and the Outliers' treatment of their subject.

As nearly every artists' obituary touted them as the "last of the Pre-Raphaelites" or some variation to that effect, it does beg the question of which artist earned that distinction. By chronology alone, that honor is given to Cadogan Cowper, having worked in a Pre-Raphaelite style until his death in 1958. Like these advocates of the PRB, CC followed the interest in Arthurian legends and classical lore as well as being inspired by the verses of Romantic poets and traditional literary masters like Shakespeare and Christ (as told through biblical references). Though these late PRB disciples may not have followed Millais' preference for thorough realism (and even he [Milllais] abandoned this by c. 1856), Cadogan Cowper continually remained true to the teachings and technique of Millais, Rossetti, and especially Hunt in the stalwart fidelity to the PRB style.

As for Pre-Raphaelit**ism**, I would suggest that it has not come to an end. In all deference to the specialists, I would agree with the argument that there were two distinct phases of the movement, but that the notion of "Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism" and whatever come what may after continues the rebellious nature of the PRB against the RA. This opus has endeavored to provide a plausible solution to what happened after the second phase of Pre-Raphaelitism with Burne-Jones, Rossetti and Morris. An argument for an Abbey-centric, or even Burne-Jonesian based Neo-Pre-Raphaelitism, could be considered as either an offshoot of a second or third generation of Pre-Raphaelitism (much to the dismay of Marsh and Nunn) or the start of a fourth phase.

Thus, as *The Studio* published in 1898, it would appear as if the general consensus of the public was confident in the assessment that:

> *No matter what the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood actually meant, or what Mr. Ruskin put forward as their creed, the movement we see today [1898] is deeper and broader than they guessed. It began before them, and it has lasted beyond them.*[10]

[10] Quoted from Marsh and Nunn, *Pre-Raphaelite Women Artists*; "The Lay Figure and Pre-Raphaelitism," *The Studio*, 1898, xiii, 70.

Bibliography

Baldry. A. L. “The Work of T.C.Gotch.” *The Studio* 13 (March 1898): 73-82.

Baldry, A.L. “Our Rising Artists: Mr. Byam Shaw.” *Magazine of Art* (January 1898): 633-642.

Abbey, Edwin Austin. “Shortcomings of American Art Education.” In *Brush and Pencil: An Illustrated Magazine of the Arts of To-Day*, edited by Frederick W. Morton, 331-335. Chicago: The Brush and Pencil Publishing Company, 1902.

Altick, Brian. *Paintings from books: art and literature in Britain, 1760-1900.* Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1985.

Amor, Anne Clark. *William Holman Hunt: the true Pre-Raphaelite.* London: Constable, 1989.

Anderson, Gail-Nina and Joanne Wright. *Heaven on earth: the religion of beauty in late Victorian art*. London: Djanogly Art Gallery, University of Nottingham Arts Centre in association with Lund Humphries, 1994.

Ash, Russell. *Sir John Everett Millais*. London: Pavillion, 1996.

Association of Illustrator, *The Best of British Illustrators: the Association of Illustrators Annual.* Maidstone, Kent, Eng.: Graphics World, 1979.

Barlow, Paul. *Time Present and Time Past: The Art of John Everett Millais*. Aldershot, Hants, England ; Burlington, VT, USA : Ashgate, 2005.

Barringer, Tim. *Reading the Pre-Raphaelites*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

Barringer, Tim and Elizabeth Prettejohn, eds. *Frederic Leighton: Antiquity, Renaissance, Modernity*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1999.

Barringer, Tim. *Before and After Modernism: Byam Shaw, Rex Vicat Cole, Yinka Shonibare, MBE*. London: Central Saint Martins College of Art & Design to coincide with the exhibition of same name, 2010.

-----, Elizabeth Prettejohn, Jason Rosenfeld and Alison Smith, eds. *Pre-Raphaelites: Victorian Avant-Garde*. London: Tate Gallery Publishing, 2012.

Bate, Percy. *The English Pre-Raphaelite Painters and Their Associates and Successors*. London: George Bell & Sons, 1905.

Bayliss, Wike Sir. *Five Great Painters of the Victorian Era: Leighton, Millais, Burne-Jones, Watts, Holman Hunt.* New York: AMS Press, 1971.

Bendiner, Kenneth. *The Art of Ford Madox Brown*. University Park: Pennsylvania Sate University Press, 1998.

Benezit, E. *Dictionary of Artists*. Paris: Gründ, 2006.

Bennet, Mary. *Artists of the Pre-Raphaelite Circle: the first generation*. London: Lund Humphries, 1988.

Bickley, Pamela. "Ford and Pre-Raphaelitism." In *Ford Madox Ford: A Reappraisal,* edited by Robert Hampson and W.A. Davenport, 59-78. New York: The Ford Madox Ford Society, 2002.

Brickdale, Eleanor Fortescue. *Centenary exhibition of works by Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale*. Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 1972.

Blackburn, Henry, ed. *Academy Notes 1889 with Illustrations of the Principal Pictures at Burlington House*. London: Chatto and Windus, Piccadilly, May 1889.

Bronkhurst, Judith. *William Holman Hunt: A Catalogue Raisonné*. New Haven, CT; London: Yale University Press, 2006.

Caffin, Charles H. "A Painter of Childhood and Girlhood." *Harper's Monthly Magazine* (American Edition), no. 720 (1910): 922-932.

Campbell-Wilson Gallery. *Frank Cadogan Cowper and Arthur Joseph Gaskin: Summer Exhibition at Wilson Fine Art.* Hove: Campbell Wilson Fine Art, 2004.

-----. *Pre-Raphaelite, Neo-Pre-Raphaelite, Post Pre-Raphaelite*. Hove: Campbell Wilson Fine Art, 2006.

Casteras, Susan P. and Colleen Denney. *The Grosvenor Gallery: A Palace of Art in Victorian England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.

Casteras, Susan P. and Alicia Faxon, eds. *Pre-Raphaelite Art in its European Contexts.* Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1995.

Casteras, Susan P. *Images of Victorian Womanhood in English Art*. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1987.

-----. *Pocket Cathedrals: Pre-Raphaelite Book Illustration*. New Haven: Yale Center for British Art, 1991.

-----. "Pre-Raphaelite Challenges to Victorian Canons of Beauty." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 55, no.1 (Winter, 1992): 13-35.

-----. *The Defining Moment: Victorian Narrative Paintings from The Forbes Magazine Collection*. Charlotte, NC: Mint Museum of Art, 1999.

Chamot, Mary, Dennis Farr and Martin Butlin. *The Modern British paintings, drawings, and sculpture, vol. 1 Artists A-L.* London: Oldbourne Press, 1964.

Cherry, Deborah and Jane Beckett, eds. *The Edwardian Era*. Oxford: Phaidon and Barbican Art Gallery, 1987.

Cherry, Deborah. *Painting Women: Victorian Women Artists.* London; New York: Routledge, 1993.

Christian, John, ed. *The Last Romantics: The Romantic Tradition in British Art: Burne- Jones to Stanley Spencer.* London: Lund Humphries in association with Barbican Art Gallery, 1989.

Clayton, Ellen. *English Female Artists.* London: Tinsley Bros., 1876.

Corbett, David Peters and Lara Perry. *English art 1860-1914: Modern artists and identity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001.

Codell, Julie. *The Victorian Artist: artists' lifewritings in Britain c. 1870-1910.* Cambridge, UK; New York: New York, USA; Cambridge University Press, 2003.

-----. "The artist's cause at heart: Marion Harry Spielmann and the late Victorian art world." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 71, no. 1 (1989): 139-163.

-----. "Painting Keats: Pre-Raphaelite Artists Between Social Transgressions and Painterly Conventions." *Victorian Poetry*. 33, no. ¾ , Word and Image (Autumn – Winter, 1995): 341-370.

-----. "Expression over Beauty: Facial Expression, Body Language, and Circumstantiality in the Paintings of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood." *Victorian Studies* 29, no. 2, (Winter, 1986): 255-290.

Cole, R.V. *The Art and Life of Byam Shaw*. London: Seeley Service, 1932.

Conway, William Martin. *The Historical Paintings in the Houses of Parliament; descriptive text and key to characters represented in the six Tudor panels in the House of Commons*. London: Fine Arts Publishing Co. [191-].

Cowling, Mary. *Victorian Figurative Painting: domestic life and the contemporary social scene.* London: Andreas Papadakis, 2000.

Delaware Art Museum. *Waking Dreams: The Art of the Pre-Raphaelites from the Delaware Art Museum.* Alexandria, Va.: Art Services International, 2004.

Dijkstra, Bram. *Idols of Perversity: fantasies of the feminine evil in fin-de-siécle culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Dixon, Marion Hepworth. "Our Rising Artists: Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale." *The Art Journal* (March, 1902): 256-262.

Elliott, David. *A Pre-Raphaelite Marriage: the lives and works of Marie Spartali Stillman and William James Stillman*. Woodbridge; Easthampton, MA: Antique Collectors Club, 2006.

Elzea, Betty. *Frederick Sandys (1829-1904): A Catalogue Raisonné*. Woodbridge, Suffolk; Wappingers' Falls, NY: Antique Collectors' Club, in association with Norfolk Museums & Archaeology Service, 2001.

Engen, Rodney. *Victorian Engravings*. London: Academy Editions; New York: St. Martin's, 1975.

Farr, Dennis. *English Art 1870-1940.* Oxford Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Faxon, Alicia Craig. *Dante Gabriel Rossetti.* New York: Abbeville Press, 1989.

Fenwick, Simon. *The Enchanted River: Two Hundred Years of the Royal Watercolor Society*. Bristol: Sansom and Company, 2004.

Fletcher, Pamela. *Narrating modernity: the British problem picture, 1895-1914*. Aldershot, Hants, England: Ashgate, 2003.

Foister, Susan. *Holbein in England*. London: Tate, 2006.

Ford, Ford Madox. *Ford Madox Brown: A Record of his Life and Work*. New York: AMS Press, 1972.

Fortesque-Brickdale, Eleanor. *Golden Book of Famous Women*. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919).

Foster, Kathleen A. and Michael Quick. *Edwin Austin Abbey: An exhibition organized by the Yale University Art Gallery*. New Haven: Yale University Printing Service, 1971.

Fox, Caroline. *Artists of the Newlyn School: 1880-1900*. Newlyn Cornwall: Newlyn Orion Galleries, 1979.

Fraser, Hilary. *Beauty and Belief: aesthetics and religion in Victorian Literature*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Fredeman, William E. *Pre-Raphaelitism: a bibliocritical study.* Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1965.

Frederick Margaretta S. and Jan Marsh. *Poetry in beauty: The art of Marie Spartali Stillman.* Wilmington: Delaware Art Museum, 2015.

Frith, William Powell. "Crazes in Art: 'Pre-Raphaelitism' and 'Impressionism'". *Magazine of Art*, (1888), 190-191.

Funnell, Peter. *Millais: Portraits*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; London: National Portrait Gallery Pub., 1999.

Gillett, Paula. *Worlds of Art: Painters in Victorian Society.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990.

Gordon, Catherine, ed. *Evelyn de Morgan: oil paintings*. London: De Morgan Foundation, 1996.

Gotch, Adam. *Gotch Family of Kettering 1755-1964*. Privately Published.

Gotch, T.C. "An Artist on Art," Penzance Institute Lectures, *The Cornish Telegraph*, Thur., 15 Dec. 1887.

-----. "Realist as Mystic: an interview with Mr. Thomas Cooper Gotch," *Black and White: a weekly illustrated record and review,* 21 Sept. 1895.

Graves, Algernon. *Royal Academy Exhibitors; a complete dictionary of contributors and their work from its foundation in 1769-1904*. London: H. Graves & Co., 1905-06.

-----. *Royal Academy Exhibitors, 1905-1970; a dictionary of artists and their works in the summer exhibitions in the Royal Academy of Arts.* Wakefield: EP Publishing, 1973.

Gray, Anne. *The Edwardians: secrets and desires.* Canberra: National Gallery of Australia: Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2004.

Greenaway, Kate. *Language of Flowers.* New York: Dover Publications, 1992.

Greutzner, Jane Johnson A. *Dictionary of British Artists 1880-1940*. Suffolk, Eng.: Antique Collector's Club, 1976.

H. "Art Notes." *Morning Leader,* 28 June 1901.

Harding, Ellen, ed. *Re-Framing the Pre-Raphaelites: historical and theoretical essays.* Aldershot, England: Ashgate Pub. Co., 1996.

Hay, Malcolm and Jacqueline Riding. *Art in Parliament: the Permanent Collection of the House of Commons.* Norwich: The Palace of Westminster and Jarrold Publishing, 1996.

Hepburn, Patrick Bruce, retains copyright. "Thomas Cooper Gotch: The Making of an Artist." The Alfred East Gallery Archives, 1994.

Hilton, Timothy. *The Pre-Raphaelites*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1993.

Hobson, Anthony. *The Art and Life of John William Waterhouse RA, 1849-1917.* London: Studio Vista/ Christies, 1980.

-----. *J. W.Waterhouse.* Oxford: Phaidon Christie's, 1989.

Hoock, Holger. *The King's Artists: The Royal Academy of Arts and the Politics of British Culture 1760-1840.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003.

Holbein, Hans. *Hans Holbein the Younger: painter at the court of Henry VIII.* London: Thames & Hudson, 2003.

Hunt, William Holman. *Pre-Raphaelitism and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood.* New York: The Macmillian Company; London, Macmillian & Co., Ltd., 1905-1906.

Hutchinson, Sidney C. *The History of the Royal Academy 1768-1986.* London: Chapman & Hall Ltd., 1986.

Hutchinson, Horace G. *Portraits of the Eighties*. London: T.G. Unwin, Ltd., 1920

Johnson, E.D.H. *Paintings of the British Social Scene from Hogarth to Sickert.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1986.

Johnson, Jane. *The Dictionary of British artists, 1880-1940: an Antique Collectors' Club research project listing 41,000 artists*. Suffolk, Eng.: Antique Collectors' Club, 1976.

Kestner, Joseph. *Masculinities in Victorian painting.* Aldershot, Hants, England: Scolar Press; Brookfield, Vt.: Ashgate Pub., 1995.

-----. *Mythology and Misogyny: the social discourse of ninetheenth-century British classical-subject painting.* Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

Kolsteren, Steven. "The Pre-Raphaelite Art of John Melhuish Strudwick." *Journal of Pre-Raphaelite Studies*, vol. 1, issue 2, (1988): 1-12.

Lambourne, Lionel. *Victorian Painting*. London: Phaidon Press, 1999.

Lucas, E.V. *Edwin Austin Abbey: Royal Academician; the record of his life and work.* Vols. 1, 2. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921.

Lochnan, Katharine and Carol Jacobi, eds. *Holman Hunt and the Pre-Raphaelite Vision*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Lomax, Pamela. *A Winter in Florence.* Penzance: Shears & Hogg Publications, 2001.

-----. *The Golden Dream: A biography of Thomas Cooper Gotch*. Kettering: Alfred East Art Gallery, 2004.

Maas, Jeremy and Jane Martineau. *Victorian Fairy Painting.* London: Royal Academy of Arts, Merrell Holbertson Publishers, 1997.

MacCarthy, Fiona. *The Last Pre-Raphaelite: Edward Burne-Jones and the Victorian Imagination*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012.

Mallalieu, Huon L. *The Dictionary of British watercolor artists up to 1920.* Woodbridge, Eng.: Antique Collectors' Club, 1976.

Mancoff, Debra. "The Arthurian Revival in Victorian Art." PhD diss., Northwestern, 1982.

-----. *Flora Symbolica: flowers in Pre-Raphaelite art.* Munich: New York: Prestel, 2003.

-----. *John Everett Millais: beyond the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.

Marsh, Jan. *Pre-Raphaelite women: Images of femininity in Pre-Raphaelite art*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1987.

-----. *The Pre-Raphaelite Circle*. London: National Portrait Gallery, 2005.

-----. *The Pre-Raphaelite Sisterhood*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985.

-----. *Bloomsbury Women: distinct figures in life and art*. London: Pavilion Books, 1995.

Marsh, Jan and Pamela Gerrish Nunn. *Women artists and the Pre-Raphaelite movement.* London: Virago, 1989.

-----. *Pre-Raphaelite women artists.* Manchester: Manchester City Art Galleries, 1998.

Martineau, Jane. *Shakespeare in art*. London: Merrell, 2003.

Mayer, Enrique. *International Auction Records.* Zurich: Edition M, 1971-2004.

McAllister, Isabel. "In Memoriam: Evelyn de Morgan." *The Studio* 70 (1920): 28-31.

McConkey, Kenneth. *Edwardian Portraits.* Woodbridge, Suffolk: Antique Collector's Club, 1987.

Meisel, Martin. *Realizations: narrative, pictorial, and theatrical arts in nineteenth-century England.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Memling, Hans. *Tout l'œuvre peint de Memling*. Paris : Flammarion, 1973.

Millais, John G. *The Life and Letters of Sir John Everett Millais.* London: Methuen, 1899.

Millais, John E. *Millais' Illustrations*. London: Pallas Athene, 2007.

Milner, Frank. *The Pre-Raphaelites: Pre-Raphaelite paintings and drawings in Merseyside collection*. Liverpool: Bluecoat Press in association with National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside, 1995.

Morgan, Thaïs E., ed. *Victorian Sages and Cultural Discourse: renegotiating gender and power.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990.

Morris, William. *Victorian and Edwardian Paintings in the Lady Lever Art Gallery: British artists born after 1810 excluding the early Pre-Raphaelites*. London: HMSO, 1994.

-----. *Victorian and Edwardian Paintings in the Walker Art Gallery and at Sudley House: British artists born after 1810 but before 1861, vol. 2.* London: HMSO, 1996.

"Mr. F. Cadogan Cowper: Subject Pictures and Portraits." *The Times*, 20 Nov. 1958, final edition.

Muthesius, Hermann. "Kunst and Leben in England." *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst,* no. 13 (1902): 49-69.

Nead, Lynda. *Myths of Sexuality: Representations of women in Victorian Britain.* Oxford, Oxfordshire; NY, NY, USA: B. Blackwell, 1988.

Newall, Christopher. *The art of Lord Leighton*. Oxford: Phaidon, 1990.

Noakes, Aubrey. *Waterhouse: John William Waterhouse*. London: Chaucer, 2004.

Noakes, Jessie, *Art, History, and Literature Illustrations. A series of 18 colored and 100 half-tone illustrations.* London: Virtue & Co. Ltd., 1920.

Nunn, Pamela Gerrish. *Problem Pictures: women and men in Victorian painting.* Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1995.

-----. *Victorian Women Artists*. London: Women's Press, Ltd., 1987.

-----. *A Pre-Raphaelite Journey: the Art of Eleanor Fortescue-Brickdale*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2012.

Oakley, Lucy. *Unfaded Pageant: Edwin Austin Abbey's Shakespearean Subjects from the Yale University Art Gallery and other Collections*. New York: Miriam & Ira D. Wallach Art Gallery, Columbia, Columbia University, 1994.

"Obituary: Mr. F. C.Cowper, R.A." *Manchester Guardian*, 20 Nov. 1958, final edition.

"Obituary: Mr. F. Cadogan Cowper: Controversies over his paintings." *Yorkshire Post*, 20 Nov. 1958.

Obituary. "Mr. J. W. Waterhouse, R.A." *Times*, 12 Feb. 1917.

Parris, Leslie. *Pre-Raphaelite Papers.* London: Tate Gallery, 1984.

Pointon, Marcia, ed. *Pre-Raphaelites re-viewed*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989.

Poulson, Christine. *The Quest for the Grail: Arthurian legend in British art, 1840-1920.* Manchester, UK; NY: Manchester University Press; NY: St. Martin's Press, 1999.

Powell, David. *The Edwardian Crisis.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.

Prettejohn, Elizabeth, ed. *After the Pre-Raphaelites: arts and aestheticism in Victorian England*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1999.

-----. *Art of the Pre-Raphaelites.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.

-----. *Art for art's sake: aestheticism in Victorian painting*. New Haven: Yale University Press for the Paul Mellon Center for Studies in British Art, 2007.

-----. "Victorian England: Ruskin, Swinburne, Pater." In *Beauty and Art*, edited by Elizabeth Prettejohn, 111-156, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Prettejohn, Elizabeth, ed. *J.W.Waterhouse: The Modern Pre-Raphaelite*. London, England: Royal Academy of Arts, 2008.

Psomiades, Kathy. *Beauty's Body: Femininity and Representation in British Aestheticism*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Queen's Gallery. *Holbein and the Court of Henry VIII: an exhibition held*. London: The Queen's Gallery, 1978.

Riding, Christine. *John Everett Millais*. London: Tate, 2006.

Rose, Andrea. *Pre-Raphaelite Portraits*. Sparkford, Yeovil, Somerset: Oxford Illustrated Press, 1981.

Rosenbaum, S.P., ed. *A Bloomsbury Group Reader*. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1993.

Rosenfeld, Jason and Alison Smith. *Millais*. London: Tate, 2007.

Ross, Robert. *Aubrey Beardsley*. Norwood: Norwood Editions, 1977.

Rowland, Eleza. *The Pre-Raphaelite era, 1848-1914 : an exhibition in celebration of the Nation's Bicentennial, April 12-June 6, 1976, Delaware Art Museum, Wilmington, Delaware*. Wilmington: Wilmington Society of the Fine Arts, 1976.

Rowlands, John. *Holbein: The Paintings of Hans Holbein the Younger*. Oxford: Phaidon, 1985.

Royal Academy of Art. *Frederic Leighton: eminent Victorian artist*. New York; London: Harry N. Abrams with the Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1996.

The Royal Academy Illustrated. London: The Academy, 1904.

Ruskin, John. *The Complete works of John Ruskin*. New York: T.Y. Crowell & Company, 1885.

S, E.B. "Eleanor F. Brickdale, Designer and Illustrator," *The Studio* 13 (1898): 103-104.

Schoenherr, Douglas and Dennis Lanigan. *A Dream of the Past: Pre-Raphaelite and aesthetic movement paintings, watercolors, and drawings from the Lanigan Collection*. Toronto: University of Toronto Art Center, 2000.

Simpson, Amanda. *Van Eyck: The Complete Works*. London: Chaucer Press, 2007.

Sketchley, R.E.D. *The Art of J.W.Waterhouse, R.A.,* A Christmas Number of *The Art Journal*, 1909.

Smith, Elise Lawton. *Evelyn Pickering de Morgan and the allegorical body*. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2002.

Spalding, Frances. *Magnificent Dreams: Burne-Jones and the late Victorians*. New York: Dutton, 1978.

Sparrow, W.S. "On Some Watercolor Pictures by Miss Fortescue Brickdale." *The Studio* 23 (1901): 31-44.

Sparrow, Walter Shaw, ed. *Women Painters of the World: From the Time of Caterina Virgi 1413-1463 to Rosa Bonheur and the Present Day.* London: Hodder and Stroughton, 1905.

Spielmann, M.H. *Millais and his works, with special reference to the exhibition at the Royal Academy 1898*. New York: AMS Press, 1971.

-----. *Millais: a sketch.* London: Pallas Athene, 2007.

Staley, Alan. *Victorian High Renaissance: George Frederic Watts 1817-1904, Frederic Leighton 1830-1896, Albert Moore 1841-1893, Alfred Gilbert 1854-1934: an exhibition organized by The Minneapolis Institute of Arts.* Minneapolis: The Institute, 1978.

-----. *The New Painting of the 1860s: Between the Pre-Raphaelites and the Aesthetic Movement*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

Stephens, FG. "English Painters of the Present Day XXI—William Holman Hunt." *Portfolio* 2 (1871): 38.

Stevens, MaryAnne. *The Edwardians and After: The Royal Academy, 1900-1950*. London: the Royal Academy of Arts in association with Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1988.

Sturgess, Matthew. *Aubrey Beardsley: a biography*. Woodstock, NY: Overlook Press, 1999.

Surtees, Virginia. *The Diary of Ford Madox Brown*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.

-----. *The Paintings and Drawings of Dante Gabriel Rossetti (1828-1882): a catalogue raisonné.* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1971.

Sussman, Herbert L. *Victorian masculinities: manhood and masculine poetics in early Victorian literature and art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

-----. "The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood and Their Circle: the Formation of the Avant-Garde." *The Victorian Newsletter* 57 (Spring 1980): 7-8.

Taylor, Gerald. *Byam Shaw: a selection of paintings and book illustrations*. Oxford: Ashmolean, 1986.

Tate Gallery. *The Pre-Raphaelites.* London: Tate Gallery, 1984.

The Times. "Exhibitions of Drawings: The Leicester Galleries." October 7, 1911.

The Times. "Miss Fortescue-Brickdale: A Versatile Artist." March 14, 1945.

Thomas, Julia. *Pictorial Victorians: the inscription of values in word and image.* Athens: Ohio University Press, 2004.

Townsend, Joyce H., Jacqueline Ridge, and Stephen Hackney, eds. *Pre-Raphaelite Painting Techniques (1848-1856).* London: Tate, 2004.

Trippi, Peter. *J.W. Waterhouse.* London; New York: Phaidon, 2002.

Trumble, Angus and Andrea Wolk Ranger, eds. *Edwardian Opulence: British art at the dawn of the twentieth century.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.

Vincent, Adrian. *A Companion to Victorian and Edwardian Artists.* Newton Abbot, Devon: David & Charles, 1991.

Walker Art Gallery. *Millais: An Exhibition organized by the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool and the Royal Academy of Arts, London, January-April 1967*. Liverpool, Walker Art Gallery; London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1967.

Wallace, Catherine. *Thomas Cooper Gotch: the last of the Pre-Raphaelites*. Truro: Royal Cornwall Museum, 2001.

Warner, Malcolm. *The Victorians: British painting, 1837-1901*. Washington: National Gallery of Art; New York: Distributed by Abrams, 1996.

-----. *Portrait Painting*. New York: Mayflower Books, 1979.

-----. *The Drawings of John Everett Millais*. London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1979.

Waters, Grant M. *Dictionary of British Artists, working 1900-1950*. Eastbourne: Eastbourne Fine Art, 1975.

Watson, Margaretta Frederick. *Collecting the Pre-Raphaelites: the Anglo-American enchantment*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 1997.

Werner, Marcia. *Pre-Raphaelite painting and nineteenth-century realism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Stephen Wilding. *Waking Dreams: the art of the Pre-Raphaelites from the Delaware Art Museum.* Alexandria, VA.: Art Services International, 2004.

Wildman, Stephen. *The Birmingham School: Paintings, Drawings and Prints by Birmingham Artists from the Permanent Collection.* Birmingham: Birmingham City Museum and Art Gallery, 1990.

Willsdon, Clare A.P. *Mural Painting in Britain 1840-1940: Image and Meaning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Wilton, Andrew. *The age of Rossetti, Burne-Jones, and Watts: Symbolism in Britain, 1860-1910*. Paris; New York: Flammarion, 1997.

Wilton, Andrew. *The Swagger Portrait: Grand Manner Portraiture in Britain from Van Dyck to Augustus John (1630-1930)*. London: Tate Gallery, 1992.

Wood, Christopher. *Olympian Dreamers: Victorian classical painters 1860-1914.* London: Constable, 1983.

-----. *Burne-Jones: The Life and Works of Sir Edward Burne-Jones*. New York: Stewart, Tabori and Change, 1998.

-----. *Dictionary of Victorian Painters.* Woodbridge [Eng.]: Antique Collectors' Club, 1978.

-----. *Fairies in Victorian Art*. Woodbridge: Antique Collector's Club, 2000.

-----. *The Pre-Raphaelites*. London: Seven Dials, Cassell & Co., 1981.

-----. *Victorian Panorama: Paintings of Victorian Life.* London, Faber, 1976.

-----. *Victorian Painting*. Boston; New York; London: Bulfinch Press, 1999.

Valentine, Helen, ed. *Art in the Age of Queen Victoria: Treasures from the Royal Academy.* New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1999.

ARCHIVES AT ROYAL ACADEMY

Letters from Frank Cadogan Cowper to Edith Cowper (17 Feb 1899- 23 July 1908), RA, COW1/1-COW/2/24

Assorted press clippings included in Cadogan Cowper letters

RA archives—letters between Cadogan Cowper and Royal Academy (1914-1951)

RA archives—letter from John Darcy to Commander Vanrenen

RA database / records used for cross referencing (courtesy of Mark Pomeroy, archivist)

RA Register of Students

PRIVATE COLLECTIONS / CORRESPONDENCE

Letter from Audrey Willis (15 November 2000), Private Collection.

Letters from FCC to Mr. Speilmann (Sept 1910-Jan 1912), Private Collection.

Grace, David. D.Grace@tesco.net "Frank Cadogan Cowper." 15 Nov. 2006, Personal Email (17 Nov. 2006).

-----. D.Grace@tesco.net "Cadogan Cowper." 20 July 2007, Personal Email (21 July 2007).

Robert Cooper, Geneaology, Private Collection.

ADDITIONAL ARCHIVES

Castle Howard Archive—letters between CC and 9th Earl of Carlisle

Records of Cranleigh School

National Archives. *Preparation and presentation of pictures in the East Corridor. 1908-11* Work 11/112-113/1.

Houses of Parliament Archives

Alfred East Gallery, Kettering, England

Yale Art Gallery Archives

Edwin Austin Abbey Memorial Collection