CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Alfred Elmore: life, work and context
Authors	de Bhailís, Caoimhín
Publication date	2017
Original Citation	De Bhailis, P. C. 2017. Alfred Elmore: life, work and context. PhD Thesis, University College Cork.
Type of publication	Doctoral thesis
Rights	© 2017, Padraig Caoimhin De Bhailis. - http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/
Download date	2026-11-04 09:03:42
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/5433

UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

Alfred Elmore: Life, Work and Context

Pádraig Caoimhín de Bhailís

A thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University College Cork

November 2017

Volume 1 of 2 (Text)

Supervisor: Professor Brendan Dooley

College of Arts, Celtic Studies and Social Sciences

Head of Department: Dr. Alan Gibbs

Contents

Acknowledgements		3
Abstract		4
List of Illustrations		5
Introduction		15
Chapter 1	Elmore's Clonakilty	28
Chapter 2	Influence and Influences in the Work of Elmore	35
Chapter 3	The Religious Controversy	95
Chapter 4	Temporality and Narrative Absence in Elmore's Paintings	144
Chapter 5	Elmore's Drawings and Watercolours: An Artist Unatrophied	190
Conclusion		207
Bibliography		213
List of Image Sources		240

This is to certify that the work I am submitting is my own and has not been submitted for another degree, either at University College Cork or elsewhere. All external references and sources are clearly acknowledged and identified within the contents. I have read and understood the regulations of University College Cork concerning plagiarism.

Acknowledgements

I'd like to thank to Department of History of Art, University College Cork for setting me on this journey and Professor Brendan Dooley for his supervision that saw me through to its completion. Thanks to the staff of the U.C.C. library and to Mark Pomeroy of the Royal Academy of Art archives. A special thanks to the Thomas Dammann Junior Memorial Trust Awards for their financial assistance and to David for his encouragement and belief. Thanks to my wife Ann and my son Caoimhín for their patience and support and also a word of thanks to Pat Maloney. Thanks to James Gorry and his late wife, Teresa, for allowing me to view some of Elmore's paintings that would otherwise have been difficult to trace. Thanks to Alan Bean of Sigmund and Jocelyn Gallery, Birmingham, for tracking images and for sending them to me.

Abstract

Alfred Elmore R.A. was a prominent and prolific Anglo-Irish artist during the nineteenth-century. Since his death, in 1881, he has largely disappeared from the study of Art History with the exception of a few of his works that have been examined in terms of gender studies of the period. It has also been asserted that other paintings from his oeuvre exhibit anti-Catholic tendencies. This thesis seeks to reposition the artist and his religious paintings as being, if not overtly pro-Catholic, at least neutral in their intention. As a painter across all genres of the period, Elmore's narrative paintings suggest a unique approach to 'narrative' painting that allows the viewer free-play in the construction of internal, imaginative, narrative creation. Elmore's narrative paintings will be compared with familiar works by other artists of the period in order to locate these paintings within the genre and highlight his approach to rendering narrative. Described as 'ahead of his time' Elmore's drawings display a modernity that belies his nineteenth-century, British context and allows for a reassessment of the status of British artistic practice during that period. As an exercise in connoisseurship and contextual interpretation, this thesis proposes that Elmore was an artist who either was a unique and exceptional artist in his output and mode of creation or that an examination of other neglected artists of the period that might exhibit similar artistic properties to Elmore will allow a renewed evaluation of British art and artists of the Victorian era.

List of Illustrations

All images by Alfred Elmore unless otherwise indicated.

Fig. 1. *The Origin of the Stocking Machine*, 1847, oil on canvas, 80 cm x 106.7 cm, Nottingham City Museum and Galleries.

Fig. 2. *Religious Controversy in the Time of Louis XIV*, 1849, oil on canvas, Location unknown. Engraving, *Illustrated London News*, 1849.

Fig. 3. *Rienzi in the Forum*, 1844, oil on canvas, 146 cm x 216 cm, Location unknown. Engraving, *Illustrated London News*, 1844.

Fig. 4. *On the Brink*, 1865, oil on canvas, 113.7 cm x 82.7 cm, The Fitzwilliam Museum.

Fig. 5. *The Novice*, 1852, oil on canvas, 74.5 cm x 91 cm, Bury Art Museum.

Fig. 6. *Her First Place*, no data, Location unknown.

Fig. 7. Henry O'Neil, *Sir Charles Taylor and Others (Forty Three members in the Billiard Room of the Garrick Club),*1869, oil on canvas, 92.5 cm x155 cm, The Garrick Club, London.

Fig. 7b. Detail of Fig. 7 showing Alfred Elmore, centre with beard and holding cigar.

Fig. 8. *Queen of the Day*, 1850, oil on canvas, 63.5 cm x 100.33 cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 9. *Griselda*, 1849, oil on canvas, 48.9 cm x 62.2 cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 10. *The Workhouse*, n.d., engraving.

Fig. 10a. *The Forlorn*, n.d., pencil on white wove paper, 28 cm x 22.9 cm, Birmingham Museum Art Gallery.

Fig. 11. *Desolation*, n.d., engraving.

Fig. 12. *The Origin of the Guelph and Ghibelline Quarrel*, 1845, oil on panel, 20.7 cm x 25.3 cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 13. *The Emperor Charles V at Yuste*, 1856, oil on canvas, 121.8 cm x 167.5 cm, Royal Holloway, University of London.

Fig. 14. *Two Women Shall be Grinding at the Mill*, 1864, oil on canvas, 35cm x 46cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 15. *Beppo*, 1847, oil on canvas, 85 cm x 112 cm, Crawford Art Gallery, Cork.

Fig. 16. Charles Robert Leslie, *Dulcinea del Toboso*, 1839, oil on panel, 30.5 cm x 24.5 cm, Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 17. *The Rose*, n.d., oil on canvas, 53.5 cm x 43.5 cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 18. Augustus Leopold Egg, *Past and Present*, 1858, oil on canvas, Triptych, each 63.5cm x 76.2cm, Tate Britain.

Fig. 19. *The Tuileries, June 20, 1792*, 1860, oil on canvas, 35cm x 37cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 20. *Marie Antoinette in the Temple*, 1861, oil on canvas, 84cm x 51cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 21. William Powell Frith, *The Railway Station*, 1862, oil on canvas, 116.7cm x 256.4cm, Royal Holloway, University of London.

Fig. 22. *The Martyrdom of Thomas* á *Becket*, 1839, oil on canvas, 300.48cm x 320cm, St. Andrew's Church, Dublin.

Fig. 23. *The Fainting of Hero from Much Ado About Nothing*, 1846, oil on canvas, 121.9cm x 177.8cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 24. *Subject from 'Two Gentlemen from Verona'*, 1857, oil on canvas, 70.1cm x 53.9cm, Royal Academy of Art, London.

Fig. 25. *An Incident in the Life of Dante*, 1858, oil on canvas, 69cm x 52cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 26. *The Deathbed of Robert, King of Naples*, 1848, oil on canvas, 97.7 cm x 162.6 cm, Lytham Art Collection of Fylde Borough Council.

Fig. 27. *The Invention of the Combing Machine*, 1862, oil on canvas, 100.2 cm x 141 cm, Bradford Museums and Galleries.

Fig. 28. Alexander Farmer, *An Anxious Hour*, 1865, oil on canvas, 30.2cm x 40.6cm, Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 29. Augustus Leopold Egg, *The Travelling Companions*, 1862, oil on canvas, 65.3cm x 78.7cm, Birmingham Museums Trust.

Fig. 30. Abraham Solomon, *First Class-The Meeting*, 1856, oil on canvas, 54.5cm x 76.3cm, Southampton City Art Gallery.

Fig. 31. *Supplication*, 1850, oil on panel, 42.5cm x 35cm, Harris Museum and Art Gallery.

Fig. 32. William Powell Frith, *The Derby Day*, 1856-8, oil on canvas, 101.6cm x 223.5cm, Tate Britain.

Fig. 33. *The Gaming Table*, n.d., oil on board, 18cm x 15cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 34. Robert Braithwaite Martineau, *The Last Day in the Old Home*, 1862, oil on canvas, 107.3cm x 144.8cm, Tate Britain.

Fig. 35. Louis Flameng, after William Powell Frith, *The Road to Ruin*, 1878, engraving, various sizes, Museum of London.

Fig. 36. William Powell Frith, *The Salon d'Or, Homburg*, 1871, oil on canvas, 125.1cm x 260.4cm, Rhode Island School of Design.

Fig. 37. William Powell Frith, *At Homburg, 1869*, 1870, oil on canvas, 59.7cm x 48.9cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 38. Gustave Doré (After), *Le Tapis Vert*, c.1883, engraving, 60cm x 104.29cm, Library of Congress.

Fig. 39. Thomas Armstrong, *Woman with Lilies*, 1876, oil on canvas, 183cm x 91.5cm, Laing Art Gallery.

Fig. 40. Pen Browning, *A Woman at Her Devotions*, n.d., oil on canvas, dimensions unknown, Wellesley College/Maisie Ward.

Fig. 41. Pen Browning, *Vespers*, 1881, oil on canvas, 96cm x 106cm, Worcestershire County Museum.

Fig. 42. *Sabrina*, 1879, oil on canvas, dimensions unknown, Location unknown. Phototograph, Raccolte Museali Fratelli Alinari.

Fig. 43. *Untitled* , n.d. , pencil on paper, 15cm x 19cm, Private collection.

Fig. 44. Francesco Hayez, *The Two Foscari*, c. 1852, oil on canvas, 121cm x 168 cm, Galleria Palatina (Palazzo Pitti), Florence.

Fig. 45. *Untitled*, n.d., pencil on paper, 15cm x 19cm, Private collection.

Fig. 46. Pelagio Palagi, *Newton's Discovery of Refraction*, 1827, oil on canvas, 167cm x 216cm, Pinacoteca Tosio Martinengo, Brescia.

Fig. 47. Pelagio Palagi, *Gian Galeazzo Sforza Dying in the Castle of Pavia in 1494*, oil on canvas, 45.4cm x 48.5cm. Private collection, Bergamo.

Fig. 48. Pelagio Palagi, *Rienzi in the Forum*, 1829, brown ink wash on brown paper, 26.6cm x 36.6cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 49. Paul Falconer Poole, *Solomon Eagle Exhorting the People to Repentance*, 1843, oil on canvas, 173.2cm x 241cm, Museums Sheffield.

Fig. 50. *Leda and the Swan*, 1869, lunette, oil on canvas, 51cm x 91cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 51. Jean Antoine Watteau, *Nymph and Satyr*, 1714-19, oil on canvas, 107.5cm x 73.5cm, Louvre.

Fig. 52. '*Study' - full length study of a nude from behind*, n.d., watercolour over traces of pencil on paper, 46.40 cm x 9.5 cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 53. *Andromeda*, 1844, oil on wood, 50.8 cm x 38.1 cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 54. *A Conversion Piece*, 1856, oil on board, 48 cm x 35.5 cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 55. *Outdoor Gathering*, 1852, oil on canvas, 30.48 cm x 46.99 cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 56. Leon Cogniet, *Scene from Massacre of the Innocents*, 1824, oil on canvas, 265cm x 235cm, Musee des Beaux-arts de Rennes.

Fig. 57. *Kabyle Orange Sellers*, 1866, oil on canvas, 56 cm x 43 cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 58. Thomas Elmore, *Moors of Algiers*, 1850, salt print from calotype negative, 17.5cm x 22.5cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 58a. Thomas Elmore, *Two Algerian Musicians*, 1850, salt print from calotype negative, 17.5cm x 22.5cm, Getty Research Institute.

Fig. 59. *That which ye have spoken in the ear shall be repeated on the rooftops*, 1866-7, chalk on grey paper, 34cm x 48cm, (Study for painting exhibited at R.A. 1867), Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 60. *The Origin of the Guelph and the Ghibelline Quarrel*, 1845, oil on canvas, 101.6cm x 152cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 61. *The Origin of the Guelph and Ghibelline Quarrel*, 1845, engraving, *The London Art Union Annual*, 1847.

Fig. 62. *The Novice*, 1843, oil on canvas, dimensions unknown, Location unknown.

Fig. 63. Sir David Wilkie, *The Preaching of Knox before the Lords of the Congregation, 10th June 1559*, 1832, oil on wood, 122.6cm x 165.1cm, Tate Britain.

Fig. 64. Tiziano Vecellio, *The Trinity in Glory*, c. 1552-54, oil on canvas, 346cm x 240cm, Museo del Prado, Madrid.

Fig. 65. Tiziano Vecellio, *Portrait of Isabella of Portugal*, 1548, oil on canvas, 117cm x 93cm, Museo del Prado, Madrid.

Fig. 66. Tiziano Vecellio, *Portrait of Charles V Seated*, 1548, oil on canvas, 205cm x 122cm, Alte Pinakothek, Munich.

Fig. 67. Joseph-Nicolas Robert-Fleury, *Charles V at the Monastery of San Jeronimo de Yuste*, 1856, oil on canvas, 98.2cm x144cms, Wallace Collection, London.

Fig. 68. Sir Anthony Van Dyck, *Deposition*, 1634, oil on panel, 109cm x 149cm, Alte Pinakothek, Munich.

Fig. 69. J.S. Beschey (Attributed), *Descent from the Cross*, 1750, oil on canvas, dimensions unknown, St. Andrew's Church, Dublin.

Fig. 70. *Judith and Holofernes*, 1871, oil on canvas, 71cm x 94cm, oil on canvas, Location unknown.

Fig. 71. *Portrait of a Girl Saying the Rosary*, 1877, oil on canvas, 59.5cm x 49 cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 72. *Lost in Thought*, n.d., oil on canvas, 44.5cm x 34cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 73. *Allegorical*, n.d., watercolour, 36cm x 28cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 74. *The Priesthole*, 1850, oil on canvas, 69 x 90 cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 75. Philip Hermogenes Calderon, *St Elizabeth of Hungary's Great Act of Renunciation*, 1891, oil on canvas, 153cm x 213.4cm, 1891, Tate Britain.

Fig. 76. Charles Allston Collins, *The Devout Childhood of St. Elizabeth of Hungary*, 1851-2, oil on canvas, 91cm x 58cm, The Maas Gallery/Private collection.

Fig. 77. James Collinson, *The Renunciation of Queen Elizabeth of Hungary*, 1850, oil on canvas, 121.7cm x 184cm, Johannesburg Art Gallery, South Africa.

Fig. 78. Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *St. Elizabeth of Hungary Kneeling with her Companions*, 1852, pencil on paper, 20.48cm x 22.3cm, Birmingham City Museum and Art Gallery.

Fig. 78a. Dante Gabriel Rossetti, *Study for St. Elizabeth of Hungary*, n.d., black chalk, 53.2cm x 40.7cm, Birmingham City Art Gallery.

Fig. 79. John Everett Millais, *St. Elizabeth of Hungary Washing the Feet of Pilgrims*, 1848, pen, 23.5cm x 20.4cm, Wightwick Manor, West Midlands.

Fig. 80. *Mary Queen of Scots and Christopher Norton at Bolton Castle*, 1875, oil on canvas, 120.6cm x 180.4cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 81. Henry Garland, *Looking for the Mail Packet*, oil on Canvas, 52.1cm x 46.9cm, 1861, York Museum.

Fig. 82. William Hogarth, *A Rake's Progress*, 1733, oil on canvas, series of eight paintings, six shown, all images approx. 62.2cm x 75cm, Sir John Sloane's Museum, London.

Fig. 83. *The Guardian*, oil on canvas, 1865, 53.7cm x 43.5cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 84. *A man and woman standing over a reclining man*, (*Beppo*), watercolour, 20.5cm x 16.2cm, British Museum.

Fig. 85. *Scene from Don Juan*, n.d., watercolour, dimensions unknown, Private collection.

Fig. 86. Daniel Maclise, *The Play Scene from 'Hamlet'*, 1842, oil on canvas, 152.4cm x 274.3cm, Tate Britain.

Fig. 87. Daniel Maclise, *Scene from 'Twelfth Night'*, 1840, oil on canvas, 73.7cm x 124.5cm, Tate Britain.

Fig. 88. William Holman Hunt, *Scene from 'Two Gentlemen from Verona'*, 1851, oil on canvas, 98.5cm x 133.3cm, Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery.

Fig. 89. *Romeo and Juliet*, 1867, oil on canvas, 99.7cm x 57.1cm, Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool.

Fig. 89a. *Romeo and Juliet*, (A man and a woman embracing in a forest), c.1840-60, watercolour, 18.73cm x 13.65cm, Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 90. *Lenore*, 1871, oil on canvas, 106.68cm x 162.56cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 91. *Thomas á Becket*, Detail.

Fig. 91a. Charles Le Brun, *Bodily and Mental Pain*, c. 1670, drawing, black chalk, 23.5cm x 18.3cm, Paris, Musée du Louvre.

Fig. 92. Richard Redgrave, *The Outcast*, 1851, oil on canvas, 78.4cm x 107.1cm, Royal Academy of Art, London.

Fig. 93. Philip Hermogenes Calderon, *Broken Vows*, 1857, oil on board, 29cm x 22cm, The Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archaeology, Oxford.

Fig. 94. Jacques-Louis David, *The Lictors Returning to Brutus the Bodies of his Sons*, oil on canvas, 323cm x 422cm, 1789, Musée du Louvre, Paris.

Fig. 95. Jacques-Louis David, *The Oath of the Horatii*, oil on canvas, 330cm x 425cm, 1784, Musée du Louvre, Paris.

Fig. 96. Jacques-Louis David, *The Death of Socrates*, oil on canvas, 130cm x 196cm, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Fig. 97. *Judith at the Tent of Holofernes*, 1869, oil on canvas, 109cm x 83cm, Location unknown.

Fig. 98. John Everett Millais, *Autumn Leaves*, 1856, oil on canvas, 104.3cm x 74cm, Manchester Art Gallery.

Fig. 99. Édouard Manet, *Olympia*, 1863, oil on canvas, 131cm x 190 cm, Musée d'Orsay, Paris.

Fig.100. Édouard Manet, *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère*, 1881-82, oil on canvas, 96cm x 130 cm, Courtauld Gallery, London.

Fig. 101. Charles Rossiter, *To Brighton and Back*, 1859, oil on canvas, 125cm x 94.5 cm, Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery.

Fig. 102. William Maw Egley, *Omnibus Life in London*, oil on canvas, 44.8cm x 41.9cm, Tate Britain.

Fig. 103. *Drawing of a Male Nude*, n.d., pencil on paper,
57cm x 42cm, Location unknown.

Fig.104. *Study of a male nude*, c. 1840, pencil on paper, 15.24cm x 17.8cm, Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig.105. *Nude male holding a book*, n.d., pencil highlighted with white chalk, 49.5cm x 33.02cm, Location unknown.

Fig.106. *Academic study of a male nude leaning on stick*, n.d., pen and brown ink, with brown wash, over graphite, 28.6cm x 17.4cm, British Museum.

Fig.107. *Study of a nude woman*, c.1840, pencil, 28.2cm x 12.7cm, Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig.108. *Study of a nude woman*, c.1840, pencil and sanguine with white chalk, 29.84cm x 12.38cm, Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig.109. Lawrence Alma-Tadema, *A Sculptor's Model*, 1877, oil on canvas, 195.5cm x 83.8cm, Private collection.

Fig.110. *Southern Nude*, n.d., watercolour, dimensions unknown, Location unknown.

Fig.111. *Don Quixote*, n.d., watercolour, dimensions unknown, Location unknown.

Fig.112. *The Bather Surprised*, n.d., watercolour, dimensions unknown, Location unknown.

Fig. 113. *Santa Maria della Salute, Venice,* (*San Giorgio Maggiore*), n.d., watercolour, dimensions unknown, National Gallery of Australia, Melbourne.

Fig. 114. *A View of Venice* (*San Giorgio Maggiore*), n.d, watercolour, dimensions unknown, National Gallery of Australia, Melbourne.

Fig. 115. *A Woman Entering a Room Holding a Candle*, n.d., graphite on paper, 17.8cm x 13.1cm, British Museum.

Fig. 116. *Faust Wooing Marguerite*, n.d., watercolour over traces of graphite

heightened with opaque white, on heavy wove paper, 19.9cm x 13.2 cm, National Gallery of Canada.

Fig. 117. *Hotspur and the Fop*, 1857, engraving, *The Art-Journal*, after R.A. exhibit 1851, oil on canvas, Location unknown.

Fig. 118. *Study for Hotspur and the Fop*, c.1840s, pencil and watercolour, 24.1cm x 19.05cm, Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 119. *Study of Figures*, n.d., graphite on blue paper, 16.7cmx 8.5cm, Private collection.

Fig. 120. *Study of Figures with Horse*, n.d., graphite on blue paper, 19.8cm x 15cm, Private collection.

Fig.121. *Study of Figures*, n.d., graphite on blue paper, 6.8cm x 8.8cm, Private collection.

Fig. 122. *Head of a Girl*, n.d., pencil on paper, 20.9cm x 15.87cm, Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 123. *Head of a Bearded Man*, pencil and watercolour, 17.1cm x 9.52cm, Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 124. *Study of Boat with Figures*, n.d., pencil on paper, Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 125. *Coastal Study with Cart*, n.d., pencil on paper, Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 126. *Coastal Study with Horses*, n.d., pencil on paper, Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 127. Richard Parkes Bonington, (Style of), Coast *Scene*, oil on panel, n.d., 31.4 cm x 41.3 cm, Ashmolean Museum.

Fig. 128. *Coastal Study with Nets and Figures*, n.d., pencil and chalk on paper, Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig.129. *Landscape*, n.d., watercolour, Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 130. *Landscape with Road*, n.d., watercolour with chalk, 13.8cm x 20.9cm, British Museum.

Fig. 131. *A Street in a Norman Town*, pencil, 27.3cm x 21.59cm, Victoria and Albert Museum.

Fig. 132. *Rouen*, n.d. pencil and watercolour, 25.1cm x 16.9cm, Victoria and Albert Museum.

Introduction

The impact of online resources such as *Wikipedia* has had a profound impact on the way we see the world and they certainly contribute to the knowledge base on artists by providing biographies that otherwise might remain inaccessible; however these biographies also allow myths or uncertainties to be attached to the life and work of an artist. In the case of Alfred Elmore, a statement entered his *Wikipedia* entry in early 2005, not long after his initial appearance on the site, and has remained there; the edit of the page stated that Elmore's *Religious Controversy in the Time of Louis XIV* and his *The Novice Nun* were implicitly 'anti-Catholic in character'.[1] The dearth of scholarly, or any, in-depth investigations into Elmore's life and work and the social and cultural context within which he painted, as it applied to him, allows such implications to be made but this lacuna also provides for challenges to be made against accepted interpretations of his paintings. One of the purposes of this thesis is to challenge this insistence of an implied anti-Catholic intent in Elmore's religious paintings. Elmore's biography is scant and can only be constructed to an extent from other sources; however, an investigation into his life leads to a revaluation of his religious works and in doing so exposes the tendency to limit the viewing of Victorian religious art to a simple binary of Catholic versus Protestant.

While Elmore was a celebrated artist in his own time and was an elected member of the Royal Academy, he quickly disappeared from art history and by 1901 he was no more than a footnote when his work was shown at the Glasgow Exhibition of 'A Century of British Artists'.[2] At the Manchester Exhibition of 1887 *The Invention of the Stocking Machine* (Fig.1) was asserted to be the only work that might keep Elmore's memory alive.[3] The earliest twentieth century discussion of his works by Ralph Edwards exposed the rate of Elmore's eradication as critics in attendance at the exhibition being reviewed by Edwards admitted to having 'never heard of Elmore'.[4] In large part, if it had not been for the chance

purchase by Ridgill Trout of over 1,500 of his 'original sketches' Elmore may well have not been reintroduced to the public nor, it is likely, would the Victoria and Albert Museum and the British Museum had the opportunity to purchase from Trout the collections of his watercolours and drawings now in their holdings. These works permit an examination of Elmore's more private approaches to his artistic production and this forms part of this project where it will be argued that Elmore was both innovative and experimental in his attitude to artistic expression not only in his choice of subject and his method of depiction in the public arena but in the use of medium and ground in his private works.

Elmore's use of expression and gesture in both of these artistic domains, public and private, will be reviewed with the aim of exploring the innovative in his approach to painting. It will be suggested that, contrary to the Victorian impulse to provide the viewer with a completed and legible narrative, Elmore denied this completion and, to borrow from Alexander Joseph Finberg, painted in order to 'appeal to the imagination, the faculty where thought, sense and desire all have free play.'[5]

In terms of engagement and contextualising of Elmore's output there have been some notable contributions. Lindsay Errington's sustained analysis of Elmore's *Religious Controversy in the Time of Louis XIV* (Fig. 2) and *Rienzi in the Forum* (Fig. 3) is one of the most serious attempts to come to terms with a part of the artist's output; Errington's conclusions will be challenged here while accepting that Errington was denied the resources that have become available to this author with the advent of the world wide web and the passing of time.[6] Similarly, Paul Barlow's thesis that pursued the Hogarthian drive amongst members of *The Clique* expands on Errington's treatment of Elmore's works both in terms of thematic explorations and in terms of the number and variety of paintings being analysed.[7] Barlow attends to the role and depiction of the feminine in the works by Elmore that he selects to interpret and within this limitation he presents an effective and precise exploration of an area

of scholarly interest that has gained purchase since the 'feminist turn' in art history. Barlow's contentions will not be disputed but rather enhanced and used as a foundation to offer an alternative interpretation of some of the works he investigated.

The 'Hogarthian' and the 'Feminine' are especially pertinent in any discussion of Elmore's *On the Brink* (Fig. 4). Lynda Nead, writing in *Art History* in 1982, utilises the painting to explore the Victorian attitudes to the female with a specific focus on the problematic tripartite of seduction, prostitution and suicide.[8] The painting has been systematically used by other authors in examining the context, role and position of women in Victorian society and Nead's analysis has become a point of departure and a support for these investigations into the manner in which the Victorian audience viewed the depicted female in terms of the categories she emphasises.[9] Elmore's *The Novice Nun* (Fig. 5) performs a similar function in Susan P. Casteras' examination of portrayed nuns in the early Victorian period.[10] Casteras places the artist's painting within the dichotomy of society's desire for a chaste Victorian womanhood and society's repulsion at the removal of the female from the sphere of species reproduction to the convent life. As with Barlow, it is difficult to deny that Victorian painting opens up and is responded to by multiple theoretical drives and this can also be claimed for many of Elmore's paintings. However, in confining Victorian painting to theoretical movements constrained as much as liberated by spatial theories that define meaning from the location of protagonists, observation in terms of the male gaze, the female as object of desire or in the many other observations that extract the social realities and fantasies of the nineteenth-century British condition is also to deny an expansion of investigation which can present an alternative way of viewing and participating with the depicted.

With these exceptions identified, the commentary on Elmore has been limited. The Victorian artist and writer brothers Richard and Samuel Redgrave allowed only one paragraph to review Elmore and his work in the 1866 edition of *A Century of Painters of the English*

School.[11] Additionally, he receives no mention by the art historian Quentin Bell and all but one sentence comes from Christopher Wood in *Olympian Dreamers*, albeit with an accompanying plate.[12] In his *Dictionary of British Victorian Painters*, Wood remedies this in his examination of late Victorian artists by including a brief paragraph on the Clonakilty native.[13] However, even this recognition limits itself and omits any link between Elmore and the next entry in the *Dictionary,* that of Edith Elmore, Alfred's daughter.[14] Michael Bryan's *Dictionary of Painters and Engravers* went through a number of editions and revisions from its initial publication in 1816; however by the time of George Williamson's revised five volume set, published in 1903-4, there was not much added to Elmore's biography.[15] When one considers the praise that Elmore received, such as that by Royal Academician William Sandby in his *History of the Royal Academy,* who concluded Elmore's biography by saying 'his pictures deservedly rank high among the works of modern painters', it is surprising that he has not been given the attention he deserves for his recognised talents in his own time.[16] However, even Sandby, writing in 1862, presents little more than a brief biography, (a biography much relied upon by later commentators including the present author), and a listing of some of the works Elmore submitted to the Royal Academy Summer Exhibitions.[17] The most comprehensive encyclopaedic entry dealing with the artist since Samuel Hall's feature in *The Art-Journal* of 1857, that reviewed and commented on the artist's life and work up to his election as a Royal Academician, is Julian Campbell's entry for the 2014 five volume *Art and Architecture of Ireland*.[18] A complete and comprehensive engagement with Elmore's biography is, at the moment, a task that cannot be achieved given that, unlike fellow artists such as William Powell Frith, Sir Frederic Leighton, Edward Matthew Ward and others, he did not, despite his longevity and his involvement in the Royal Academy and other organisations, leave a memoir that can be used to allow us direct access to his thoughts on his art or the art of his contemporaries. Unlike his fellow Cork born artist, Daniel Maclise,

Elmore did not have any contemporary write a memoir of him as Justin O'Driscoll had done for Maclise in 1871.[19] The limited number of Elmore paintings in public collections in Britain, many in provincial galleries, and in his native Ireland and the lack of literature available on the artist may have been the main contributor to his slipping from the art historian's view.

This thesis will address all the issues raised here. Initially, the environment of Elmore's childhood, in terms of place and family, will be presented; this will serve as an essential foundation for the detailed discussion of Elmore's religious paintings and the conclusions that will be reached on their interpretation.

Influences on Elmore's work will suggest that while he operated in British artistic circles he brought to his practice elements and themes that have a secure foundation in a European tradition that counters the commonly held assertion that nineteenth- century, Victorian British art had formed its own School and that all artists sat comfortably within it. Influences also play a role in the opposite direction and it is a reflection of the demoted status of Elmore that Jeremy Maas constructs a sentence thus: 'Like Frith's picture *The Salon d'Or*, his [Elmore's] *On the Brink,* painted in 1865 is set at the gaming rooms in Homburg'; the implication here is that Elmore's painting is similar to Frith's rather than any contention that Frith is influenced by Elmore.[20] In stating that Elmore ran 'the full gamut' of nineteenth century genres, Maas confers a mantle of replication and imitation rather than acknowledging Elmore's technical ability and observation that allowed him to embrace multiple styles.

Stylistic variation does not preclude thematic consistency and in addressing Elmore's religious paintings it as an imperative that this consistency is explored. The chapter on the religious controversy of the period under examination, both in terms of painting and political circumstance, places Elmore's work within the broader religio-political debates of the time

but also anchors these debates within the artist's own political connections via his father and his maternal relations. Biographical background will be restated in this context with the intention of ensuring that an explicit connection between Elmore's religious paintings and his biography is reinforced. The artist's limited biography is gleaned from multiple sources and it will be argued that Elmore's experiences are as much an influence on his work as other artists may have been and that to neglect his biography is to deny the implications and impacts that can be extracted from his works.

It will be argued here that the classification of Elmore into any or all genres of the Victorian age is to overlook his approach to the most identifiable type – the narrative painting. It is a contention of this thesis that Elmore challenged the notion of narrative as it was defined both then, and now, as a simple and legible form; this will be explored in depth, using contemporary reactions to his works and an interrogation of expression and of the emotional connection established by Elmore between art work and art viewer. In exploring a viewer and viewed connectedness the subject of the 'gaze' will be reviewed, not to deny its existence or its motivations but to expand on the viewer's entry into the world of the image and ownership taking of narrative in internal, imaginative narrative creation. The discussion will place space and temporality into a cohesive unit that adds a poetic power to the image as an active agent in the construction of undelineated narrative and mental liberation. This position challenges the imperatives of the viewed subject as controlled and offers up the opposing view that internal narrative construction empowers liberating thought.

Edwards, citing his fellow critics, has posited the idea that Elmore was 'oddly in advance of his time – certainly anything but a typical Victorian' and this is supported when we view Elmore's watercolours and drawings that encompass both preliminary studies and works that are confined to sketch books and standalone sheets.[21] It will be contended here that the expression and gesture in many of Elmore's completed works are also to be found in his

drawings and watercolours. This will be the first sustained analysis of these works since Edwards' review of the Squire Gallery exhibition in 1934. Here it will be argued that Paul Oppé's contention that the Victorian artist's 'artistic instincts …were all but atrophied' is not as applicable to Elmore as was the case with many of the artist's peers.[22] In contrast it will be shown that Elmore's participation in 'the full gamut' of Victorian art demonstrates that not all artists limited themselves to work that the market demanded nor that all artists fell into the realm of portraiture once their status as an artist of merit had been established.[23]

The foregoing will be presented in a manner that begins with the earliest years of Elmore's life. This is not solely to serve the purpose of biography creation; it acts also to establish a grounding for the reviewing of Elmore's religious paintings and to put the artist's biography into effect in his paintings. While it has often been argued that the artist no longer exists in the work he produces, it is also important to remember that the artist too lived a life and is influenced in his creative decisions as much as the viewers, and theorist, are influenced by their own observations and practices in their quotidian world. The formative years of Elmore's life, discussed in chapter one, may have been relatively privileged as he was the son of a business owner and a grandson of a noted local doctor but they were also years of major and violent upheaval surrounded by poverty and armed revolts. The religious conflicts and the responses to these conflicts that he would have been in close, familial contact with is reflected in the controversial works he produced that addressed the religious debates of the period.

Chapter two discusses the influences that may have impacted upon Elmore's work and how he influenced others. The impact of the art market on the Victorian artist and the importance of the changing demographic of the patron and the rise of the art agent will be reviewed here not to deny that this influence was operative but to state that this was not an influence that needed to alter the artist's decisions on his productive output. In this case Elmore was either

unique as an artist of the period in his manner of response to market demands or he is one of many that can contribute to a revisioning of the practice of the artistic community as one not as subservient to the market as has been the accepted position. The English School of Painting as a hermetic location did not exist even though it was assumed to be a part of its own national identity. The works by Elmore are definitive in supporting the influence of interactions with continental artists. The works that will be discussed in this chapter by Elmore and Pelagio Palagi, show that the exclusion of an international influence on mid-Victorian art serves only to enhance a myth that this art was both uniquely English and hermetic in its Englishness.

Chapter three, *The Religious Controversy*, deals with Elmore's oeuvre in terms of his religious paintings. This is not a catalogue *raisonné*; however, it is required to approach such a status to give full support to the position that Elmore was neither anti-Catholic nor a painter of anti-Catholic works. While Elmore's biography and political connections argue against these works falling into the contentious mire of religious extremes, it is also the case that the works themselves do not clearly support the proposal of anti-Catholicity as has been asserted by Errington and Barlow. The limitations placed on this thesis in terms of its focus on an individual artist prevent a comprehensive review of the many paintings that dealt with religious themes during the period but within this constraint it also reveals that the generalities applied are not all encompassing and are open to further examination.

Victorian narrative painting defines itself in terms of its designation and in terms of its own content. It is a hackneyed stance to state that 'every picture tells a story' in the case of nineteenth century English narrative paintings born of French and Dutch genre.[24] The story that was being told is, however, subsumed into the vast late twentieth and early twenty-first century's drive for explanation and grounding in the various art historical turns that explicate the people, locations and events depicted. Many of Elmore's works conformed to this

narrative pursuit but others did not. The narrative in the genre paintings of the period is easily read once we are provided with the texts that the painting holds in terms of visual symbols and clues. Paintings by Robert Braithwaite Martineau, William Powell Frith and Augustus Leopold Egg will be discussed in chapter four to demonstrate the manner in which these works functioned as exemplars of the painted story and, in turn, some of Elmore's works will be counter-positioned to open the door to a redefining of narrative painting as not only an object that contains a narrative but one that also allows for the creation of narrative in the imagination of the viewer. It will be shown that this imaginary did exist at the time and that Elmore's paintings facilitate such an imaginary. This is not to claim that Elmore is the only artist whose works allowed such activity in the mind of the viewer but that allowing for this in Elmore's work points to a further development in the understanding of narrative paintings as more than public, surface based fictions. This may seem a pragmatic stance but it is none the less a truth that persists: John Hadfield interpreted a painting by Elmore in a private collection, *Her First Place* (Fig. 6), and from this painting of a young woman, weeping or wiping her eyes alone in a room and dressed in the garb of a maid, Hadfield imagines the position of the woman in the hierarchy of the household, how many are employed there and what the future holds for her.[25] The painting can, of course, be much more than this simple story that is constructed in the mind of the spectator; the same image can be seen as an entry point into the lives of servants during the period, the status of the female in society, the denial of sight, the removal of the exterior world and so forth depending on one's decision as to where it fits in modern, theoretical frameworks. Importantly, and as will be demonstrated in this chapter, it shows that looking involves a creation outside of the depicted and the real. This chapter will focus on works by Elmore that involve spectator participation, and the manner in which this is achieved, relying only upon the content and lack of content in his works as a means to inspire the imaginary as a creative and private function.

The final chapter examines Elmore's watercolours and drawings. Here it is proposed that, as Edwards suggested, Elmore was not the typical Victorian artist. This chapter also permits us to view an aspect of Elmore's work that does not come under scrutiny due to it not featuring in his finished oils to any great extent - landscape. Elmore's landscapes expose an approach to his artistic production that belies his time and location as an English, Victorian artist. Using examples from the collections of the Victorian and Albert Museum, the British Museum and private collections, galleries and auction sales it will be shown how Elmore altered from the classical training of the Academy to a freer and more non-idealised rendering of the body that is reflected in his nudes and that in turn gave rise to controversy. In many respects, this chapter is an exercise in connoisseurship yet this is an imperative in tackling an artist that has been neglected by art history, with the exception of those mentioned earlier. This neglect allows a gap in scholarship's investigation of the period as it seeks to utilise the explicit for support and allows the unseen, or not looked at, to slip further from view. In this instance we can see that the Academic schools are not the towers of influence that they professed to be, as Elmore questions the standards and motivations of drawing in both his verbal utterances and his own production.

Labelled a 'singular fish' and 'a ghost', Elmore challenges the conventional in Victorian art in his variety, his individuality and in his modernity.[26] In the context of his time he anticipates Manet rather than reflects Hogarth, he purloins and reconfigures Palagi rather than he absorbs and conforms to Reynolds and he inverts the view that nineteenth- century English art was controlled by the market and the media to deliver the painted sermon.[27]

Notes: Introduction

[1] The edit was contributed by Paul Barlow who has done much to maintain and update information about Elmore, https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Alfred_Elmore&diff=next&oldid=9358040 (accessed December 12, 2016)
[2] *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, May 3, 1901, 4; the reporter stated 'A. Elmore, Copley Fielding, and many others, whose names on the scroll of fame have not been so deeply inscribed and come now with an unfamiliar sound.'
[3] *Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser*, June 28, 1887, 8.
[4] Ralph Edwards, 'Drawings of Alfred Elmore, R.A. 1815-1881', *Apollo*, 1934, 263-265.
[5] Alexander Joseph Finberg, *English Watercolour Painters*, (London: Duckworth and Co., 1905), 168.
[6] Lindsay Errington, *Social and Religious Themes in English Art 1840 – 1860*, PhD thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, (London: Garland Publishing, 1985).
[7] Paul Jonathon Barlow, *'The Backside of Nature', The Clique. Hogarthiainism and the Problem of Style in Victorian Painting*, Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sussex, 1989.
[8] Lynda Nead, 'Seduction, Prostitution, Suicide: *On the Brink* by Alfred Elmore', *Art History*, (September, 1982), 310-22.
[9] Nead's essay had the effect of bringing *On the Brink* to a wider academic audience and has been referenced in discussions on suicide, Ron Brown, *Art of Suicide*, (London: Reaktion Books, 2001), 14, prostitution, Sander L. Gilman, '"Who Kills Whores?" "I do", says Jack: Race and Gender in Victorian London', in *The Body*, ed. Tiffany Atkinson, (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 64-74.
[10] Susan P. Casteras, 'Virgin Vows: The Early Victorian Artists' Portrayal of Nuns and Novices', *Victorian Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 2, 1981, 157-184.
[11] Richard and Samuel Redgrave, *A Century of British Painter*s, (Oxford: Phaidon, 1981), 478. James McGuire, James Quinn, eds., *The Dictionary of Irish Biography: From the Earliest Times to 2002*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), asserted that the names of Elmore's parents are unknown and that he never married, this was altered by additional information provided by the present author in 2016.
[12] Quentin Bell, *Victorian Artists*, (London: Academy Editions, 1967). Christopher Wood, *Olympian Dreamers: Victorian Classical Painters 1860-1914*, (London: Constable, 1983), 218.
[13] Wood, *The Dictionary of Victorian Painters*, 2nd ed., (Suffolk: Antique Collectors' Club), 1978, 144.
[14] Ibid.
[15] Michael Bryan, *Bryan's Dictionary of Painters and Engravers,* Vol. 2, ed. George Charles Williamson, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1903), 126-7.
[16] William Sandby, *The History of the Royal Academy from its Foundation in 1768 to the Present, With Biographical Notes of All the Members*, Vol. 2, (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts and Green, 1862), 302-3.
[17] Ibid.
[18] Julian Campbell, 'Alfred Elmore', *Art and Architecture of Ireland: Painting 1600-1900*, ed. Nicola Figgis, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), 243-5. *The Art-Journal*, 1857, 113-5.
[19] Justin O'Driscoll, *A Memoir of Daniel Maclise*, (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1871). Although there were similarities between Elmore and Maclise in terms of their background; both were born in Cork and both had fathers who had been members of the British army, there were also important differences in terms of their political affiliations and outlooks. Alexander, Maclise's father was a Presbyterian who had arrived in Ireland as a soldier to quash the Irish revolts that Elmore's grandfather was involved in; (Peter Murray, 'The Artist's Life and Artistic Training in Cork, 1806-1827' in *Daniel Maclise, 1806-1870: Romancing the Past*, Peter Murray, ed. (Cork: Crawford Art Gallery, 2008) 21.). Alexander married Rebecca, also a Presbyterian, from Bandon, a notoriously Orange town; (Ian D'Alton, *Protestant Society and Politics in Cork - 1812-1844*, (Cork: Cork University Press, 1980), 29, 74, 171,). While still in Cork Maclise was championed by members of the Brunswick Club, including Richard Sainthill who Maclise sketched, a notoriously anti-Catholic and anti-Emancipation grouping; (D'Alton, 29,74, 171, Murray, 27-9. *Cork Constitution*, January 15, 1829, 1). William Maginn, a fellow Corkman and editor of *Fraser's Magazine*, that Maclise illustrated, was also a member of the Brunswick Club, albeit at Trinity College, Dublin. *Fraser's* was noted for its anti-Catholic and anti-Daniel O'Connell stance; (David E. Latné, *William Maginn and the British Press: A Critical Biography*, (New York: Routledge, 2016), 116). Although Maclise produced numerous works connected with Ireland, unlike Elmore, it

is evident that his political background suggests he was a Tory and not a supporter of Emancipation or Repeal; (Tom Dunne, 'The Marriage of Strongbow and Aoife: Entertaining History in the Interests of the State', in *Creating History: Stories of Ireland in Art*, (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2016), 135). One telling statement by Maclise that suggests his painting was not to be taken as a support for the nineteenth century upheavals in Ireland against England is quoted in John Turpin's study of the artist, 'I quite long to see Ireland once more, and try to see something of you and also of this astounding Fenianism which I try not to believe in… the Irish Channel appears to me as the most material Repeal of the Union.'(John Turpin, 'The Irish Background of Daniel Maclise', *The Capuchin Annual*, 1970, 177-94). Maclise was too ill to travel to Ireland and looked at the physical distance between London and Ireland as a sufficient chasm between the countries without resorting to the Repeal that Daniel O'Connell sought and that Elmore supported as we learn from his support for O'Connell.

[20] Jeremy Maas, *Victorian Painters*, (London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1969), 240.

[21] Edwards, 'Drawings of Alfred Elmore'.

[22] Paul Oppé, 'Art' in *Early Victorian England: 1830-1865*, Vol. 2, (London: Oxford University Press, 1934), 142.

[23] Jeremy Maas, *The Victorian Art World in Photographs*, (London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1984), 58-9.

[24] John Hadfield*, Every Picture Tells a Story: Images of Victorian Life*, (New York: Fact on File Publications, 1985), 7.

[25] Ibid. 116.

[26] William Powell Frith to Thomas Miller, 11 July 1848, Thomas Miller Papers. Royal Academy, R.A.A./236/39/3, Maas, *Victorian Painters*, 239.

[27] See En. 52, Chapt. 4.

Chapter 1

Elmore's Clonakilty

The society into which Alfred Elmore was born was one far removed from the crowded urban metropolis in which he would practice his art. Samuel Carter Hall has insisted that Elmore was born on the very day that the Battle of Waterloo was taking place, the outcome of which would introduce a period of peace and economic regeneration to Britain.[1] Rural Ireland of the same period was not such a promising environment even when one considers the efforts of industrialists to improve the conditions of the impoverished, unlanded and unemployed Irish peasants. Testimony from Alfred Elmore's father, Richard, in letters still extant and in his observations to Parliamentary Enquiries are illustrative of the poverty that existed in the early nineteenth century around Clonakilty.

Richard Elmore arrived in Clonakilty in 1807 but as a surgeon in the British army was absent on a number of occasions before finally taking permanent residence there, until 1827, after the Siege of Burgos.[2] In his evidence to the Select Committee on Emigration in 1827, Elmore stated that when he arrived in Clonakilty he found immense misery, 'I have gone into their cabins, where probably there have been two or three families residing in the one cabin and I have frequently met them without even a blanket to cover them.'[3] The extreme poverty was a reason for Elmore ceasing to practice medicine and turning to manufacture, both as a means of alleviating the general destitution of the town and to earn a living for himself; in his role as a doctor the 'miserable condition of the people' forced him to frequently 'put my hand into my own pocket.'[4] Alfred Elmore would spend only the first twelve years of his life in this environment and it cannot be definitively stated how this would impact upon his outlook on life or his approach to his art but the poverty and disturbances of the west Cork town of Clonakilty and the surrounding areas were not a distant event from him as the wars in Europe

might have been for artists of his age living in Britain; his family had direct contact with these local occurrences and his father testifies to this truth.

Prior to the Act of Union of 1801 there existed in Ireland as much poverty and violence as after the passing of the Act; rent, taxes and Church tithes were imposed most heavily on the poorest in an unfair method of evaluation that resulted in the poor 'supporting themselves by work, begging and pilfering and, if the neighbourhood wants hands or takes no notice of them, their hovel, no better than a pigsty, grows into a cabin.'[5] The increases in rents applied to land that came with the demand for produce during the wars served to further allow profits to be made on the poorest without offering security of tenure.[6] Richard Elmore's father in-law, Dr. William Callanan, was closely connected to the United Irishmen's rising of 1798 which grew out of the conditions in Ireland at the time and he was also arrested in the aftermath of Robert Emmet's rising of 1803 along with William Todd Jones at the doctor's home in Ballymacowen in Clonakilty.[7] Theobald Wolfe Tone, leader of the 1798 rebellion, had as an aim the unification of Catholics and Protestants in common cause. [8] Elmore's own father would go on to support Daniel O'Connell's movement for Catholic Emancipation.[9]

Richard Elmore's involvement in Irish politics was not limited to passive support. The period during which Elmore was living in Clonakilty was a turbulent one. This was a time of agrarian upheaval and revolt with groupings such as the Whiteboys, Ribbonmen and others active in the area. In Cork, Kerry and Limerick the notorious, and unidentified, 'Captain Rock' was leader of another group during the years 1821- 24 and conflicts between the yeomanry and 'Rockites' occurred around west Cork, including Clonakilty.[10] One instance involved the owner of a large farm holding being killed in response to his purchase of the land of a local, evicted farmer; on another occasion the yeomanry opened fire on a large group of peasants who were seeking the release of two prisoners and shot one of the prisoners while his hands were still tied.[11] Elmore was of the opinion that any violence could be

attributed to the yeomanry and 'by thus removing the corrupting power, gold, we should not hear so much corruption, caballing and party abuse from Orangemen when reeking from their drunken orgies and bellowing forth infuriated insults on the mass of their fellow citizens.' He did not hold the Orange Order in any great regard.[12] Rev. Michael Collins, in a submission to a House of Commons Select Committee, outlined instances of killings and retaliations in Bandon and Timoleague near Clonakilty.[13] Although in evidence to the same Select Committee Elmore stated that he remained aloof from inter-party conflicts, he was also very aware of the feelings of dread that surrounded the west Cork area and the crossover between Orange Order membership and the yeomanry.[14]

Richard was also involved in many of the day to day aspects of the political life of Clonakilty and of county Cork. Apart from the linen manufacturing industry which he set up in the town, he also intervened on behalf of a local Catholic and employer, Richard Deasy. Deasy had been removed from the position of magistrate and Elmore sought his reinstatement. He had also collaborated with the Deasy family to seek improvement in the infrastructure of Clonakilty.[15] Elmore wrote a series of letters to the Earl of Darnley that was published in 1828.[16] Many of the ideas in the letters were conveyed by Darnley to Parliament when he brought a copy to a parliamentary session and in his speech he referenced Elmore.[17] Elmore's knowledge of the situation pertaining to Ireland was far reaching and it is clear that his opinions were well respected. When a political delegation from Cork was sent to Devonshire House in London it was Elmore who was asked to read the petition of the delegation and inform the Earl of Liverpool, Prime Minister at the time, of the particular nature of the conditions in Cork even though the majority of the delegation consisted of Lords and other members of the gentry, including Devonshire himself.[18] Accompanying the delegation was another individual involved in the woollen and linen trade in Cork city, Thomas Lyons, who would later become the first Roman Catholic mayor of Cork since the seventeenth century.

Elmore delivered a series of six lectures in Dublin during 1827. These were very well attended and well received, covering many of the topics of the day including education and the status of women; the audience of 'eminent men' and 'fashionable ladies' suggests that the speaker and his authority on the topics to be elucidated upon were both considered worthy of attention. [19] Elmore had a practical impact on the improvement of education in Cork; he had made a point during 1825 to visit and survey various institutes of practical learning in England and this information was conveyed to the board of the Cork Mechanics Institute which was being set up during that same year.[20] At a meeting to discuss the establishment of the Institution Elmore gave a detailed lecture, twice in the one day, on the workings of and the effects that the Glasgow Institute had on that city and it was listened to with 'almost breathless attention.'[21] By the first quarterly meeting of the Institution, in September 1825, the numbers attending had begun to diminish but among those few who had attended and contributed to every meeting from its inception was Elmore.[22]

Elmore's return to London in 1827 may have been motivated by the fall off in linen production due, he would argue, to the lack of capital investment and the general state of Ireland and the treatment of Catholics.[23] It may also have been due to the family misfortunes that occurred around the same period. Elmore's wife Marianne, daughter of Dr. William Callanan, had died sometime in February 1827 along with a child around the same time, so perhaps she died in child birth; this was followed by the loss of another son, the eldest of his remaining children.[24] At the end of 1827 Richard was a widowed father of three sons, Alfred, Thomas and Charles and living in London.[25]

We have no record of Alfred Elmore's education during the formative years of his life up to the age of twelve and his commencement as a student at the Royal Academy. The education system in Ireland was one that was grounded in the religious conflicts of the time but in Clonakilty there had been attempts to organise schools that were open to both Catholic and

Protestants without a bias toward either religion.[26] In 1808 a 'classical school' was set up in Clonakilty by the Earl of Shannon and became, at the time, one of the 'most reputable' and Elmore may have attended here.[27] Whatever education the young Elmores received it was sufficient for Richard to foresee Alfred becoming a doctor and for Thomas to eventually become a respected diplomat.[28]

Elmore's youth in Clonakilty was, then, one that was surrounded by famine, violence and a family, paternal and maternal, involved in what would have be seen as revolutionary politics. It was also a time when he left the town of his birth under the shadow of the death of his mother and siblings. He did not leave Clonakilty forever and remained in touch, as will be noted in later chapters; however, even as he lived and died in London he remained 'thoroughly Irish'.[29]

Notes: Chapter 1

[1] *The Art-Journal*, 1857, 113-5.
[2] Elmore's evidence to the Select Committee on Emigration from the United Kingdom tells us of his moving to Clonakilty and the year of 1812 is deduced from his army pension document as therein it states that he was injured on the retreat from Burgos. *Third Report from the Select Committee on Emigration from the United Kingdom, 1827*, House of Commons, London, 464. http://0-parlipapers.proquest.com.library.ucc.ie/parlipapers/result/pqpdocumentview?accountid=14504&groupid=96119&pgId=02fdf9f3-99bb-4b6e-ac6a-ed7fed351e04&rsId=1583F58F806#0 (accessed December 7, 2016) Pension Records, War Office Records, National Archives, Kew, United Kingdom, WO 25/75/92.
[3] *State of Ireland, Minutes of Evidence: Taken before the Select Committee appointed into the Disturbances in Ireland, in the last Session of Parliament, 13th May – 8th June 1824*, House of Commons, London, 407.
[4] Ibid. 419. The manufacture Elmore involved himself in was linen manufacture and this is recorded in his parliamentary submissions and in local trade digests such as *Pigot's Provincial Directory*, (Cork: Pigot and Co., 1824). Elmore employed upwards of five hundred people before his return to London, John Beare, *A Letter to the King on the Practical Improvement of Ireland*, (London: Clerc Smith, 1827), 62.
[5] Rev. P. Cahalane, 'Social Conditions in Ireland During the Napoleonic Wars', *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, (June, 1916), 210-25, 211.
[6] Ibid.
[7] James Coombes, *Clonakilty and District*, (Clonakilty: C.Y.M.S, 1959), 63, 77-9 & 86-9. Seán Ó Coindealbháin, 'The United Irishmen in County Cork – VI: South and South-West Cork – continued', *Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society*, July-December, 1951, 103. James Buckley, 'The Skirmish at Ballinascarty, County Cork, 1798', *J.C.H.A.S.*, July-September, 1903, 137-140.
[8] Patrick Geoghegan, 'Act of Union', in *The Encyclopaedia of Ireland*, ed. Brian Lalor, (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 2003), 7.
[9] For a more detailed discussion of Richard Elmore and Daniel O'Connell see Chapt. *Religious Controversy*.
[10] A detailed examination of Captain Rock and the agrarian disturbances of the period are to be found in: James S. Donnelly, Jr., *Captain Rock: The Irish Agrarian Rebellion of 1821–1824*, (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009).
[11] Ibid. 115, 67.
[12] Ian d'Alton, *Protestant Society and Politics in Cork: 1812 -1844*, (Cork: Cork University Press, 1980), 204.
[13] *State of Ireland: Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the Disturbances in Ireland, in the last session of Parliament*, House Commons, London, 1824, Rev. Michael Collins, 379.
[14] Ibid. Elmore, 418-9.
[15] Richard Griffith (signed by Richard Elmore) to Henry Goulburn, Chief Secretary, 12 September 1822, Richard Elmore to Henry Goulburn, Chief Secretary, 17 December 1822, Richard Elmore to William Gregory, Under Secretary, 15 July 1822, Chief Secretary's Office Registered Papers, Francis J. Crowley Bequest, National Archives of Ireland, NAI Reference Numbers: CSO/RP/1822/1800, CSO/RP/1822/3097, CSO/RP/1822/3334.
[16] John Richard Elmore, *Letters to the Right Hon. The Earl of Darnley: On the State of Ireland, in Advocacy of Free Trade and other measures of practical improvement, more especially calculated to supersede the necessity of Emigration*, (London: James Ridgway, 1828).
[17] *Southern Reporter and Cork Commercial Courier*, May 6, 1828, 1.
[18] Ibid. March 17, 1825. *The Freeman's Journal*, March 16, 1825, 2.
[19] *The Freeman's Journal*, April 16, 1, April 20, 2, 1827.
[20] *Southern Reporter and Cork Commercial Courier*, March 31, 1825, 4.
[21] Ibid., February 10, 1825, 3-4.
[22] Ibid. September 29, 1825, 2.
[23] Elmore, *Letters To the Right Hon. The Earl of Darnley*.
[24] *Southern Reporter and Cork Commercial Courier*, February 10, 1827, 4.
[25] War Office Records, National Archives, Kew, United Kingdom, WO 25/757. I have found no further reference to Charles.
[26] James Coombes, 'Doctor William O'Brien of Glenanaar', J.C.H.A.S., 1977, 120.
[27] *The Belfast Monthly*, September 30, 1812, 190-1.

[28] Samuel Hall intimated that, were it not for his intervention, Alfred would have become a doctor, S.C. Hall, *Retrospect of A Long Life, 1815-1883*, Vol. 2, (London: Richard Bentley and Son, 1883), 219. Thomas would become a much travelled Queen's Consul, see Chapt. *Influences*.
[29] Elizabeth Ward, *Mrs. E.M. Ward's Reminiscences*, ed. Elliot O'Donnell, (London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons), 1911, 177.

Chapter 2

Influence and Influences in the Work of Elmore

As a result of the limited engagement with the works of Alfred Elmore there are many aspects of his paintings which have been ignored. The religious meaning of his works is an essential area of examination and this is addressed in the chapter dealing specifically with this topic. The important question of influence on and by Elmore's paintings also needs to be asked. In this chapter it will be argued that Elmore, even though he has largely fallen from the art historical landscape, was both influential on and influenced by the artists of his day. More importantly, it will be argued that he was a follower not so much of artists operating within his own space and circle, an assertion that confronts the idea of an English School of Art, but of external practitioners, most notably those whose works he would have encountered in Italy and France. The effect of the rise in the middle-class market demand for art during the nineteenth century impacted enormously upon the approaches of artists to their output; this has been well rehearsed and is now accepted as fact but it will be reviewed here initially. It is important to revisit this subject in order to locate Elmore within the market and within the social and cultural connections that existed at the time with specific reference to his network of associations as evidenced from commentaries and references to him in the writings of others and in the press of the period; this approach arises from the lack of written records available from Elmore's own hand.

A visual concretisation of the artistic connectivity that existed at the time can be seen in the painting by Henry Nelson O'Neil, *Sir Charles Taylor and Others (Forty Three members in the Billiard Room of the Garrick Club*), 1869, (Fig.7&7b). This painting features many of the most notable artists of the Victorian era. Alfred Elmore is included in the picture along with

William Powell Frith, John Everett Millais, Frederic Leighton, Thomas Creswick and O'Neil himself, to name just a few.[1] Also among the sitters are the writers Anthony Trollope and Charles Reade, author of *The Cloister and the Hearth*; a posthumous reference to Thackeray via a painted portrait of the writer by John Gilbert is also included in the painting.[2] The gathering of members of the artistic and literary class in places such as the Garrick Club is a simple reflection of the close associations which this grouping had; artists attended soirees together, had dinner in each other's homes, supported each other in times of need and, apart from being members of the Academy, vacationed together and formed informal artistic groupings such as *The Clique*.[3] The Garrick Club offered a 'rendezvous' for the 'representatives of all the best classes of society' in a relaxed 'social' setting.[4] Social contacts and comings together of artists was important enough for Turner to oppose the abolition of varnishing day at the Royal Academy; in support of retaining the day he said 'Then you will do away with the only social meeting we have.' Although Turner may have been engaging in hyperbole in suggesting it was 'the only social meeting', it does underline the importance artists placed on maintaining contact with their peers.[5] Artists involved themselves in committees and organisations; Elmore and Frith were part of the National Byron Memorial Committee, Elmore, Maclise and Millais were amongst those who sought permission to erect a memorial for Thackeray in Westminster Cathedral and Elmore was a member of the National Shakespeare Committee, preparing for the Bard's tercentenary celebrations, along with Frederick Hurlstone.[6] Collectors, artists and writers kept in contact with each other and interacted to their mutual benefit. Some of these attachments would become intimate and long lasting; Elmore would not be an exception to this social interplay although, it seems, he was at times less extroverted than others of his profession.[7] In trying to understand the relationships between artists, collectors and agents we often need to rely on a subject's collection of letters or an autobiography, but unfortunately, Elmore did not write a memoir

and many of his letters that are extant have been widely dispersed. We sometimes find individual letters written by or to Elmore being auctioned or sold on internet websites or through antiques outlets. One reason for this is the chance purchase by Captain Ridgill Trout of a 'cupboard full of rubbish' around 1932.[8] Trout was an antiquarian and bookseller who said he hoped to come across a rare book or two in the cupboard which he purchased for £2 but instead found a collection of over 1,000 paintings, etchings and drawings by Elmore.[9] In 1934 an exhibition of Elmore's work was held in The Squire Gallery in London which was reviewed in *Apollo* magazine as a selection of 'about a dozen examples' from 'several portfolios…new to the market.'[10] In *Apollo* we are given the first mention of possible influences on, or at least similarities to, Elmore's watercolour style; Richard Parkes Bonington and Watteau were identified by the author of the review as possible influences and *The Times* in its observations was in agreement.[11] The Squire Gallery exhibition of watercolours was said to have come from a member of the Elmore family.[12] The discovery, exhibition and sale of the collection by Trout suggests that a clearance of the remainder of Elmore's belongings had taken place. It is most likely that the family member was his grandson Aubrey Hammond who was active as an illustrator and theatre scenery designer throughout the U.K. and Ireland up to the time of his death in London in 1940 at the age of 46.[13] A number of the works found in the 'cupboard' were acquired from Trout by the British Museum and by the Victoria and Albert Museum but if we are to compare the number of items found and auctioned by Trout with the number of works in public ownership then much of it must have been dispersed into private hands. A sketch book by the artist was auctioned, having been divided into its individual pages, on the internet auction site *EBay* in 2015; the dealer, Delphis Antiques, had purchased them at a 'small auction.'[14] A similar selection had been put forward for sale at a gallery in Birmingham in 2014.[15] Where we do have access to some of Elmore's letters, we find that in most instances they contain little more than

acknowledgements of invitations or receipts and offer little context or indications of his artistic practice. His letters do show how artists borrowed items that could be incorporated into paintings from each other; writing to fellow artist John C. Horsley in 1861, Elmore promised to send him a 'top-knot'.[16] It was mainly artists who attended the sale of Elmore's studio props and costumes after his death; this was not a unique occurrence but it is one which shows that artists were aware of each other's collected material and indicates that Elmore's studio was part of a social network that provided artists with a knowledge of the contents of each other's workspace.[17] It is acknowledged that this is not the ideal way to understand an artist's concerns and motivations but it also reveals an 'otherview' of the artist and his participation and status in the art trade. We learn that Elmore was an active participant in the interplay between vested interests but how active is difficult to gauge, again due to the lack of traceable correspondence. This chapter seeks to measure his involvement by looking to the collectors who owned and traded his work, his accessible correspondence, and theirs, on matters relevant to his output and to extract how he may have influenced others and, similarly, where he drew on the painting of fellow artists as an influence on his own artistic production. In seeking to answer this question, it is held here that the most important document in examining a visual record in this instance is the painting itself. This does not imply a purely formalist approach as both form and context need to be brought to bear on any examination of the paintings, but as there is no direct access to the artist's private intention, any intentional motive in Elmore's work is driven in this thesis by what can be gleaned from his biography and by analysis of the works themselves. An overview of the changes and of the development of art patronage during the period provides an insight into the motivations of the collectors active at the time and helps to situate Elmore's place within this milieu.

The investigation of Elmore and his work, as a noted artist of the period, a Royal Academician and as an artist whose paintings were sought after and engraved, in this context

opens up a challenge to the accepted view of Victorian paintings and how they functioned as commodities. Elmore's situation calls into question the perception that the British artistic community was driven solely by market demands. Thomas Bayer and John Page emphasise the role of the art dealer in the direction of Victorian artistic output but, as will be seen below, Elmore does not appear to have interacted with dealerships to the same extent as his peers who, as we see from Thomas Miller's letters and from the many biographies of other artists, were very much integrated into the dealer system.[18] Bayer and Page, through a comprehensive examination of statistical data, show that in the period from 1840 to beyond Elmore's death, both history and mythological painting was least in demand and yet history painting, of a type, was still a substantial part of the artist's output throughout these years.[19] As in the eighteenth century, portrait painting was still a popular genre for established artists of the Victorian era.[20] Jeremy Maas lists the number of established Victorian painters that painted portraits and many of these produced numerous works in the genre.[21] John Everett Millais, Leighton and Frith all had an extensive portrait output but Elmore submitted only two identifiable portrait paintings to the Royal Academy, the first of Sir John Simon in 1869 and the second of his own daughter, Edith, in 1872.The portrait of Simon may have been as a means of honouring the surgeon, who described Elmore as one of his oldest friends and Simon was amongst the attendance at Elmore's funeral, rather than a commission in response to market pursuits. That the portrait was created so late in his career demonstrates that it was not an area he had sought recognition for and thus an indication of his rejection of a popular genre that could be seen as an economically rather than an artistically motivated pursuit.[22]

Nineteenth-century British artists met with collectors and attended dinners at their homes, they communicated with potential purchasers and one another in attempts to assist and influence each other. William Powell Frith often wrote to the collector Thomas Miller keeping him informed of the progress being made by individual artists and he recommended

and compared works owned by Miller with new works that might be available.[23] William Hogg purchased Elmore's *The Invention of the Stocking Machine* (Fig.1) and wrote to the artist Augustus Egg outlining his intention to sell the work on to Miller and to make a tidy profit on the transactions.[24] The Miller collection of letters at the Royal Academy in London reveals the demands and comparisons being made by collectors and how this could impact upon the artist's production. Elmore was already discussing *The Queen of the Day* (Fig. 8) with Miller a year before it was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1850.[25] Elmore may have even adapted the size of one painting being purchased by another collector to accommodate Miller's wishes, although there is no indication that anything other than size, if that, was changed.[26] Miller wrote to Elmore in March 1850 asking that another of his paintings be sized to accommodate its being a companion piece for a work by Augustus Egg.[27] On another occasion Miller had managed to view *The Novice Nun* (Fig. 5) before it had been completed and Frith agreed with him on its excellence and even suggested that it was better than other nun paintings that Miller possessed, while advising the dealer to purchase it as soon as possible due to the popularity it would achieve once exhibited.[28] The letters between these personalities showcase the close relationships that developed around the art trade during that period. Why was there such an active exchange taking place within the British art world at this time that seemed to alter the relationships that had previously existed between patron and artist? This can be answered by a review of the role and method of art patronage during the late eighteenth-century and on into the nineteenth-century.

During the eighteenth-century and earlier the British aristocracy was the main source of patronage for artists but they tended to pursue works by European artists and works by the Old Masters were seen as the ideal. This was a result of the impediment to the development of a distinctly English school of art brought about by the lack of patronage from ecclesiastical sources after the Reformation in Britain.[29] This assertion is not to deny that artistic production existed in

Britain, it is to acknowledge that, even where Church patronage was replaced by the Crown and by the aristocracy, support for artistic output was directed largely towards Continental artists and artists influenced by them.[30] It is not surprising that given this predilection for Continental art and artists that in times of peace those who could afford to would travel to Europe to experience its culture first hand. Paintings, sculpture and antiquities collected on these travels would also help to decorate the newly built homes of the wealthy Englishman, of which 'over six hundred' were constructed in the second half of the eighteenth-century.[31] Italy was the prime destination for the wealthy traveller, following Joseph Addison's advice to experience the pleasure to be found there.[32] Becoming knowledgeable in manner and taste was an imperative, according to Lord Shaftesbury, and this could only be fully achieved in Italy.[33] On this *Grand Tour*, the aristocracy sought to identify themselves with exemplary taste by resorting to having their portraits painted by Italian and English artists and purchasing examples of antique and classical sculpture, artefacts and Old Master paintings. In his *Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy: 1791-1800,* John Ingamells provides numerous instances of large scale purchasing by the English tourist.[34] James Johnston, 2nd Marquess of Annandale, was 'said to have returned to Scotland with one of the largest consignments of objects of art and antiquity ever brought home by a travelling collector', his account book listing over 300 paintings including works by Guercino.[35] The Jesuit, Fr. John Thorpe, used the Irish artist James Forrester, resident in Rome, to assist him in collecting works for the 8th Baron Arundell of Wardour; amongst the paintings returned to England via this route were numerous copies of Old Masters.[36] It is not necessary to repeat the list given by Ingamells, suffice to say that he identifies a massive transfer of Continental art back to Britain, which illustrated two essential points. Firstly, the aristocracy and those who were free to expend their profits targeted Old Master works, both original and copies, and works painted by contemporary Italian and British artists working in Rome. Secondly, these

contemporary artists produced portraits and landscapes which conformed to the demands of the patrons and to the ideas of future President of the Royal Academy, Sir Joshua Reynolds. The conformity to Reynolds' ideals is evident in the adherence to a classical and *Grand Manner* style visible in the portraiture and landscapes of the period which made reference to the architecture of antiquity within the framework of the portrait and the Claudian impulses that resonate throughout the imagined landscapes. Reynolds' own portrait of *Jane, Countess of Harrington*, 1778, typifies this approach. This engagement with the Continent was not guaranteed to continue in perpetuity given the insecure nature of international relations and threats to peace and this was soon to be realised.

The break in relative peace brought about by the Napoleonic wars would lead to a phase of military activity that would curtail the *Grand Tour* but also bring further commercial growth in Britain.[37] Although the economic growth would continue to have a basis in agricultural production, and thus see the landed gentry rewarded, there would also be the expansion of the manufacturing areas and this would further enrich the entrepreneurs, industrialists and financiers.[38]

The *nouveaux riches* came from a demographic that was not limited to the landed aristocracy and they brought with them a different approach to art patronage. The resultant change in the production of British art and art patronage was not as straightforward as is sometimes assumed. It has been argued that the change in art production came about due to the change in patronage that began with the increases in wealth brought to the rising middle class enriched by the profits garnered from 'commerce and trade'.[39] These newly enriched, although not as new as might have once been thought according to Dianne Macleod, concentrated on purchasing works by living, British artists where there was no need to be a connoisseur, as the works could be verified by the artist and by the patron.[40] Macleod identifies a number of prime movers in the change from the pursuit of Old Masters and their motivations; Samuel C.

Hall, of which more below, was one such highly influential individual.[41] This change in patron type and patronage activities is not as simple as it may appear, or at least the transition was not as abrupt. Holger Hoock has suggested that the interest in British art was occurring as early as the *Grand Tour* prior to the Napoleonic Wars and continued through this period.[42] However, British art was still defined as in the *Grand Manner* style and followed Reynolds' ideas on what art should be – *Grand Manner* portraiture and History painting. Hoock points out that those who purchased Old Masters also purchased British work from the late eighteenth-century, such as those by Reynolds and Hogarth.[43] Hoock also suggests that the monetary value of native works had not yet increased to the extent that collecting them would have been seen as a financial investment; this would not come about until after the influence of Hall.[44] At this early stage of the nineteenth-century, collecting British art was seen as a patriotic act as it attempted to create a unique style or British School of painting while the nation felt under threat of invasion before the defeat of Napoleon. That being the case, even John Sheepshank, the noted Victorian collector enriched by the expansion of the cotton industry at the end of the eighteenth century, collected Old Masters just as he collected modern paintings by British artists and his contribution of a large collection of works to the, now, Victorian and Albert Museum was as important as Robert Vernon's donation to the National Gallery in 1847.[45] According to Lady Eastlake, by the 1830s 'The patronage which had been almost exclusively the privilege of the nobility and higher gentry was now shared (to be subsequently engrossed) by a wealthy and intelligent class, chiefly enriched by commerce and trade.'[46]

The Reform Act of 1832, the expansion of the right to vote, the growth of industry and the new type of patron that emerged from the cumulative effects of these changes to English society also had a profound impact on artistic production. As if by way of confirmation of Lady Eastlake, Paul Oppé also noted that from the 1840s a change took place in the

demographic of the purchasers of art in that it moved from the nobility and landowners to the enriched industrialists.[47] Thomas Miller fitted into this demographic make-up as he was 'one of a knot of gentlemen all residing near each other, many of whom have been enriched by manufacture, and all distinguished by their manifest patronage of art.'[48] The importance of these new patrons was lauded by Samuel Hall in *The Art-Journal*, which reported on their private collections and referred, as it did with Miller, to its 'duty to speak especially of the more than liberal support which our painters have received from the neighbourhood of Preston and Manchester.'[49] *The Art-Journal* on its visit to Thomas Miller's private collection as part of their series in 1857 commented on Elmore's *Griselda* (Fig.9) in the collection, saying it was 'one of the most carefully executed works we have ever seen painted from his [Chaucer's]verse.'[50] Hall, as founder of the journal *The Art-Union*, which would later become *The Art-Journal*, argued that support for living, British artists would be beneficial both to the nation and to the patrons; for the nation, art could act as a commentator on and thus improver of the lot of the lower classes; for the patron, there was his argument that work by artists who were living would increase in value over the Old Masters.[51] In his memoir, *Retrospect of a Long Life*, Hall gives the example of a manufacturer who had bought a Rubens for £500 and a work by Thomas Webster and Thomas Creswick for 60 guineas; the Rubens he sold later for £80 while the Webster/Creswick sold for £300.[52] In 1850 he wrote in *The Art-Journal*, in the context of a list of paintings purchased directly from the artists or from the walls of the R.A. exhibition, that 'The class to which the majority of the purchasers belongs is evidence that we have not laboured in vain in directing the attention of the wealthy merchant and manufacturer, who have now become the great patrons of Art, to the best channels for acquiring works of sterling merit and of unquestionable monetary value.'[53] Hall's extolling of the virtue of patrons that collected English works encouraged them in their activities in the art marketplace and enhanced the reputation of the artists. Hall, besides printing engravings in

The Art-Journal, also published books that carried social messages and he employed living artists to illustrate them. *The Trial of Sir Jasper*, written by Hall, was a lengthy poem on the importance of temperance and it was illustrated by many of the upcoming and leading artists of the day; Elmore had two engravings carried in the publication (Figs. 10&11).[54]

In addition to his championing of artists like Elmore in his publications, there is an important point that specifically connects both Hall and Elmore; in his *Retrospect* Hall claims to have played a pivotal role in Elmore becoming a painter. Hall wrote that when Elmore had moved to London with his father the intended profession for the young artist was to be a doctor like his father, who was at this stage the Hall family physician.[55] Hall suggested to Richard Elmore, having viewed some drawings by the young Alfred, that 'You will try in vain to prevent Alfred from being anything but an artist.'[56] It is also from *The Art-Journal*, and Hall, that we have much of our biographical information and our knowledge of the early reception of the artist's work is based on Hall's review of Elmore's career up to 1857.[57]

It may be that having decided that Elmore was destined to become an artist Hall felt that he had to ensure that it would be so by promoting him. This could not have been for Elmore's production of paintings that dealt with English themes or that his output adhered to the English style of painting that Hall was hoping would follow from the changes in the market. *The Art-Journal*'s promotion of British artists, like Frith and other members of *The Clique*, was not seeking a complete break from existing artistic practices, as can be seen from its condemnatory response to the Pre-Raphaelites.[58] *The Art-Journal* was promoting artists that would assist in the change from the purchase of Old Masters and a 'transfer of patronage to modern Art.'[59] Hall wished to 'induce people to patronize British Art' that was also 'modern' and it is for this reason that he gave commissions to 'young and rising artists' such as Frith, Elmore and Edward Matthew Ward.[60] However, Elmore's earlier works were not all exclusively British in subject or theme, and were very much influenced by his time on the

Continent, especially prior to his elevation to R.A.. His paintings were not considered as 'modern' in the same way that Frith's, Ward's and Henry O'Neill's were, even by *The Art-Journal* itself that pointed to Elmore's adherence to History painting in the four years up to his election as R.A..[61] Elmore was valued as an artist not just under the terms sought by Hall which may imply a bias. However, Elmore was also critically praised by other publications, so, as much as it may be tempting to accuse Hall of showing a partiality towards, the artist it is unlikely that the praise was unjustified. Apart from Hall's championing of native, living artists through an appeal to patriotism, commercial acumen and to increase production of 'modern Art' (the positive reaction to this is evident from the collections built up by the wealthy collectors), there were other reasons for the desire to collect and Elmore's art seemed to answer the first two demands without sacrificing his own path in responding to the call for the 'modern'.

MacLeod's list of those who amassed large galleries of modern art suggests that there were multiple reasons for a collector targeting a specific type of painting. However, for the rising middle class status and competitiveness amongst their peers were two of the main motivational drivers within the ranks of the buyers of the mid-nineteenth century. Sam Mendel, who gained his wealth from his activities in the textile industry, collected his paintings not because he was a lover of art but because 'he saw that other rich men in business, successful like himself, were displaying their wealth by buying pictures at high prices and making their dwelling houses magnificent with works of modern art as the aristocracy had always done with pictures by the Old Masters.'[62] The new collectors also understood, or were at least happy with their understanding, of the meanings that were to be taken from the modern paintings.[63] Patrons and collectors alike could also be certain of a painting's authenticity thus ensuring that the true value, in monetary terms, of what they were purchasing was not in doubt.[64] Sir John Pender, having been involved in the cotton industry

like Mendel, made his fortune in underwater telegraph cabling and his large collection of artworks took eight days to sell at Christie's.[65] *The Art-Journal* pointed to the historical lineage of Pender's house on Arlington Street in London when they visited his gallery and a further indication of how the status of the industrialist had changed is given by the attendance at his home when the first telegraph was sent from Arlington Street to India in 1870; amongst those present were British, European and Indian royalty.[66] That Pender used his collection to emphasise his status amongst the aristocracy as a result of his control of telegraphy throughout the Empire may be to exaggerate such a claim; however, what is certain is that his collection was a highly visible part of his wealth and would have exposed his cultural awareness and taste as identified by the visit of *The Art-Journal*.[67]Albert Grant, another collector and a former M.P., noted for his corrupt financial dealings, collected his art as a means of 'gratifying his really good taste in the Fine Arts and his ambition to have the leading gallery of modern pictures of the day.'[68] Elmore's work was present in many of the galleries of the well-known collectors such as Pender and Mendel but also in others examined by MacLeod. The sales records provided by Redford and the visits to private galleries by *The Art-Journal* present us with one anomaly if we consider collectors to be interested in genre scenes that could be read and easily understood due to their simple narrative content. The presence of Elmore's work in these collections is, by and large, typified by his historical and literary paintings that demanded a familiarity with both the historical and literary context; this contrasts with Bayer and Page's finding that History paintings were in the least demand and demonstrates that Elmore's works, while not conforming to the market, remained desirable. Pender had *A Scene from Lucrezia Borgia* (No Image available), Mendel purchased *Katherine and Petruchio* (No Image Available), Samuel Ashton owned *The Origin of the Guelph and Ghibelline Quarrel* (Fig.12) and Albert Grant owned *Charles V at Yuste* (Fig. 13).[69] John Farnworth, a timber merchant and onetime Mayor of Liverpool, owned *Two*

Women Shall be Grinding at the Mill (Fig.14) and *Life in Algiers* (No Image Available), paintings which might be described as Orientalist or, in the former case, religious.[70]The art dealers, William Cox and Ernest Gambart collected his works but, as with the merchants, the examples were not of the genre type if by genre we mean representations of 'narrative pictures of people in scenes from ordinary life.'[71]

With the exception of Miller, there is no evidence to suggest that Elmore created these works specifically for the owners and many of his works quickly became commodities, changing ownership repeatedly and speedily. *Queen of the Day* (Fig. 8) was in the ownership of Samuel Lloyd, the banker and art collector by July 1850, having been sold to Miller, but not painted for him, by Elmore in November 1849 for 200 guineas.[72] *Beppo*, 1847, (Fig. 15) was bought from the wall of the R.A. exhibition by the noted publisher and patron of the arts John Clowes Grundy who was seen as an astute judge of paintings suitable for engraving; *Beppo* is, however, not known to have been engraved.[73] *Beppo* was in the possession of Richard Nicholson, Treasurer of the York, Newcastle and Berwick Railway Company by 1849 as it was sold in an auction of his paintings after his suicide that year.[74] It had previously left Grundy's ownership as it was sold in July of 1849 from the 'collection of a deceased nobleman'.[75] Redford records the painting turning up at auction four times between 1849 and 1885. [76]

That Elmore was subservient to those who collected his art is unlikely. The Miller letters seem to indicate that Elmore had commenced work on his own initiative and that Frith reported on the paintings and advised that they be purchased rather than the works having been commissioned by the collector. The artist was slow to take advice even from such a close associate as Frith who, when writing to Miller, called Elmore 'a singular fish – and as for his taking hints, it would be much better for him if he had less disinclination to do so …as [his pictures] would be much more perfect.'[77] Even at the early stages of his career before

elevation to Associate Academician while Frith and others were following the popular literary trends, Elmore entered *Rienzi* (Fig. 3) causing *The Art-Journal* to say 'It is absolutely refreshing to turn to a picture like this after having been dosed *usque ad nauseum* with "Gil Blas", "Don Quixote" and the "Vicar of Wakefield".'[78]The collection of Elmore's output suggests that his work was in the marketplace but not controlled by it unlike artists such as Frith who was destined to undergo frustration with the demands of patrons and having to produce works that he wished he would never see again.[79]

If we consider Frith and Egg, as just two contemporary examples associated with Elmore, an examination of their contributions to the Academy Exhibition demonstrates a following of popular subjects in comparison to Elmore's deviations and his decisions to exhibit works outside of trends, by either preceding them, ignoring them or allowing a lapse to develop between the moment of highest demand and his painting of the subject. In his short career Egg contributed no less than seven scenes from Shakespeare compared to Elmore's output of just one more than this throughout his much longer engagement with the R.A. Exhibition and even Egg's most famous *Past and Present* (Fig. 18) is isolated as an engagement with social concerns as it is both preceded and succeeded by his drawing on the works of Thackeray as source material.[80] While Frith constantly returned to the well of Goldsmith, Sterne, Scott and Shakespeare, Elmore illustrated just one scene from Sterne, none from Goldsmith and painted a subject from Thackeray just once, (*Mistress Hetty Lambert – The Virginians*, R.A., 1874).[81] Elmore did on one occasion return to a subject with direct reference to a previous year's work. In 1860 Elmore exhibited *The Tuileries, June 20, 1792* (Fig. 19); it was generally well received and has been listed as one of his best works in obituaries such as that of the *Illustrated London News*, February 5th, 1881. The following year he showed *Marie Antoinette in the Temple* (Fig. 20) this was not as popular but there may have been a reason for this repetition. The Royal Academy Exhibition was deemed to have been particularly poor that

year, 1861, in terms of the displays from established artists.[82] The upcoming Great International Exhibition of 1862 was posited as one reason and Frith's absence was attributed to his on-going work on *The Railway Station* (Fig. 21) but for Elmore there may have been the personal impact of the death of his father in October of 1860.[83] Elmore had no paintings exhibited in the years following the death of his wife and he may have decided to lessen his contribution for 1861 following his father's demise. Although he sent three paintings, they were small and one was scarcely referred to in the reviews of the exhibition.[84] Elmore might well have been working on *The Invention of the Stocking Machine* (Fig. 1) which was shown in 1862. He also spent some time Ireland in 1861, presenting a photograph of *The Tuileries* to his uncle, Dr. Albert Callanan.[85] Nonetheless, this was an exception to the artist's tendency to be novel in his approach to his R.A. contributions.

That Elmore chose his own path and was happy to follow his own impulses was commented upon at many times during his career, whether as an observation of his overall output or in reference to his treatment of a particular subject or theme.[86] It is certainly the case that at many points of his career when one would expect an artist to capitalise on positive reviews and praise in the media that Elmore departed from the centre of activity and travelled abroad. After exhibiting *The Martyrdom of Thomas á Beckett* (Fig. 22) he moved once more to the Continent for a lengthy period and at later stages to North Africa after exhibiting *On the Brink* (Fig. 4). If we look at the list of his paintings at the R.A., a pattern emerges of his receiving praise and then departing from the theme or subject that had been so highly lauded. His early departure from religious paintings, according to *The Art-Journal*, was a surprise having been so talented in the field.[87] On being made Associate of the R.A. based on *Origins of the Guelph and Ghibelline Quarrel* (Fig. 12), and *Rienzi* (Fig. 3) of the previous year, rather than pursuing paintings in a similar style and genre, he reverts to a Shakespearian theme with *The Fainting of Hero* (Fig. 23), which was purchased as the chief prize of The

Art-Union, and he exhibited *Two Gentlemen of Verona* (Fig. 24) as his diploma work in 1858, following on from the large, historical painting, *Charles at Yuste* (Fig. 13).[88] When *Two Gentlemen of Verona* was shown at the R.A. exhibition Elmore also exhibited *An Incident in the Life of Dante* (Fig.25), two paintings which in terms of subject, expression and literary source were entirely dissimilar.[89] In 1847, the year following on from *The Fainting of Hero* (Fig 23), he jettisoned Shakespeare to paint his highly popular *Invention of the Stocking Machine* (Fig. 1), along with *Beppo* (Fig.15), but once more left a successful formula that produced *The Stocking Machine* to engage with an historical death scene, *The Death Bed of Robert King of Naples* (Fig.26) rather than an historical scene dealing with the theme of creation. *The Art-Journal* was quick to point out to its readership how 'Mr. Elmore has changed his style of subject and his manner of working'.[90] In 1862, *Blackwood's* reminded its audience that Elmore 'in his ingenious subject, *The Invention of the Combing Machine*, for the moment forsakes the history of nations for the incident of invention' (Fig. 27).[91] If there is a formula of selection or collection then Elmore was not consistent in fitting into it and it can be assumed that the motive for collecting his work was not based on type but rather on appeal to taste or, as we have seen, appeal to monetary value. An appeal to monetary value must also have been secondary to an appeal to taste as in terms of market demand, as outlined by Bayer and Page, history paintings such as *Charles at Yuste*, *Robert King of Naples* and *Stocking Machine* should have been least in demand by dealers and the market they served. Whichever option is chosen, and both appear valid, Elmore's work was valued by both the Academy and the market even though his work did not conform to immediate market demands for easily understood narratives about modern life.

The increase in easily understood, narrative painting that did not depend upon a profound knowledge of history appealed to the newly enriched, and this was demonstrated by the increase in the viewing public that attended galleries.[92] Throughout the 1850s and 1860s,

when ‘domestic scenes’ with a traceable narrative were most popular, Elmore only delivered one depiction of modern life to the R.A., namely *On the Brink*. The remainder of his exhibits touched upon almost every other genre except narrative painting set in a contemporary context. He did not indulge in sympathetic paintings of children, ill or dying, as did Alexander Farmer in *An Anxious Hour* (Fig. 28), and produced no paintings of dogs displaying loyalty or pouting children. Nor do we find crowded scenes of London or train interiors like Egg’s *The Travelling Companions* (Fig. 29) and Abraham Solomon’s *First Class* (Fig. 30). Elmore did not conform to the changing demands of the audience. A painting such as *On the Brink* serves to highlight the limit of ‘modern genre’ in his output when taken in the context of Jeremy Maas’ statement that Elmore ran ‘the full gamut from historical painting to full-blooded modern genre.’[93] Elmore did, however, produce narratives that were not always as easily read unless by those who would have been aware of the connections between the historical event depicted and the connotative meaning for the contemporary viewer as will be discussed in the chapter dealing with his religious paintings.[94] Kate Flint suggests that ‘not all paintings were as easy to read’ and includes *On the Brink* amongst those as easily read; however, it would be more accurate to say in this case that ‘easily read’ does not equate with a completed ‘coherent narrative’, Flint’s bracketing of *On the Brink* within a discourse on gambling limits its interpretation as can be seen in the different exegeses of the work discussed earlier. [95] Flint is correct in her assertion that ‘looking is frequently subordinated to an enforcement of dominant social opinion’; similarly it is true to state that this dominance can be rejected as the contrasting contemporary interpretations of Elmore’s *Religious Controversy* confirms.[96] Ambiguities that exist for the viewer of Elmore’s paintings are subject to differences that exist in that viewer’s cultural context, Protestant or Catholic in the case of viewing paintings that pertain to religious dispute. An assertion of such uncertainties may also be applied to *On the Brink* as a painting that could be ‘easily read’ but read

differently by different audiences. However, there is, as shown by Nead, far more to this painting than appears on the surface.[97]

That a reading beyond the represented surface could be extracted from Elmore's paintings and applied to contemporary, societal concerns is evidenced by *Blackwood's* comments on *The Tuileries*; discussing the painting the magazine asserted that 'The picture might indeed be intended at the present moment as a warning against the tyranny of the majorities and the vengeance of a populace which know no law but passion.'[98] This is most likely a reference to the demands to extend the franchise beyond that of the 1832 Reform Bill. The Chartist movement, which had more or less ceased by the late 1850s, was not content with the lack of expansion of the franchise beyond the landed class as a result of the 1832 Reform and had continued to campaign for further rights to vote. However, writings from the pen of John Stuart Mill and his arguments for greater democracy in parliamentary representation would have been interpreted as a threat against the established mode of representation and what Geoffrey Best termed the 'sun of social harmony' that was in place by the 1851 Great Exhibition.[99] In a period when the demand for further reform was growing and radical unification of classes were being agitated for, perhaps *Blackwood's* sought to remind its readership of the dangers of the mob.[100] Interest in the subject of the Marie Antoinette was not confined to visual representation. The literature on which both of Elmore's works were based was the *Royal Memoirs of the French Revolution* written by Marie Thérèse, daughter of Marie Antoinette.[101] The sympathetic reception given to Marie Thérèse's book in press reviews might be seen to define the paintings when the labels quoting the text were attached to both Marie Antoinette works by Elmore at the R.A.[102]

In these two single incidents, reflecting the relationships between a mother and her children and interpreted as works of broader political significance by the contemporary British audience, Elmore demonstrates his ability to allow the viewer a scope for multiple readings

from that of political warning to investigation of the emotions through expression. Elmore's own life would have aided him in being able to add to the emotional impact of these works and to his paintings in general. The traumatic loss of a mother was something Elmore experienced and he would have been doubly aware of the impact of death as a result of the loss of his own wife Jane and his son Alfred. As will be discussed in the context of his religious paintings, the ability of Elmore to bring a personal or family experience to bear on illustrating a subject of public concern allowed him to enrich the audience encounter by ensuring the emotional and psychological gestures and expressions of the protagonists that he painted attracted more than just a factual or historical recognition but also an emotive or sympathetic response. The *Cork Examiner* wrote of the intense emotion displayed in both of the *Tuileries* paintings saying of the 1861 *Marie Antoinette in the Temple* that 'there is no picture in the Academy so touching and no other so completely arrests the attention.'[103] A regional English newspaper stated that 'A mother imprisoned in body but not in soul … and the deep sorrow on the countenance is one that must have been carefully studied ere it could have been expressed so well'.[104] *The Crayon* refers to the whole gamut of emotion captured in the faces of all the participants depicted in the 1860 *Tuileries.*[105] It is certain that Elmore's careful study of sorrow would not have been difficult to achieve if we accept one of the most touching accounts of the Elmore household which comes to us from Frith's daughter, Jane. In *Leaves from a Life*, her memoir published in 1908, she recalls how of the many artists with whom the Frith family were acquainted as she was growing up it was 'the Ansdells, Phillips, Edith Elmore, [and] Brooks' who were their 'real friends'.[106] Jane Frith recounts how she had often sat for Elmore and she describes his extreme suffering from neuralgia and from his wife's death in childbirth.[107] Poignantly, she describes the Elmore household as having 'always a romantic air of sorrow and suffering' and a place where the boisterous play of children was not engaged in as in other homes.[108]

This ‘air of sorrow’ is to be found in many of Elmore’s paintings whether it be a death scene, as in the case of *Robert King of Naples* (Fig. 26), or one of religious contemplation, as in the case of *Supplication* (Fig. 31). Although his own emotional formation may have informed his approach to depicting subjects, this would not have been a consideration by the market other than in the surface effect that becomes materialised in the finished work as the artistic production enters into the public domain. This is not to suggest that his works were limited to surface but rather that his own awareness of emotion as a means of expression may have informed the temporal, emotional and spatial connotations to be developed in the mind of the viewer; this important issue will be revisited later. Even though the endeavours of the artist gave rise to responses that pointed to the emotional content of his works as a means of achieving an empathetic connect with the viewer, they ultimately became a commodity as they entered into the economic world of the art marketplace. This commodification of works that deviated from the demand for easily understood, contemporary works with a narrative content, discussed earlier in this chapter, does not adequately reflect the reality of variations in the market and that such variations insist on a fracture in accepted perceptions of the Victorian art market place, a fracture exemplified by Elmore.

Elmore’s work, as that of other artists, circulated in the marketplace via indirect dealings with collectors such as Miller and through the purchase and resale of his works by agents like Thomas Agnew, Louis Victor Flatou, Ernest Gambart and the Colnaghi gallery.[109] In terms of the patronage and marketplace environment that operated during Elmore’s artistic career, his work does not seem to have been subject to the same commercial influences as many other artists while in terms of his choice of subject and his treatment of those subjects it was claimed that he was ‘an artist who follows no beaten track: who thinks for himself and works out his ideas in a spirit of independence, affording as great pleasure in the novelty of the subjects he places before us as by the skilful and effective manner in which they are

treated.'[110] These two assertions suggest that Elmore was an artist who painted uninfluenced by all outside sources and this was not the case. Nor can it be claimed that Elmore did not influence other artists. It is this artistic interplay between artists, and indeed authors, rather than the commercial environment in which artistic production occurred as discussed earlier that will now be addressed. Apart from his life experience, and while accepting that even his artistic encounters are part of the artist's quotidian world, Elmore early in his career demonstrates many similarities in his work with the Italian artist Pelagio Palagi and this will be shown to have had an immense impact on some of his most lauded early works. However, initially I will address influences which his work might have had on his fellow English artists, ignoring any influence his work as a visiting instructor at the R.A. schools may have had, as the number of artists passing through the schools and the changing styles that occurred throughout the period may not lead to any definitive conclusion of influence. Elmore was a visitor at the Royal Academy from the time of his election and, as a R.A., he would have instructed and reviewed the work of students in both the School of Painting and in the Life School from 1857 but his method of instruction does not appear to have been anything other than conforming to the accepted academic standards.[111] One would expect that among the instructors of the Academy there might be some mutual influences whether intended or not and it would be appropriate to begin by examining works that have some convergences within the close circle of this rank and especially those relationships which present themselves as more than just professional friendships. These interconnections both at personal and at artistic production level can illustrate not just an influence but also how these relationships can intertwine around a specific painting focusing on a defined theme and across literary and artistic outputs.

The relationships between Elmore and other artists such as William Powell Frith is one to be considered when discussing *On the Brink* as these relationships governed its influence and

even its title. As we have noted, there was a close family relationship between the Elmore and the Frith family.[112] Elmore was also godfather to one of Frith's sons, who adopted Elmore's name as his stage name.[113] Frith was co-executor, with Alfred's brother, of the artist's will when he died in 1881. Elmore and Frith attended many dinners together. One such occasion is recorded by George Storey. Frith, Elmore and members of *The St. John's Woods Clique*, as distinct from the earlier *Clique* of Frith, Richard Dadd and O'Neil, were invited to the home of the Belgian art dealer Ernest Gambart.[114]The dealer's house had been recently almost destroyed in a gas explosion and the artists sat around without cutlery, tables or chairs enjoying the expensive food and drink that had survived.[115] Lucky also to escape was Frith's *Derby Day* (Fig. 32) which was away from the house on the day of the explosion.[116] *Ouida,* also known as Maria Louise Ramé, the female Victorian author, invited Frith to dinner at the Langham Hotel where she stayed for a period when residing in London but wished that Elmore would also attend.[117] Frith and Elmore seem to have been identified as a pair to attend events together and, from Miller's correspondence, Frith appears to have been accepted as one with an intimate knowledge of Elmore that could only come from a close friendship.

A similar relationship between Henry O'Neil and Elmore permitted Anthony Trollope to ask Elmore to provide a 'small pen and ink sketch' for a private 'novelette' he was writing even though the author was almost afraid to ask Elmore and so decided to use O'Neil as a go between.[118] Trollope was writing for 'a very pretty girl whom I have known for some years.' Perhaps it was Elmore's illness or because he was, as Frith described him, 'a singular fish' that made Trollope afraid to ask Elmore directly.[119] Elmore might have been very happy to contribute an illustration in pen and ink to Trollope because of the author's attachment to Ireland and his sympathetic approach to the Irish people.[120] We do not know what illustration Elmore did provide but from Trollope's letter to him we do know that he did supply a

work.[121] These interpersonal artistic relationships are important when we examine Elmore's *On the Brink* (Fig. 4).

One further relationship needs to be addressed before examining how they can be considered as influential on the production of *On the Brink* and how it in turn influences other works. The title of the painting may not have been Elmore's invention as Jennifer Carnell suggests he drew from a list provided to him by the author Mary Elizabeth Braddon who had seen the painting before it was exhibited.[122] Braddon wrote to Elmore after seeing his 'most interesting picture'; an implication here is that Braddon was friendly enough to be allowed view the painting in his studio before it was exhibited at the Academy.[123] The suggestions included 'A Woman's Peril' and 'On the Brink'.[124] The two titles suggested are statements on the moral dangers to which women were susceptible; however, the outcome of the choices facing the protagonist of *On the Brink* remains undetermined. Of the two titles, 'On the Brink' is the most equivocal; the other suggestion is unambiguous in associating the perils of gambling, seduction and being outside of the domestic space with women and this 'peril' has already been succumbed to; 'On the Brink' implies a choice still remains. That Elmore opted for this title offered by Braddon indicates that it was most in conformity with the narrative ambiguity he wished to be attached to the painting. *On the Brink*, as a result of its surface theme and its female subject, has been scrutinised as a work of immense importance when viewing the represented female in Victorian art.[125] It is most worthy of investigation within this gendered framework but even though the role of the female in Victorian society, her depiction in paintings of the period and the problems that they present is not the purpose of this chapter, neither is it an issue that can be ignored.

On the Brink was exhibited in the same year that John Ruskin delivered his lecture *Sesame and Lilies* and also the same year that John Stuart Mill stood successfully for Parliament

advocating women's suffrage as part of his campaign.[126] In *Sesame and Lilies*, Ruskin provides definitions of the male and female roles in Victorian society:

> The man's power is active, progressive, defensive. He is eminently the doer, the creator, the discoverer, the defender. His intellect is for speculation and invention; his energy for adventure, for war, and for conquest, wherever war is just, wherever conquest necessary.[127]

The man provided the safe home and the woman was to ensure that it remained so as one who:

> must be enduringly, incorruptibly good; instinctively, infallibly wise—wise, not for self-development, but for self-renunciation: wise, not that she may set herself above her husband, but that she may never fail from his side: wise, not with the narrowness of insolent and loveless pride, but with the passionate gentleness of an infinitely variable, because infinitely applicable, modesty of service.[128]

Ruskin's perception of gender roles was not unique for the period; it was accepted, although not universally as demonstrated by Mill and his fellow Liberals and by the nascent suffragette movement, that the woman's role was within the home where she should act as a support to her husband who had to contend, daily, with the world beyond the safe domestic setting. Coventry Patmore's *The Angel in the House*, written for his first wife Emily, was much lauded by writers of the day, such as Ruskin, both as a poem and for its idealising of the domestic exemplar.[129] In her management of the interior space of the household, the wife contributed to the exterior perception of the entire family and maintained its position within the middle class. As Elizabeth Langland asserted, 'The domestic sanctuary overseen by its attending angel can be decoded as a theatre for the staging of a family's social position, a staging that depends on prescribed practices.'[130] However, women were not confined to this

domestic sanctuary; it was a fiction. Lower class women worked on the streets and in factories alongside men who were not related to them as had been the case prior to the explosion of industrial mills in the nineteenth century.[131] Middle-class women traversed the modernised cities to visit exhibitions and the theatre and to participate in artistic and theatrical practice.[132] Artists depicted the female in the public sphere in works like Charles Rossiter's *To Brighton and Back* (Fig.101), William Maw Egley's *Omnibus Life in London* (Fig.102) and by many other artists including Frith. These portrayals of women in the public sphere did not displace images of women in the private sphere conforming to Ruskin's definitions; works by artists such as George Elgar Hicks showed the woman supporting her husband in his sadness with a 'passionate gentleness' in *Woman's Mission – Bad News* (oil on canvas, 1863, Tate Gallery). The painted representation of the female sought to subscribe to her the frailties and strengths that she was perceived to possess. The fallen woman was a common theme, as illustrated by Augustus Egg (Fig. 18), and so too was the middle-class working woman, seen in Richard Redgrave's *The Governess* (oil on canvas, 1844, Victoria and Albert Museum). While Egg's painting depicts the social 'fall' that results from a moral failure on the part of the unfaithful wife, Redgrave's painting shows the only acceptable and respectable position open to the 'unmarried, educated woman' and the consequent isolation that followed as a result of being single.[133] Egg's *Past and Present* is often used as a means to elucidate the gender conflicts that existed at the time. Apart from Terri Edelstein's examination of the painting, Julia Thomas also provides an exegesis of Egg's work that brings together many of the issues raised by the painting.[134] The legal status of women, their rights and the manner in which these rights alter as their marital status changed were all issues of contention in the mid-nineteenth century. Patricia Thomson points out that by the 1860s progression on the issue of women's rights was seen as putting the institution of marriage itself on trial.[135] The issues of marital instability and the prospects for the unfaithful

wife, as opposed to the unfaithful husband's more favoured position, are addressed in Egg's narrative and commentaries on it. But, these portrayals and their social realities were not unchallenged. Female artists also responded to their perceived roles as they sought to challenge male society's categorisation of women as angels prone to the 'fall' outside of the domestic sphere. Emily Mary Osborn's painting *Nameless and Friendless* (oil on canvas, 1857, unknown location) and Florence Claxton's *Scenes from the Life of a Female Artist* (oil on canvas, 1858, unknown location) both sought to demonstrate the ability of the female artist to produce artistic works and to seek financial reward for this work as an independent woman.[136] As the role and the status of the female in society as depicted were being confronted by female artists so too was their actual position in the world being challenged by these same female artists.

The author Caroline Norton was instrumental not only in influencing the advancement of women's rights by her campaign against laws that denied her the right to her own property within marriage but also access to her children.[137] The Custody of Infants Act 1839 and The Matrimonial Causes Act of 1857 could both be attributed to her intense campaigning, letter writing and pamphleteering on the injustices suffered by married women in terms of ownership of their own property and in ownership of their own bodies. The Matrimonial Act allowed women the right to separation, although in circumstances less favourable than men, but also gave women the right to control her own property and thus improved her status as a legal entity separate from her husband.[138] The Act was instrumental in overturning the situation whereby an offence against a married woman could be interpreted as damage to a husband's property.[139] It was in reaction to her own situation after her husband refused her a divorce that she had earlier in the century campaigned for the right of a wife to access to her own children.[140] Norton's campaigns and pamphleteering and the resultant passing of the Acts impacted upon other artists and writers. The female artist Barbara Leigh Smith

Bodichon took an interest in the laws that protected men's status to the detriment of women in society as a result of reading Norton's pamphlet and the media coverage that it attracted.[141] Bodichon produced a pamphlet describing the laws in the United Kingdom and how they subjugated women to mere properties of their husbands.[142] Bodichon's drive to reform the inequitable laws against women and her pamphlet outlining these laws and their injustices was seen as an influence on Mill's *Subjection of Women* (1869).[143] Bodichon, along with the many female authors and writers who supported her, were instrumental in the founding of the feminist cause during the Victorian period that would lead to a woman's right to work independently of her husband (if married), a separate legal status for married women and, eventually, the right to vote.[144] Louise Jopling, another artist, was 'a keen suffragist', a supporter of Bodichon's campaigns and friend of Elmore's who was assisted by him in her development as an artist. [145] It is most likely that Elmore supported the cause of women's emancipation as much as he did Catholic emancipation; his support for Jacob Bell and the Liberal Party seems to suggest that he would also agree with John Stuart Mill and other members of the Party in their pursuit of progress on social issues.[146] The active role of female artists and writers in altering the actual, social status of women in Victorian society is not as clearly reflected in male artistic outputs of the time as is evident from the paintings depicting women discussed here. These images maintain the societal demands delineated by Ruskin. Paintings of women were not neutral and were part of the communicative network that both referenced and sought to highlight and to change and simultaneously maintain the social position of women. *On the Brink*, exhibited as it was in 1865 while the role of women was such a topic for debate as a result of Bodichon's movement and Mills' advocacy for the improvement of women's rights, could also be viewed in the light of woman's frailties and potential to 'fall' outside of the domestic setting ascribed to her while also highlighting the control of one's own life that comes with choice.

However, as much as *On the Brink* is important in the discussion of gender relations during the mid-nineteenth-century it is also important in that it demonstrates Elmore's influence on his contemporaries and most especially on Frith while also addressing the dangers of gambling and seduction for female members of society.

Female gambling was the subject of another painting by Elmore. Although we have no date for *The Gaming Table* (Fig. 33), it appears to be a study rather than a completed painting and may have been in preparation for *On the Brink*. In *The Gaming Table* the complexities and symbolism of the later painting are less defined or absent. There are just three figures, two female and one male. The seated woman has a look of despondency and resignation as she grips the card in her hand. She may have ventured to the gaming room in the hope of financial gain but now she is being looked upon by a smiling woman reaching for the contents of her purse to assist the woman on the brink of loss. The male to the rear whispers into the ear of the younger female as if to instruct her to take advantage of the seated woman's predicament and so lull her on to the downward path that is so eloquently, if in an ambiguous and narratively inconclusive fashion, portrayed in the more developed *On the Brink*. Gambling and its dangers had been the subject of an earlier painting by Robert Braithwaite Martineau. *The Last Day in the Old Home*, 1862, (Fig. 34) focuses on the repercussions of gambling for a family once part of the upper echelons of society but now reduced to selling the family home and its contents. The painting is loaded with textual and visual clues to convey the unfolding narrative and to allow the viewer to understand the explicit moral message on the dangers of gambling. In *The Last Day* auction lot tickets have been attached to the paintings and other items in the room, removal men can be seen carrying out their work through the open door, a racing card remains in the hand of the adult male and the catalogue of sale lies on the floor; all of these legible phrases given painted expression provide an easily accessed and conclusive narrative within the painting. Later, Frith, in

addressing the same theme, would revisit Hogarth's strategy of illustrating the perils of gambling across a series of connected narrative instances in his *The Road to Ruin* (Fig. 35). Elmore overcomes the need for a series of images or for a loading of visual clues by allowing the viewer to engage in completing the narrative based on his or her own experiences of the real world and the moral commentary on gambling to be found in Victorian literature. Lynda Nead in her work highlights the prevalent attitude and the dangers of gambling by women that were well rehearsed during the period.[147] The moral disrepute of women frequenting the spa resort and casino at Bad Homburg, Germany was identified in newspaper coverage of the casino located there and the proliferation of women who stole from the novice male gamblers and the lure and destruction caused by the gaming tables were in the news throughout much of the early 1860s due to the attempts by some of the German states to ban many of the more enticing gaming pursuits.[148] The news reading public would have been aware of the links with Homburg and suicides and the 'women in false hair and obvious enamel, in costumes of Babylonian colour and pattern …and impudently short skirts.'[149] Anthony Trollope's novel, *Can You Forgive Her?*, was published initially in serial form and then in book form in 1864-5. Along with an illustration carried in the book edition depicting a scene at a gambling table, Trollope described the women who habitually attended Homburg and their effect on the more demure, English lady, '[T]hose horrid women with vermilion cheeks, and loud bonnets half off their heads, and hard, shameless eyes, and white gloves, which, when taken off in the ardour of the game, disclosed dirty hands. They stared at her with that fixed stare which such women have, and Alice saw it all, and trembled.'[150] The female protagonists in Trollope's novel all stand as exemplars of the defined roles of women and their social positions as outlined above and in terms of the effects the laws governing women's rights in marriage and outside of it. In the opening pages of *Can You Forgive Her?* Trollope attempts to summarize the way the laws work and how a widow might be relieved of any independence through

remarriage.[151] The position of Alice as a future wife of John Grey was such that Grey would depend on her 'for all his domestic happiness' and once married he would have 'a right to her obedience.'[152] The trip to Europe that Alice and Kate were to take, accompanied by her former beau George, could not be taken by two women on their own for, as her fiancé John Grey says, 'It's a very fine theory, that of women being able to get along without men as well as with them; but like other fine theories, it will be found very troublesome for those who first put it into practice.'[153] The three main female protagonists, Alice Vavasor, single but engaged at the beginning of the novel, Mrs. Arabella Greenow, a widow who remarried and aunt of Alice, and Glencora McCluskie offer the reader the opportunity to compare the differing marital situations and how they effect the financial and behavioural limitations that the rules imposed upon women. When Lady Glencora deviates from the ideal position of being under the control of her husband, she 'would go and drink beer and listen to music' at Baden if not for her husband's refusal to allow her, and when she goes to the gambling rooms accompanied only by Alice it arouses nothing but anger in him.[154] Lady Glencora's actions in the absence of her husband Plantagenet demonstrate the dangers that faced unaccompanied women just as John Grey had suggested. As has been mentioned Trollope was an associate of Elmore's and Trollope admired his work. The moral danger of Homburg implicit in the painting was made explicit by the reaction of reviewers of *On the Brink* when it was exhibited.[155] However, while this didactic element of the painting is an essential aspect of its interaction with the informed viewer, but not the defining element of the painting as will be demonstrated when discussing narrative elements in Elmore's paintings, it is the influence the painting may have had on Frith's treatment of the subject which shall now be addressed.

On the Brink (Fig. 4) was exhibited at the R.A. in 1865. In June of 1864 Elmore travelled to Homburg, in Germany, with John Leech.[156] Leech, a long term illustrator with *Punch*, was suffering from an illness brought about by a high sensitivity to noise which was affecting his

general health.[157] Leech was a close friend of Elmore and of Frith over a long period and all three frequented the Garrick Club together.[158] Frith was also of the opinion that Leech was second only to Hogarth and at times better than him in his artistic production.[159] Surprisingly, Frith doesn't mention Leech and Elmore accompanying each other to Homburg in his memoirs although he does refer to the trip in his biography of Leech.[160] Frith's memoirs were published in 1887 and 1888 and his biography of Leech was published in 1891, it is possible that his research into Leech's life would involve his having to include references to the trip as it was included in obituaries of Leech and thus could not be ignored if Frith wanted to be accepted as authoritative on Leech's life.

Frith himself travelled to Baden in 1843 and felt 'a strong desire' to paint the gaming tables there but did not feel adequately skilled to do so.[161] Frith's admission of a lack of skill to treat such a contemporary subject in 1843 fits with his output during that period but between his first visit to Germany and his second, in 1869, he had painted *Life at the Seaside*, (1851-54), and *The Derby Day*, (1856-58), (Fig. 32) seventeen and thirteen years respectively prior to his attempt to deal with the subject of gambling and just six years after Elmore's painting. When, in 1869, Frith travelled to Homburg again, this time with Henry Nelson O'Neil, he was determined to paint the gaming rooms before the resort closed down.[162] The outcome of his work would be his celebrated *Salon d'Or* (Fig. 36). Exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1871, Frith's painting had the subtitle: *le jeu est fait... rien ne vas plus*, an obvious reference to the impending closure of the gambling resort.[163] Frith also tells us of another of his paintings based on his experiences in Homburg that would be worthy of Hogarth if it had not included 'matters unpresentable to the present age.'[164] The painting Frith refers to is *At Homburg* (Fig. 37) exhibited in 1870. *At Homburg* is less crowded than the artist's *Railway Station, Derby Day* and *Salon d'Or* and in focusing on one gesture follows Elmore's *On the Brink* in exposing the intensity of the moral dilemma that confounds the perception of the

female in Victorian society without denying the viewer an enclosed narrative as Elmore does. *At Homburg* represents an outdoor scene in which a woman is seen receiving a light for her cigarette from a male while in the background members of both sexes mingle and interact. Frith said in his memoir that he was 'mercilessly attacked' for painting such a subject.[165] In his autobiography Frith doesn't mention Elmore's painting, which he would certainly have been familiar with given the reaction it received when exhibited and this is even more startling considering their friendship. Also surprising is the fact that a painting by Gustave Doré, *Le Tapis Vert* (Fig. 38), dealing with the same theme and featuring an interior of the Homburg gaming rooms similar to Frith's was exhibited across the road from the Royal Academy in 1868.[166] We cannot be sure if it was a lapse of memory, unlikely, or a deliberate attempt by Frith to negate the influence which the two earlier paintings must have had on his decision to tackle the subject of female gambling at Bad Homburg, and its dangers, that led to his failure to mention Elmore's painting. It is most certain that Elmore's painting, dealing as it did with an image following Hogarth in depicting the underbelly of Victorian life, was one that Frith would have wished to create himself if we are to believe his 'strong desire' to do so. Christopher Monkhouse and William McNaught describe Frith's central female in *Salon d'Or* as 'the heir to Elmore's tragic female' and *The Morning Post* in its review of Frith's painting in the Royal Academy referenced Doré and other 'painters of celebrity' already having dealt with the subject in a similar manner to Frith.[167] The form of Doré's painting and the substance of Elmore's did not escape critics of Frith's work yet for all their recognised influence Frith denies *On the Brink's* very existence by omission from his memoirs. Frith and Elmore, like other artists of the period, drew inspiration from many of the same literary and historical sources and this allows for a similarity in subject choice. However, in the case of a unique subject that had a recognisable moral and contentious theme the same tendency to follow an already beaten path is not one that can be accepted as being part of a common trope

but a deliberate attempt to emulate an already original work. It must be remembered that after *The Derby Day* Frith, in his Academy paintings, returned to portraiture and to paintings sourced in literature, (a course he would return to again after *The Salon d'Or*) until *At Homburg* in 1870. It is acknowledged that *The Railway Station* was painted in 1862 but the crowded urban scene was already becoming a commonplace in artistic production following on from *The Derby Day* with artists such as George Elgar Hicks (*The General Post-Office: One Minute to Six*, 1860) and Phoebus Levin (*The Dancing Platform: Cremorne*, 1862) offering just two examples. The popularity of the type influenced Victor Flatlow to commission it from the artist; it was from the outset a commercial venture regardless of its artistic merit.[168]

Elmore's interactions with, and assistance to, other artists may not always have had as direct an influence on their subject choices as appears to be the case with Frith's Homburg paintings; but there would certainly have been an influence upon their ability to proceed as artists and on the directions that their artistic output followed. Frederic Leighton, later Lord Leighton and President of the Academy, was given great support by Elmore in the late 1850s when the future President was not yet an Associate Academician. Elmore treated Leighton with 'marked kindness', lending him a studio, and, although the studio seemed to have not been of the standard Leighton had become accustomed to during his time spent in France, it allowed him time to settle back into the London art scene and to produce works for the Academy Exhibitions.[169] Thomas Armstrong, a pupil of Ary Scheffer, friend of Edward Poynter and James McNeill Whistler and a member of the 'Paris Gang', who would later succeed Poynter as Director of Art at the South Kensington Museum, was also assisted by Elmore.[170] Probably best known for his *Woman with Lilies* (Fig. 39) Armstrong bore a letter of introduction from Elmore to his brother Thomas, then Vice-Consul in Algiers, when he visited there in 1858.[171] Henry Nelson O'Neil, named as a member of *The Clique* by John

Imray and Frith, travelled in Europe with Elmore during the early 1840s.[172] Sir Henry Thompson, the noted Victorian surgeon, writer and painter, studied under Elmore, and the artist was among the first to be invited to dine with Thompson and other eminent members of the Victorian elites at his 'Octaves'. This latter initiative of Thompson's called for no more than eight diners who would discuss a single topic of importance and, judging by the other guests present, the topic at Elmore's dinner would have been art.[173]Also present at one of the meals with Elmore were Valentine Princep, the Pre-Raphaelite, P.H. Calderon, one time Pre-Raphaelite, and Sir Arthur Sullivan the composer.[174] Thompson travelled to paint in the Lake District with Elmore and Landseer.[175] He travelled to Whitby on another occasion with Elmore where they met with Armstrong. [176] Thompson presented more than 13 paintings to the R.A. but he was not the only exhibitor who may have received instruction from Elmore outside of the Academy School.

The manner in which a painting could be received and interpreted was influenced by its title and by the way a similar theme was illustrated in a similar way across artistic disciplines. This influence was not unilateral as the blending of literary and artistic outputs by multiple personalities impacted upon each other through the exchange of acknowledged or unacknowledged ideas. Influence via instruction and support was also part of this artistic interplay. However, there is another sphere of influence that shows how close relationships can be bilateral and act as a part of mutual exchange. This relationship involves the poet Robert Browning, his son 'Pen', and Elmore; here the exchange acts to provide literary support for a painting by Elmore and instructional support for 'Pen' Browning's progression as an artist.

In April 1877 Robert Browning, a correspondent of Elmore's, wrote to the artist reminding him to view his son's paintings.[177] 'Pen' Browning was moderately successful as an artist and exhibited at the Royal Academy from 1878 to 1884. Robert Browning wrote to Elmore again

in 1878 to discuss a viewing of Pen's work.[178] Although Pen is not mentioned explicitly in the 1878 letter both the timing of the letter, just before the R.A. summer exhibition of that year, and the substance suggests that it refers to Pen's painting. It is difficult to see Elmore's influence on Browning's work due to the limited number of examples of Pen's painted works available but it is not impossible. Paintings reproduced in Maisie Ward's biography of the artist show a wide range of subjects but within these are works that certainly align themselves with some of Elmore's religious paintings.[179] *A Woman at her Devotions* (Fig. 40) has the same religious fervour and intensity present in Elmore's depictions of young women praying, although Pen's painting is clearly influenced by his time in Europe as the woman is dressed more in the fashion of a Continental, older woman rather than a British female. *Vespers* (Fig. 41) depicting a monk enclosed in a convent and in the process of calling the faithful to evening prayer, seems to follow the Catholic tradition and, as with Elmore's convent scenes, it juxtaposes the exterior with the interior, the light and the shade to expose the inner sanctity and piety of the monastic world with the fleeting and ephemeral nature of the secular world.[180] The steadfastness of the solid walls, the grounding of the monk and his interior strength, contrast with the fugitive shadows cast by the sun through the fragile lattice work of the window and suggest that those outside, perhaps working on a monastery plot or garden, will return when called to the sanctuary of the enclosed religious space. Robert Browning was in favour of elevating the status of the Catholic Church, at least in Ireland, so may well also have had a shared interest in this matter with Elmore and this could have been a constituent part of the influence on Pen's output and his approach to depictions of religious scenes.[181] But the transaction of influence between the Brownings and Elmore was two-way. Elmore's 1879 painting of *Sabrina*, (Fig. 42), the only full nude painting at the Academy that year, described as depicting a figure showing a Rubenesque 'plumpness', was the subject of

correspondence as far back as 1873 when Browning adapted the words of Milton's *Comus* to fit with Elmore's painting of the river nymph Sabrina.[182]

The impact of the literary on Elmore's work is not then limited to his imaginative use of textual source material; his relationships with authors such as Trollope, Braddon and Browning impact on our reading of his paintings. Braddon's title for *On the Brink* provides the painting with an unanswered enigma as to what that brink is or what will be the conclusion to the issues being meditated upon in the painting; the painting's contextual, cultural embedding is secured by designation while still allowing a free-flow of imagination in the mind of the viewer, an important consideration in Elmore's paintings that will be returned to later in this thesis. Browning adapts an already existing literary work to frame a painting within an accepted canon, an essential requirement for the depiction of the female nude during the period and, as will be demonstrated later, a canonicity that Elmore proceeds to usurp in his problematic depiction of Sabrina. Trollope's reimagined description of the games tables at Homburg and expression of the psychological dilemmas and intensities encountered by the demure English female provide a textual backdrop to an already familiar environment that combines with Elmore's own experience of the casino. Apart from these influences and connections that existed within a circle of known figures, locations and cultural reference points, Elmore's support and guidance may also have been of assistance to many younger artists who hoped to attend the Royal Academy schools. A letter conserved in the Getty Research Institute illustrates Elmore's willingness to sign applications for potential students and in the specific case of the Getty letter the student appears to be Charles Burton Barber, the noted painter of sentimental animals and children.[183]

In terms of traceable influences on Elmore's works and his approaches to depiction, we must rely on the visual evidence of similarity in style and form rather than on textual supports, as there are too many crossovers in the themes that were treated by the British Victorian artists

to isolate a definitive connection based solely on the subject depicted. To find an influence on Elmore at a time when he would have been most open to such we need to look at where he practiced his work at the early stages of his career and beyond the sphere of English influence. While this part of the discussion of Elmore's works focuses on one particular artist, Pelagio Palagi, there was also an interchange of ideas that existed between Italian art and British literature and historical moments during the period under scrutiny that manifested itself in the artistic output in both countries; this is especially evident in Elmore's work. This interplay can be seen in depictions by Francesco Hayez of Mary Queen of Scots and of *The Two Foscari* (Fig.44) an incident inspired by Byron's play published in 1821 of the same name.[184] The popularity of portrayals of Mary Queen of Scots amongst British artists is well known, but frequent also were scenes from *The Two Foscari*: note for instance the paintings by Ford Madox Brown, (watercolour, 1870, William Morris Gallery, London, Cat. No. W142), Frederick Pickersgill, (oil on canvas, 1854, The Royal Collection, Cat. No. RCIN406235) and Frederick William Burton, (watercolour, 1838, private collection).

Elmore's time spent travelling in Europe gives the impression of a painter that, without archival evidence for support, shows very distinct visual resemblances between some of his most praised works, *Rienzi in the Forum* (Fig. 3), *The Death Bed of Robert King of Naples* (Fig. 26) and *The Invention of the Stocking Machine* (Fig. 1) and those of Italian artist Pelagio Palagi. Pelagio Palagi was a Bolognese painter born in 1775 and was noted as a collector, architect and designer.[185] Palagi 'applied historical-erudite discoveries' to his paintings and Elmore applied equal attention to the historical accuracy in his history paintings shown at the Royal Academy.[186] Palagi's *Newton's Discovery of the Laws of Refraction* (Fig. 46) and Elmore's *The Invention of the Stocking Machine* (Fig. 1) both address a historical event, even if this event may be apocryphal, while also dealing with the theme of creative impulse. These two paintings also demonstrate the painters' adherence to historically accurate settings.

Fernando Mazzocca points out that during the earlier part of the 19th century Italy had as much a fascination with its history as did the English and Palagi's paintings reflect this preoccupation. Palagi was especially noted for his attention to background detail and accuracy in the depiction of costumes, a trait evident also in Elmore.[187] Some of the reactions to Palagi's work could almost be substituted for the response to Elmore's R.A. paintings in the English press. Referring to Palagi's *Gian Galeazzo Sforza Dying in the Castle of Pavia* (Fig. 47), Ludwig Schorn said:

> knowledge of perspective, power and truth of colouring, with maximum precision of execution, and at the same time with a grace and flair that does not appear in the least laboured, and which in a word recalls Paolo Veronese; except that in Signor Palagi, stillness, the thoughtful and profound study of the mind emerges with its own distinctive features.[188]

The Art-Journal reacted thus to Elmore's *The Death Bed of Robert King of Naples* (Fig. 26): 'The composition contains numerous groups of figures grouped with masterly skill and effect; but the great point of interest is the head of the dying monarch, which evidently has been carefully studied.'[189] A provincial paper that reviewed the painting wrote:

> We do not in any modern picture remember to have seen a bolder cast of drapery, accompanied with equal distinctive identity - the colour throughout is vivid, without glare – the light and shadows are powerfully contrasted and all is in harmony – add to these requisites for the grand in the art, correct drawing, particularly traceable even in the hands; and extreme care in even the minor accessories.[190]

We see that there are evident similarities in the treatment of a death bed scene, with particular attention to detail in both the environment and the participants. Although Elmore's painting demands a larger cohort of actors within the scene due to its source material, namely *Mrs.*

Dobson's Life of Petrarch, and accords with the quote attached to the painting when it was exhibited at the R.A. in 1848, the attention to detail is shared in both image and text.[191] Yet, as with Elmore's *Martyrdom of Thomas á Becket* (Fig. 22), and other examples of his work, there is evidence of the desire to elaborate a theatrical setting in his historical paintings as much as there is a need to realise the source material within an individual frame. This points to a further link between Palagi and Elmore: the Bolognese artist brought the same sense of the theatrical to his *Gian Galeazzo Sforza Dying in the Castle of Pavia* in order to guide the sympathies of the viewer and expose the emotions of participants within the painting.[192] While these may seem like coincidental alignments between two artistic productions by two artists of differing generations and nationalities, they must be seen in the context of additional artistic convergences between the two and Elmore's time spent in Italy.

Palagi was still working as an artist and designer during the period of Elmore's visit to Italy from 1840 to 1842 when he spent time in Bologna, Florence, Venice and Rome 'visiting in succession the chief schools of ancient Italian art.'[193] It cannot be definitively stated that Elmore encountered Palagi's work but it is likely that he did when we consider the visual evidence of not just *Gian Galeazzo* but also *Rienzi in the Forum* (Fig. 3) and *The Invention of the Stocking Machine* (Fig. 1). It is also very probable that Elmore would have encountered, or perhaps been made aware of through correspondence, Giuseppe Mazzini's article in *The Westminster Review* which discussed Palagi at length, making specific reference to *Newton Watching the Child Blowing Soap Bubbles*, (*Newton's Discovery of Refraction*), and *Gian Galeazzo*.[194] Even though this documentary evidence is not emphatic, the visual evidence is.

To consider initially Elmore's *Rienzi* (Fig. 3), this was engraved in the *Illustrated London News* and was accompanied by an extract from Byron's *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* when shown at the R.A. in 1844, and we find that it bears a striking resemblance to Palagi's painting dealing with the same subject (Fig. 48). Elmore expands on the architectural

background. Palagi on the other hand directs the viewer to a context which would be evident to a native Italian aware of Rienzi's political significance during the *Risorgimento* without the need for a broader setting, whereas the English viewer might not have been able to extract the location without the textual aid or the full visual reference points. In addition Elmore tended to aim for the more populated space when dealing with historical incidences as can be deduced from his *Martyrdom, Robert King of Naples* and *Charles at Yuste*. Elmore's painting suggests an awareness of Palagi's theatrical structure of the same incident and the depicted stances and gestures of the Tribune and his audience. The act of rhetoric taking place differs in terms of reference; Elmore's Rienzi speaks to the group as though he wished to demonstrate the importance of the site in which he is located, his hand gesture encompassing the entirety of their surroundings; Palagi, on the other hand, makes a direct appeal to the epigrams of Roman antiquity in order to agitate the Roman populace.[195] Barlow sees an influence on Elmore's *Rienzi* emanating from P.F. Poole's *Solomon Eagle Exhorting the People to Repentance* (Fig. 49) and indeed there are certain treatments of the subjects contained in the painting that can be deemed to be similar; however, Elmore began his painting in Rome and only completed it when he returned to England.[196] To state that Elmore imitated Poole, as Barlow suggests, ignores any possibility of an Italian influence on his *Rienzi*, an influence acknowledged by *The Art- Journal*. That a number of his paintings sent to the British Institution in 1843-4 were clearly indebted to his visit to Italy both in subject and treatment is beyond dispute.[197] While Elmore may have been able to maintain a contact with verbal and textual discourse in London during his period abroad it is most unlikely that he could begin an 'imitation of Poole' at such a distance without seeing Poole's painting and be willing enough to continue to adapt *Rienzi* to echo Poole's painting rather than retain references to his Italian sojourn in keeping with his other paintings of the period, if indeed he did view Poole's *Solomon Eagle*, on his return to England. It is more credible that an

awareness of a painting *in situ* in Italy and in keeping with Elmore's attraction to subjects of Italian landscape and historical events evident in the work he was exhibiting both from Italy and after his return to London might have influenced both his subject and his artistic approach to it. During Elmore's time in Italy, Palagi was still active as a collector, teacher and sculptor; he had featured in Nagler's dictionary of artists and, as has been noted, was discussed in *The Westminster Review*. We might also expect that any visitor to the cultural highlights of Italy would have read, or at least consulted, Stendhal who also mentioned Palagi and his works.[198] The French writer Antoine Claude Pasquin, otherwise known as Valery, had produced a guide to Italy highlighting many of the historical and artistic points of interest but was not limited to the standout attractions in Rome, Florence and Naples. Valery's guide, published between 1831 and 1833, was popular throughout Europe and was translated into English by C.E. Clifton in 1839, coinciding with Elmore's time in Italy. Valery directs visitors to locations such as Brescia and in particular to the gallery of Count Paolo Tosi for his collection of contemporary Italian artists, including those by Palagi.[199] The importance of Brescia as a centre for the production of silks, the portrayal of which Elmore was given recognition for in many of the reviews of his paintings, is highlighted by Valery, who states that the silk was purchased and borne away by the English.[200] We have no record of Elmore visiting Brescia, where Palagi had painted *Newton* for Paolo Tosi, but during his travels he is most likely to have spent some time there as it would have been on the route to Venice where we know him to have spent some time and the popularity of Valery's guide may well have led to his diverting to the town to see works by many of the giants of Italian painting including Titian and Palagi.[201]

This Italian influence was still evident in Elmore's work after his return from Italy and can be seen even as late as 1848. This continued attachment to both form and substance derived from his time in Italy demonstrates his ability to instil into his paintings the experience of

moving in the environment of his depicted protagonists. *The Invention of the Stocking Machine* was not exhibited until 1847, five years after Elmore's return from Italy but during that period he had only deviated once from his Italian based works, although *The Fainting of Hero*, 1846, might be categorised as influenced by Italy as it is set in Messina, and *Beppo*, also 1847, is set in Venice while *The Death Bed of Robert King of Naples* was still to come in 1848. This influence is especially important in viewing *The Invention of the Stocking Machine* and *The Invention of the Combing Machine*.[202]

The Stocking Machine (Fig.1) and *The Combing Machine* (Fig.27) both deal with the same themes of invention and discovery and of the female role as muse rather than as an aware and active participant in the process of creation. Both paintings follow a similar structure and compositional arrangement albeit that *The Combing Machine* has an increased number of participants. The attention to historical accuracy is evident in both paintings, a common trajectory in English pictures of the period. The rise of 'serious antiquarianism' in England demanded historical accuracy in painting during the nineteenth century and Elmore responded to this.[203] Both Mazzocca and Mazzini refer to a similar preoccupation by Italian artists of the period in terms of the attention to detail that they incorporated in to their work with an almost forensic fascination with the correct depiction of historical accuracy.[204] This is particularly apparent in Palagi's *Newton*. By the time of his publication of *Opticks*, in 1704, Newton was already an established 'natural philosopher' and his surroundings in Palagi's painting depict a man at work in a comfortable environment and scholarly setting; the recess that his wife and child sit in might be an accurate depiction of the bay window that still exists in Newton's Trinity study room. This painting and Elmore's *The Stocking Machine* are about the process of discovery and inspiration but are in separate social milieu: Newton is shown at a time when he had been already elevated by his earlier discoveries, whereas William Lee, who was possibly an English curate and inventor, was only at the beginning of an ill-fated

career.[205] Lee invented the stocking machine frame in 1589 and it remained in use for centuries afterwards in the silk and wool industries. Initially, Lee was unable to produce the frame in England due to reluctance on the part of Queen Elizabeth I to endanger the industry of English hand knitters. Eventually, on moving to France he was granted a patent by King Henry IV. After the King's death Lee was unable to enforce his patent and died almost destitute in 1614. Legend has it that he invented the machine after watching his wife knitting and realised that there must be a speedier and more efficient means of manufacture.[206] One story tells us that his brother, who had been with him in France, returned to England and sold the frames which would help to establish the knitting industry in the English east midlands; another tells us that it was his apprentice, whom we only know of as Aston, who gained favour with the Stuart dynasty enabling him to introduce the machine to England.[207] Elmore shows us the moment of inspiration, or frustration, which led him to invent the industry-changing machine. The Reverend Lee is contemplative and attentive to the movements of the female subject's fingers as she holds her child while engaging in the production of some clothing or other item of wear. On the wall hangs a breastplate and sword indicative of the times in which he lived and the fear of invasion and of religious conflict during the Elizabethan era; Elmore again demonstrates his attention to historical detail in both environment and costume.

Structurally, both works reflect each other well; the male figure of authority is to the right and shows a contemplative, passive expression. The female is active in the role of child-minder but contributing nothing knowingly to the creative process. Although a limited colour palette is used, the colours in both paintings are similar. The reversal of the colour scheme in the outer dress of Newton and Lee, Lee with the gold interior and the reduced cloth of his waistcoat subdued by the larger and cheaper outer black overcoat in contrast to Newton's richly embroidered outer gold lounge coat covering a short blue/black inner jacket, reflects

the reversal of fortunes that occurred in the real lives of the main protagonists. The smiles of the female and of the child in *Newton* acknowledge for us the elevated and secure position of the participants in Palagi's painting when compared with the despondent expression of the mother in Elmore's painting. The discarded books on the floor echoed in both paintings hint at the inspiration of genius through observation and deduction from nature in place of imitation or development via a reliance on bookish authority. The hands of the scholars remain close to the writing implements on their desks ready to transfer the mental image of their discovery to paper, illustrating further the close affinity between processes of discovery and between the representation of the moment of inspiration in Elmore's Lee and Palagi's Newton.

It is difficult to discount the influence of Palagi on three of Elmore's most important early works given the painterly, structural and compositional similarities and the rhetorical similarities that exist between the depictions of *Rienzi*, *Robert, King of Naples* and *Gian Galeazzo* and *Newton* and *The Origin of the Stocking Loom*. It would also be in keeping with the Italian influence on his other contributions to the R.A. around this time and his later and continued treatment of drapery and colour that may have been influenced by Titian and Tintoretto from his time in Italy and the obvious references to Titian in a work such as *Charles V.*[208] Even as late as 1864 the Italian influence on Elmore's work was being commented upon even if the subject, in this case *Excelsior* (no image) from Longfellow's poem of the same name, was not rooted in Italian or British history; the painting reminded one viewer of 'some old, Italian master'.[209]

Considering then that this was a period when *The Clique* is asserted to have been at its most active as a unit, it is most unlikely that Elmore, even if part of that unit, did in practice conform to the alleged motivations behind the formation of the grouping. Given his output and his personal associations, it is more probable that Elmore's relationship with the group

was as part of an amicable union of artists close in age and location, at least when in London, rather than as part of a community with a shared artistic manifesto.[210] It is also most likely that it was for this reason that Imray does not even mention Elmore in his recollection of *The Clique* and why Frith does not engage too closely with Elmore as an artist in his memoirs. The revolution that was taking place in British art at the outset of Victoria's reign and the role of *The Clique* in this revolt is undermined by including Elmore within its ranks as he would continue to produce history paintings throughout his career regardless of his output in other genres and his limited engagement with works that might be deemed to follow a Hogarthian impulse and depictions of modern life conflicts with the aims, as we consider them to be, of *The Clique*.[211]

Are there other influences on the painterly style adopted by Elmore distinct from the Italian impact on his early work? As discussed earlier, both Bonington and Watteau have been mentioned by Edwards and *The Times* as impacting upon Elmore's style but is there any substance in these suggestions?

There are certainly similarities to be found between Elmore and Jean Antoine Watteau and these are highlighted when we compare Elmore's *Leda and the Swan* with Watteau's *Nymph and Satyr* (Figs.50&51). While there have been comparisons made to Rubens in descriptions of Elmore's naked females, and his sketches of the nude support this, there is much to suggest that an awareness of Watteau is also present.[212] The plump depiction of *Diana at her Bath* (1715-16, Louvre) and Venus in *The Judgement of Paris* (1718-21, Louvre) demonstrate a concerted effort to portray the nude in a realistic, unidealised fashion; and, although we have no image, a similar observation was made by Shirley Brooks when he commented upon Elmore's *After the Expulsion* (no image) and visually we can see the likeness between Watteau's Venus and Elmore's anonymous figure in *Study for a Female Nude from Behind* (Fig. 52).[213] One image that clearly illustrates this tendency by Elmore that distinguishes him

from his contemporaries and aligns his approach with that of Watteau, and even Etty who also sought to depict the nude in the manner of Rubens, is *Andromeda* (Fig. 53).[214] Here we can see the exaggerated curves and realism of the breasts that are neither symmetrical nor pinnacles of Raphaelite perfection and neither have they been idealised as they might have been by Leighton or Millais. The nude simply becomes a constituent part of the landscape and ground and is thus solidified in its own realism. Oil paintings by Elmore that have now been lost to public view also hint at an influence rooted in eighteenth-century, French painting. *A Conversation Piece* (Fig. 54) and *Outdoor Gathering* (Fig. 55) seem to owe as much to Fragonard and Watteau as to Boccaccio, (the gathering of ten individuals hint at an episode from Decameron). *A Conversation Piece* is reminiscent of Fragonard in the treatment of architecture, dress and landscape, particularly in Elmore's realisation of trees, which is particularly Italianate in its setting. The framing, setting and the figures conspire to present a narrative that follows in the tradition of Fragonard's terrace scenes that were at once decorative in themselves and expressive in the frisson created by the circumstance unfolding. Has the male entering the scene from the right stumbled upon his lover departing with another? Is the seated female dismissing herself behind her carefully placed fan? The dog, still attached to its leash, wanders freely suggesting an infidelity has occurred and the lute, cast aside, may point towards a love discarded; as with many of Elmore's paintings the conclusion is nebulous. *Outdoor Gathering* reminds us of Watteau's many outdoor group scenes. Both Fragonard and Watteau were present on the walls of the Louvre and other French galleries during Elmore's time spent studying there.[215]

It has been suggested by Julian Campbell that Elmore's time in France opened him up to the influence of Eugene Delacroix, Leon Cogniet and Bonington; Bonington was also referred to at the Squire Gallery exhibition.[216] Certainly, as Campbell points out, there are some figurative similarities between Elmore's *Dante* (Fig. 25) and Cogniet's *Massacre of the*

Innocence (Fig. 56) especially in the mother and child crouched against the wall, and the same figure seems to appear again in Elmore's *Kabyle Orange Sellers* (Fig. 56).[217] However, it is more likely that *Kabyle Orange Sellers* was an incident gleaned from Elmore's visits to Algiers and the figurative constructions aided by his brother's skills as a photographer. Elmore's trips to Algiers are mentioned during reviews of his works in the press and his brother Thomas, while Vice-Consul in Algiers, photographed much of the everyday life of the colony and would no doubt have communicated such images to Alfred. Although there are few documented records of Thomas Elmore's work, Fig. 58 demonstrates the painterly aspect of the photographic image and use of the draped curtains as framing devices. The same setting is used for the two Algerian musicians in Fig. 58a. It seems that Thomas was noted for his knowledge and intimate acquaintance of the Kabyle and of Algiers as a whole, including the interior, as he had made numerous journeys exploring the country.[218] Thomas' knowledge would have been of immense benefit to Alfred's approach to and the reception he may have received from those he wished to paint when he visited Algiers. Calotypes by Thomas were exhibited in London in 1850 representing 'Moors, Arabs and Algerines, in their various costumes and with accessories of dwelling places, furniture, arms, pipes and other things that convey the peculiar truth and accuracy of the picture'.[219] Alfred Elmore retained a collection of 'Moorish' costumes, cloths and other materials, some of which were auctioned after his death.[220] Glass negatives by Thomas Elmore were discussed in *The Atheneum* where his accuracy and attention to detail were again praised although on this occasion the subject was mainly French architecture (Elmore was Vice-Consul at Algiers from 1854 until he was made Consul at Nice in 1871).[221] Thomas also attended the funeral of Augustus Egg in Algiers in 1863 and met with Thomas Armstrong when he visited there with the letter of introduction from Alfred Elmore, demonstrating his continued contact with his brother and with the art world of England.[222] Alfred Elmore, while attending to many Biblical scenes in his

Orientalist paintings, which will also act as religious paintings, was certainly true to the environment in terms of accuracy in rendering the reality of his experiences in Algiers. *That Which Ye Have Spoken of* (1867), the first of a series of Orientalist paintings over a period of three years to be exhibited at the R.A. has not been seen by this writer other than as a preparatory sketch (Fig. 59). However, the painting was described in enough detail, both in terms of subject and of style, to allow an evaluation of it in terms of its adherence to the realistic portrayal of a mythic event embraced as a living custom by the women of Algiers.[223] Although when reviewed in *The Art-Journal* reference is made to the Biblical text of Luke 12.3, 'That which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed upon the housetops', the label attached to the painting at the Exhibition was more descriptive of an event that appears to be more contemporary.[224] *The Illustrated London News* points out that the painting was made at the time of day when 'the inhabitants collect and gossip across the low parapets of the houses' and depicts 'a graphic illustration of Oriental manners.'[225]Typical of Elmore, he leaves the *ILN* reviewer with a sense of 'incompleteness' as there is no hint as to the subject of the gossip or its consequence.[226] Similarly, the reviewer for *Bell's Life* acknowledged that, regardless of the skill in creating the painting, were it not for the catalogue a recognisable narrative could not be established.[227] Henry Blackburn described the view from his roof-top as offering almost the same aspect, in fact almost from the same location as Elmore's painting, where he could spend time 'conversing from one roof –top to another'.[228] As with many of Elmore's paintings, he brings his own experience of the environment and of the actors who moved in a real space to his work and it seems that it is these encounters with the real that impose themselves on representations of people as much as figures extracted from the work of other artists when he is dealing with non-historical subjects. Elmore, in contributing *Rooftops* to the Academy in 1867, and indeed subsequent Algerian inspired paintings, ignored advice that had been given publicly in the press on the

type of paintings he should bring from his North African experiences. A contributor to the *Illustrated London News* suggested scenes taken from incidents in the life of Cervantes, advice that Elmore, 'as a singular fish', was likely to and did ignore.[229]

Elmore was then both influenced and influential but it seems that his influences were imported with him from Italy in the early part of his career and were reflected in his subject matter and in his treatment of those subjects in terms of colour and drawing. This view was supported by French observers of his work. A review of the Viennese Exposition of 1873 described his painting as 'less British than the others', that is to say, less British than his fellow English artists, and Amédée Gabour stated that Elmore was 'inspired by the great masters of Italy'.[230] In his works that deviated from an Italian theme he would retain these technical developments and make them his own when dealing with literary scenes and scenes from the daily lives of his contemporaries. His early attention to detail, evident in *Martyrdom*, and his use of the theatrical setting contributed to his paintings' abilities to attract the audience through technique and involve the viewer with an emotional depth drawn from lived experience.

These lived experiences and artistic influences combine with the intention of the artist and with the reception of the viewer to suggest that Elmore's work departs from the commonplace tendency of the Victorian artist to feed the viewer an excess of symbols and hints to secure and complete a narrative. In Elmore's historical and religious paintings the use of iconography, symbolism and extreme attention to detail is no more than following a tradition he would have been exposed to during his time in Italy. How this mode of painting functions in Elmore's works is addressed in the following chapter dealing with his religious paintings. *On the Brink* further explores and indulges in excessive use of symbols but, rather than securing the work in a complete and undeniable narrative trajectory, Elmore creates a tension of uncertainty, allowing the viewer to imagine a completed story but not a conclusion

that is universal. The moment depicted denies a narrative completed and allows the viewer to create a narrative imagined. The framed moment operates outside of its own spatial and temporal confines to intersect with the mind of the Victorian viewer and his emotional and psychological make-up as socially defined. This intersection between severed moment and developing narrative in Elmore's paintings forms the basis of the later theoretical analysis of temporality and empathy in his works.

Notes: Chapter 2

[1] Located at *The Garrick Club*, London, Catalogue Number: G0793: http://garrick.ssl.co.uk/object-g0793 (accessed December 7, 2016). The list of participants are identified in Geoffrey Ashton, *Pictures in the Garrick Club : A Catalogue of the Paintings, Drawings, Watercolours and Sculpture*, eds. Kalman A. Burnim & Andrew Wilton, (London: Garrick Club, 1997), 418.
[2] Ibid.
[3] As this chapter progresses, instances of encounters will be specifically referred to but there were formal occasions such as Lord Londesborough's *Conversazione*, *The Morning Post*, May 31, 1852, 5, the annual dinner of the Royal Academy members and the annual dinners of the Artist's General Benevolent Institution, *The Morning Post*, April 6, 1857, 2. Shirley Brooks' diary gives instances of informal gatherings such as a dinner at the house of music promoter William Chappell attended by Elmore, Sir Edwin Landseer, the renowned Hungarian violinist Joseph Joachim and the young composer Arthur Sullivan. Charles William Shirley Brooks, *Diary*, 1869, 51, M.S., London Library.
[4] John Timbs, *Club Life of London*, Vol. 1, (London: Richard Bentley, 1866), 257-8.
[5] Sidney C. Hutchison, *The History of the Royal Academy: 1768-1986*, (London: Robert Royce Limited, 1986), 101.
[6] *Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser*, July 4, 1876, 5, *Wrexhamite and Denbighshire and Flintshire Reporter*, July 1, 1864, 8, *The Northern Whig*, December 8, 1863, np.
[7] Elmore's letters indicate how he often declined invitations to events and his reason is often due to illness. Alfred Elmore to George Leslie, 14 May 1869, Leslie Family Collection, Tate Archive, 9613/5/3/3, Alfred Elmore to Ms. Stacey, 1868, National Art Library, MSL1985/8/59. Leighton's address to the R.A. annual dinner referred to Elmore's long years 'of constant and acute bodily suffering', *The Times*, May 2, 1881, 13.
[8] *Sunday Express*, January 01, 1934, *Connaught Telegraph*, May 29, 1937, 6. A sale the auction rooms of Hodgson & Co. in March 1934 contained a large collection of drawings and watercolours from the Trout find. The list of works for sale, numbering almost one thousand include descriptions that conform to the many paintings and drawings that are in the holdings of the V&A and the British Museum and the works that have come into the public domain through the auction houses named in this text. It is clear that the activity, in terms of exhibitions and reviews, around 1934 was designed to increase exposure of Elmore. Trout also organised an exhibition at 118, Euston Road, around this time and wrote a publicity statement for the same. Hodgsons & Co., *A Catalogue of Books from Various Sources, etc.*, Auction 12, 1933-1934, March 27, 1934, London. Robert Ridgill Trout, *Alfred Elmore R.A.*, Senate House Library, M.S. 862/4/4.
[9] Ibid.
[10] Edwards, 'Drawings'.
[11] Ibid. *The Times*, October 14, 1933.
[12] Edwards, 263.
[13] Aubrey was the only child of Edith and he was to be the beneficiary of Elmore's will as much of his personal belongings were to be held in trust for her children. *Illustrated London News,* April 16, 1881, 24, *Yorkshire Post and Leeds Intelligencer*, March 20, 1940, 8.
[14] Correspondence with present author.
[15] Sigmund and Jocelyn, Fine Art Gallery, Birmingham and correspondence with author.
[16] Alfred Elmore to John C. Horsley, 14 October 1861, Horsley Family Papers, Bodleian Library, M.S. Eng. C. 2222 fols. 145-6.
[17] Artists such as Ansdell and Calderon attended and purchased from an auction of Elmore's studio items, *Catalogue of Contents of the Studies of Solomon Hart and Alfred Elmore*, Christies, London, August 8, 1881.
[18] Thomas Bayer & John Page, *The Development of the Art Market in England: Money as Muse, 1730-1900*, (London: Routledge, 2011), 99-119. Bayer and Page present a detailed analysis of the trends and people involved in art dealing, yet it is telling that Elmore is absent from their consideration especially as his work was often resold, as is discussed in this chapter.
[19] Ibid. 106.
[20] For a discussion on eighteenth-century portraiture see: Louise Lippincott, 'Expanding on Portraiture: The Market, the Public and the Hierarchy of Genres in Eighteenth Century Britain' in *The Consumption of Culture 1600-1800: Image, Object, Text*, eds. Ann Bermingham & John Brewer, (London: Routledge, 1997), 75-88.
[21] Maas, *Victorian Painters*, 210-223, Maas, *The Victorian Art World*, 58-69.

[22] Sir John Simon, *Personal Recollections*, (London: 1894), 15.
[23] William Powell Frith to Thomas Miller, 10 February 1850, Thomas Miller Papers, Royal Academy of Arts Archive, R.A.A.236/41/1 The R.A. Archive has an extensive collection of letters between Miller, Ref. 236, and many active artists, including Elmore, demonstrating the social interplay and commercial dealings among collectors and artists.
[24] Ibid. Reference Code: 236/1
[25] Ibid. 236/34.
[26] Ibid. In this instance the painting was *Griselda* (Fig. 9) which was exhibited in 1850 at the R.A.
[27] Ibid. 236/50/5.
[28] Ibid. 236/41/3.
[29] William Vaughan, 'Britain and Europe c. 1600 – 1900' in *The History of British Art: 1600-1870*, ed. David Bindman, (London: Yale Centre for British Art/Tate Publishing, 2008), 56-77. The literature on the idea of an 'English School' of art is extensive and was a matter of concern for artists and critics of the day. Ernest Chesneau, in *The English School of Painting*, trans. L.N. Etherington, (London: Cassell and Company,1885), suggests, as is supported by many others, that William Hogarth was the first to create 'art in a truly English style' (Chesneau, xiiv) and in his opening line asks the question 'Is there an English school of painting at all?'. In 1862, reviewing the International Exhibition, *The Times* felt confident enough to insist that from a group including Hogarth, Reynolds, Gainsborough and Wilson, only Hogarth could be described as 'national', all others having been heavily influenced by Continental artists, their practices and theories of art, *The Times*, June 7, 1862, 8. This proposal continues in present day criticism, with little significant deviation. John Brewer, in *The Pleasure of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century*,(London: Routledge, 1997), highlights this continuance and leads one to conclude that, with the exception of Hogarth, and until after the foundation of the Royal Academy and the development of English Genre painting, a distinct English School did not develop. John Barrell, in 'Sir Joshua Reynolds and the English of English Art' in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Homi Bhabha, (London: Routledge, 2003), 154- 176, suggests that even to define a national school is problematic.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Roy Strong, *The Spirit of Britain: A Narrative History of The Arts*, (London: Pimlico, 2000), 294.
[32] Joseph Addison, *Remarks on Several Parts of Italy, &c. in the Years, 1701, 1702, 1703*, (London: J. and R. Tonson, 1767), 1.
[33] Brinsley Ford, 'The Englishman in Italy', in *The Treasure Houses of Britain: Five Hundred Years of Private Patronage and Art Collecting*, ed. Gervase Jackson-Stops, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 41.
[34] John Ingamells, *A Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy: 1701-1800*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997).
[35] Ibid, 560.
[36] Ibid. 939-940.
[37] Patrick Karl O'Brien, 'The Impact of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, 1793-1815, on the Long-Run Growth of the British Economy', *Review* (*Fernand Braudel Center*), Vol. 12, 1989, 335-395.
[38] Ibid.
[39] Lady EastLake, 'Memoir of Sir Charles Eastlake' in *Sir Charles Eastlake, Contributions to the Literature of the Fine Arts,* (London: John Murray, 1870), 147, quoted in Diane S. Macleod, *Art and the Victorian Middle Class: Money and the Making of Cultural Identity*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 5.
[40] Macleod, *Art and the Victorian Middle Class*, 5.
[41] Ibid. 48- 74.
[42] Holger Hoock, '"Struggling against a Vulgar Prejudice": Patriotism and Collecting of British Art at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century.', *The Journal of British Studies*, 2010, 566-591.
[43] Ibid. 571.
[44] Ibid. 572.
[45] Lionel Lambourne, *Victorian Painting*, (London: Phaidon, 1999), 27-9.
[46] Eastlake, *Memoir of Sir Charles Eastlake*, 147.
[47] Oppé, 'Art', 115.
[48] *The Art-Journal*, 1857, 41.
[49] Ibid. 206.
[50] Ibid. 41.
[51] Samuel C. Hall, *Retrospect of a Long Life: From 1815 to 1883*, Vol. 1, (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1883), 197.

[52] Ibid. 198-9.
[53] *The Art-Journal*, 1850, 234.
[54] Hall, *The Trial of Sir Jasper: A Temperance Tale, in Verse*, (London: Virtue, Spalding and Daldy, n.d. after 1873). A pencil sketch for one of the engravings (Fig. 10) is held by the Birmingham Museum Art Gallery (Fig. 10a), present author's observation. The record of the work in the Birmingham Museum indicates that on the verso of Fig. 10a are two four line stanzas of a poem by the American poet James Russell Lowell, *The Forlorn*. The lines from the poem are not an accurate reflection of the image depicted on the recto which visually appears to conflate more with the illustration for *The Trials of Sir Jasper* and with the lines of Hall's moral discourse. While there is not enough evidence to testify to Elmore's prolificacy as an illustrator there are enough examples to suggest that he was valued in the field. *The Home Affections Portrayed by the Poets*, ed. Charles Mackay, (London: Routledge and Sons, 1866) featured a work by Elmore as the frontispiece and other instances of his work are to be found in *The Playmate: A Pleasant Companion for Spare Hours*, ed. Joseph Cundall, (Boston: Crosby Nichols & Company, 1847) and *Midsummer Eve: A Fairy Tale* by Mrs. S.C. Hall, (London: John Camden Hotten, 1870). The Dalziel Brothers, two of the periods most noted engravers, described Elmore as one of the 'young artists who were introducing a new and more realistic feeling into the black and white of the day', Edward & George Dalziel, *The Dalziel Brothers: A Record of Fifty Years' Work, etc.*, (London: Methuen & Co., 1901), 26-7. A proof illustration by James Stephenson after Elmore and held in the British Museum,(1934,1220.5), is said by the Museum to be for an unidentified publication; the illustration is in fact the frontispiece for Sir Walter Scott's *The Betrothed*, published in 1891 by Adam and Charles Black, Edinburgh. The moment illustrated is that of Rose Flammock supporting Eveline Berenger. Another engraving in the museum, (1934,1220.4) was also made by Stephenson and is Elmore's depiction of The Countess Isabelle of Croye from Scott's *Quentin Durward*. *The Art-Journal* published an engraving of the painting in 1866 where the engraving is given as John Stancliffe. Elmore's illustration for Anthony Trollope's private novel, (see below), and the other examples discussed here certainly point to an aspect of the artist's output that is deserving of further investigation.
[55] Hall*, Retrospect*, Vol. 2, 219-20.
[56] Ibid.
[57] *The Art-Journal*, 1857, 113-15.
[58] George Landow, 'The Art-Journal, 1850-1880: Antiquarians, the Medieval Revival, and the Reception of Pre-Raphaelitism', *The Pre-Raphaelite Review*, 2, 1979, 71-6.
[59] Hall, *Retrospect* , Vol. 1, 197.
[60] Ibid. 198-9.
[61] *The Art-Journal*, 1857, 113-15.
[62] George Redford, *Art Sales: A History of Sales of Pictures and Other Works of Art*, Vol. 1, (London: Bradbury, Agnew and Company, 1888), 200.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Ibid.
[65] Anita McConnell, 'Pender, Sir John (1816–1896)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. David Cannadine, Oxford: OUP, 2004, http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.library.ucc.ie/view/article/21831 (accessed December 7, 2016).
[66] Ibid., *The Art-Journal*, 1872, 8-10.
[67] Ibid.
[68] Redford, *Art Sales*, Vol. 1, 253.
[69] Ibid. *The Art-Journal*, 1872,10, 1855, 128
[70] *Bath Chronicle and Weekly Gazette*, April 16, 1874, 2, *The Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser*, May 22, 1874, 3, *Liverpool Mercury*, August 16, 3, 1879.
[71] *The Morning Post*, April 3, 1871, 6 and June 24, 1882, 8. Lambourne, *Victorian Painting,* 12.
[72] *The Art-Journal*, 1850, 234, Alfred Elmore to Thomas Miller, R.A.A., 236/34/8.
[73] *London Daily News* , May 11, 1847, 6.
[74] *Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser*, September 8, 1849, 5.
[75] *Morning Post*, July 16, 1849, 6.
[76] Redford, *Art Sales*, Vol. 2, London, 1888, 31.
[77] William Powell Frith to Thomas Miller, R.A.A., 236/39/3. In Frith's *My Autobiography and Reminiscences*, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1888), 218, he described Elmore as one 'who never took anybody's opinion but his own'.

[78] *The Art-Union*, 1844, 165. Amongst the many paintings of landscapes and scenes inspired by literature that year was a work painted by Frith from the *Vicar of Wakefield*. In the closing comments on the exhibition Elmore was pointed to as an artist whose work in the show merited special mention. Elmore may have painted a work derived from *Don Quixote* if we compare two images, Figs. 16 and 17; the painting by Charles Robert Leslie is a representation of Cervantes' *Dulcinea del Toboso* (Fig. 16) and the work by Elmore (Fig. 17) is highly reminiscent of the earlier artist's work. The Elmore painting was signed but not dated when auctioned at Sotheby's, Lot 168, *British and Continental Pictures*, 13 October 2004, Olympia, London. *The Times*, June 07, 1862, 8, described Elmore, and other artists, as 'legitimate' sons of Leslie and Gilbert Stuart Newton. The painting exhibited by Elmore in 1862 was *The Invention of the Combing Machine*, a painting which owes more to Italian than British influence and which, given its context might be defined as a history painting rather than following the prosaic subject and portraiture of Leslie or Newton and the painting was a standout feature when exhibited in terms or subject and treatment. Although Edward Bulwer-Lytton had written a historical novel based on the life of Rienzi, in 1835, the label attached to the painting when exhibited links it Byron's *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*. The influence of Pelagio Palagi on this painting is discussed below.
[79] Frith, *My Autobiography*, 182-4.
[80] Algernon Graves, *The Royal Academy of Arts: A Complete Dictionary of Contributors and their Work from 1769 to 1904*, Vol. 3, (London: Henry Graves and Company, 1905-6), 30-1.
[81] Ibid. 171-7.
[82] *Illustrated Times*, May 11, 1861, 3.
[83] Ibid.
[84] *Morning Post*, April 24, 1861, 5, *Morning Chronicle*, May 23, 1861, 2.
[85] *The Cork Examiner*, July 22, 1861, 2.
[86] William Sandby stated that 'There is an originality in the subjects he selects, and in his mode of dealing with them, which show that Mr. Elmore thinks for himself, and follows no established precedents', Sandby, *The History of the Royal Academy*, Vol. 2, 302-4.
[87] *The Art-Journal*, 1857.
[88] *The Origins of the Guelph…* shown here was auctioned at Christie's South Kensington in November 2013 with the inscription 'The Florence from the Decameron. Boccaccio'. This is most likely a preliminary oil sketch for Fig. 60 as this figure is larger, more finished and conforms more to the engraving carried in *The Art-Union* in 1847 (Fig. 61).
[89] *London Daily News*, August 19, 1846, 5.
[90] *The Art-Journal*, 1852, 170.
[91] *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 1862, 64.
[92] MacLeod, 61.
[93] Maas, *Victorian Painters*, 1978, 239-40.
[94] See Chapt. *Religious Controversy*.
[95] Kate Flint, *The Victorians and the Visual Imagination*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 36.
[96] Ibid.
[97] Nead, 'Seduction, Prostitution, Suicide: *On the Brink* by Alfred Elmore'.
[98] *Blackwood's*, July, 1860, 79.
[99] In 1861 Mill had published *Considerations on Representative Government*. Geoffrey Best, *Mid-Victorian Britain 1851-75*, (London: Fontana Press, 1985), 252.
[100] *The Times*, May 5, 1860, 5, made a similar allusion to the dangers of the mob while also referring to the emotional intensity of the painting which demonstrated 'the madness of misery'. Asa Briggs, *The Age of Improvement: 1783-1867*, (London: Longman, 1983), 433-35.
[101] Although the quotes attached to Elmore's two paintings of Marie Antoinette conform to the text by Marie Thérèse, they also fit with a work on Marie Antoinette by her chambermaid Madam Campan. Both were published in translation and both were extensively reviewed. Madame Royale, [Marie Thérèse], *Royal Memoirs of the French Revolution*, (London: John Murray, 1823), 225-6. Madame Campan [Jeanne-Louise Henrietta], *Memoirs of the Private Life of Marie Antoinette, Queen of France*, (London, 1823). These books were reviewed in *The Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle*, Vol. 93, London, 1823, 239-40 and in *The Lady's Magazine and Museum*, London, May 1836, 291-310.
[102] Reviewing one of the Madame Royale's other journals of her time in the temple, pointed out that one of the most interesting aspects of the journal was when she addressed her parents deaths and the 'very touching' situation in which she found herself after the Revolution. *The Edinburgh Review or Critical Journal* also

highlighted, and criticised the general sympathy given by other sectors of the British public towards the French Royal family, *The Edinburgh Review or Critical Journal*, Vol. 39, Edinburgh, 1824, 91,103.
[103] *The Cork Examiner*, July 22, 1861, 2. *The Cork Examiner* reviewed *Maria Antoinette in the Temple* and *The Tuileries* as exhibited at the Royal Academy and in addition examined the only 'sun-painting' of *The Tuileries* to be made and which was exhibited at Mr. Tollerton's, Grand Parade Cork. Tollerton's premises was a frequent exhibition space for works of art visiting Cork.
[104] *Dorset County Chronicle and Somersetshire Gazette*, May 30, 1861, 11.
[105] *The Crayon*, New York, 1860, 262.
[106] Jane Ellen Panton, *Leaves from a Life*, (London: Eveleigh Nash, 1908), 79.
[107] Ibid. 108.
[108] Ibid.
[109] Redford, *Art Sales*, Vol.1, 254, 359, Vol.2, 31.
[110] *The Art-Journal*, 1857, 115.
[111] *Report of the Commissioners appointed to Inquire into the Present Position of the Royal Academy in Relation to the Fine Arts; together with the Minutes of Evidence*, House of Commons, London, 1863, 76, 169, 366-88. http://0-parlipapers.proquest.com.library.ucc.ie/parlipapers/result/pqpdocumentview?accountid=14504&groupid=96119&pgId=78994712-469f-4403-a45f-1480beaf992e#14 (accessed December 7, 2016) It will be seen from his own approaches to drawing that Elmore did not always conform to an academic standard but there is no evidence that he insisted on anything but academic standards while teaching in the Academy.
[112] See En. 106 this chapter.
[113] *The Shields Daily Gazette and Shipping Telegraph*, March 9, 1889, 2.
[114] George A. Storey, *Sketches from Memory*, (London: Chatto and Windus, 1899), 323-6.
[115] Ibid.
[116] Ibid.
[117] Record of Letter from Ouida to Frith, http://manuscripts.co.uk/stock/1781.HTM , accessed 20/06/2016. This dinner, or one similar, became a topic for debate after Frith mentioned that smoking was allowed during the meal and *Ouida* disputed it in an article in *The Woman's World*, London, 1888, 193-4, only for Frith to offer a defence in the *Pall Mall Gazette,* letter reproduced in *The Press*, Canterbury, May 04, 1888, 5.
[118] Anthony Trollope, *The Letters of Anthony Trollope*, Vol. 2, ed. John Hall, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1983), 600 and 606. Trollope's hesitancy adds further to the notion that Elmore could at times be unapproachable.
[119] Ibid. ,William Powell Frith to Thomas Miller, R.A.A. 236/39/3.
[120] Trollope had attacked the notion of tithes being collected in Ireland being apportioned to the Church of Ireland rather than the Catholic Church in Ireland in his article: 'The Irish Church', *Fortnightly Review*, Vol.2, 1865, London, 82-90. John McCourt discusses in depth Trollope's relationship with Ireland and points to his support for Catholic Emancipation; John McCourt, *Writing the Frontier: Anthony Trollope between Britain and Ireland*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 180-1.
[121] Trollope, *Letters*, 606.
[122]Jennifer Carnell, *The Literary Lives of M.E. Braddon*, (Hastings: The Sensation Press, 2000), 178, quoted in Clair Hughes, 'Lady Audley: The Woman in Colour', *The Wilkie Collins Journal*, Vol. 5, 2002, http://wilkiecollinssociety.org/lady-audley-the-woman-in-colour/ (accessed December 3, 2016) and Sos Eltis, *Acts of Desire: Women and Sex on Stage 1800 – 1930*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 65.
[123] https://www.manuscripts.co.uk/stock/0204.HTM (accessed January 25, 2017).
[124] Ibid.
[125] Nead, 'Seduction, Prostitution, Suicide: *On the Brink* by Alfred Elmore', 310-22. Paul Barlow suggests that this painting was Elmore's only direct reference to Hogarth, Barlow, *'The Backside of Nature'*, 247.
[126] John Batchelor, *John Ruskin: No Wealth But Life*, (London: Pimlico, 2001), 204. Sophia A. van Wingerden, *The Women's Suffrage Movement in Britain, 1866–1928*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), 9.
[127] John Ruskin, *Sesame and Lilies and the Political Economy of Art*, (London: Collins' Clear-Type Press, n.d.), 117.
[128] Ibid. 119.
[129] Dinah Birch, ed., *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 762.
[130] Elizabeth Langland, "Nobody's Angels: Domestic Ideology and Middle-Class Women in the Victorian Novel", *PMLA*, 107, No. 2, 1992, 290-304.

[131] Edgar Royston Pike, *Human Documents of the Industrial Revolution in Britain*, (London: Unwin University Books, 1966), 219.
[132] Deborah Cherry, *Beyond the Frame: Feminism and Visual Culture, Britain 1850-1900*, (London: Routledge, 2000), 25-8.
[133] Michelle Facos, *An Introduction to Nineteenth Century Art*, (New York: Routledge, 2011), 230-1.
[134] Teri J. Edelstein, 'Augustus Egg's Triptych: A Narrative of Victorian Adultery.', *The Burlington Magazine*, 1983, 202-212, , Julia Thomas, *Pictorial Victorians: The Inscription of Values in Word and Image*, (Ohio: Ohio University Press), 145-39.
[135] Patricia Thomson, *The Victorian Heroine: A Changing Ideal 1837-1873*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1956, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1978), 89. All citations from Greenwood edition.
[136] Cherry, *Beyond the Frame*, 36-7.
[137] Jane Gray Perkins, *The Life of the Honourable Mrs. Norton*, (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1909), 130-4, 148-56 and 238-43. Caroline Norton was the model for Justice in Daniel Maclise's fresco of Justice in the English House of Lords (Tom Dunne, 'Caroline Norton, a Study for the Great Fresco of Justice in the House of Lords', in Murray, *Daniel Maclise*, 64.) Although Emancipation had been achieved in 1829, Norton is thought to have been a supporter, (Diane Atkinson, *The Criminal Conversation of Mrs Norton*, (London: Preface Publishing, 2012), 8. The *Study*, discussed by Tom Dunne, was painted in 1846 and, as Dunne states, may reflect Norton's struggle for justice for women. However, given Maclise's Tory tendencies it is likely that his interest in depicting Norton in the role of Justice was not one that aligned with Norton's Whig sympathies and her support for Catholic Emancipation, (Atkinson, *The Criminal Conversation*, 8).
[138] Gail L. Savage, 'The Operation of the 1857 Divorce Act, 1860-1910: A Research Note.', *Journal of Social History*, 16, No. 4, 1983, 103-10.
[139] Pam Hirsh, *Barbara Leigh Smith Bodichon; Feminist, Artist, and Rebel*, (London: Pimlico, 1999), 86.
[140] Ibid.
[141] Ibid.
[142] Ibid. 87.
[143] Ibid. 94-5.
[144] Ibid. ix.
[145] Cherry, *Beyond the Frame*, 149. Louise Jopling, *Twenty Years of My Life: 1867-1887*, (London: John Lane, 1925), 16-18. Jopling also painted a portrait of Elmore's daughter, location unknown, which was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1873 under the name of Mrs. Frank Romer, Jopling, *Twenty Years of My Life*, 59-60 and Graves, *The Royal Academy of Arts*, Vol. 6, 356.
[146] *The Daily News*, December 16, 1854, 1.
[147] Nead, 'Seduction', 310-22.
[148] *Newcastle Guardian and Tyne Mercury*, September 27, 1862, 2, *Chester Chronicle*, September 27, 1862, 2, *Dundee Courier*, June 06, 3, 1862.
[149] *Dublin Evening Mail*, February 5, 1862, 4, *London Evening Standard*, November 2, 1864, 7 and September 22, 1868, 6.
[150] Anthony Trollope, *Can You Forgive Her?*, (London: Chapman and Hall, 1864; London: The Folio Society, 1989), 628. Citations refer to the Folio Society edition.
[151] Ibid. 2.
[152] Ibid. 15-6.
[153] Ibid. 18.
[154] Ibid. 628-9.
[155] Nead, 'Seduction'.
[156] Graham Everitt, *English Caricaturists and Graphic Humourists of the Nineteenth-Century,* (London: Sonneschein, 1893), 332-6. The impact of the street noises of London on Leech was grave enough for his doctor to recommend he visit Homburg for some respite and Elmore volunteered to accompany him, Simon Houfe, *John Leech and the Victorian Scene*, (Suffolk: Antique Collectors' Club, 1984), 201-2. Elmore was also one of the signatories of a letter of support to Michael Bass, M.P. who had introduced a Bill to suppress excessive street noise of the type which increased Leech's affliction, Michael Bass, *Street Music in the Metropolis*, (London: John Murray, 1864), 41-2.
[157] Ibid.
[158] William Powell Frith, *John Leech: His Life and His Work*, Vol. 2, (London: Richard Bentley and Sons, 1891), 46. Frith outlined the following incident his autobiography: Frith rode a horse, with the intention of purchasing it on the recommendation of Leech, (which Leech denied to Elmore). The horse proved very difficult and was

not bought, Elmore recounted the tale to Leech but Frith does not mention Elmore's knowledge of the incident, Frith, *My Autobiography*, 189-192.Elmore was described as a 'constant' friend of Leech in John Brown, *John Leech and Other Papers*, (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1882), 25, n.1.
[159] Ibid. The entire two volume work is in praise of Frith's good friend, Leech.
[160] Ibid. 269.
[161] Frith, *My Autobiography*, 280.
[162] Ibid. 280-281.
[163] Graves, *The Royal Academy of Arts*, Vol. 3, 174.
[164] Frith, *Autobiography*, 282.
[165] Ibid. *The New York Times* described it as 'not art' and 'execrable' August 06, 3, 1871. *The Examiner*, (London), said it displayed none of Frith's 'technical dexterity' and the faces portrayed were 'utterly meaningless', April 29, 1871, 10.
[166]William P. McNaught, and Christopher P. Monkhouse, 'The Salon D'Or, Homburg' in *European Painting and Sculpture, ca. 1770-1937 in the Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design*, ed. Daniel Rosenfeld, (Providence: Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design, 1991), 89-91.
[167] Ibid. and *The Morning Post*, April 29, 1871, 6.
[168] Caroline Arscott, 'William Frith's The Railway Station: Classification and Crowd', in *William Powell Frith: Painting the Victorian Age*, eds. Mark Bills and Vivien Knight, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 79.
[169] Russell Barrington, *The Life, Letters and Work of Frederic Leighton*, Vol. 2, (London: Allen, 1906), 47-9, 118-9.
[170] Maas, *Victorian Painters*, 181, 184.
[171] L.M. Lamont, *Thomas Armstrong, C.B., A Memoir: 1832-1911*, (London: Phaidon, 1912), 8.
[172] Gilbert Imray, 'A Reminiscence of Sixty Years Ago', *The Art-Journal*, 1898, 202. Della Clason Sperling, 'O'Neil, Henry Nelson (1817–1880)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. David Cannadine, May 2009, http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.library.ucc.ie/view/article/20764 accessed December 7, 2016.

[173] *The Lancashire Evening Post*, April 19, 1904, 4, *The Times*, April 19, 1904, 3.
[174] Ibid. For further information on the format and attendance at the 'Octaves' see: Zachary Cope, *The Versatile Victorian: The Life of Sir Henry Thompson*, (London: Harvey and Blythe, 1951), 92-7.
[175] Jonathan Goddard, D.E. Osborn, 'Sir Henry Thompson 1820-1904: Scientist, Artist, Motorist, Gourmet, Traveller, Cremationist and Subspecialist Urologist', *De Historia Urologiae Europaeae*, Vol. 11, 2004, 91-105. For more on Thompson's artistic career see Cope, 98-101,
[176] Lamont, *Armstrong*, 12.
[177] Robert Browning to Elmore, Alfred, 18 April 1877, The Browning Letters, Armstrong Browning Library, Baylor University, Waco, Texas. http://digitalcollections.baylor.edu/cdm/compoundobject/collection/ab-letters/id/6980/rec/1 accessed March 10, 2015.
[178] Ibid. and Browning to Elmore, 26 march 1878, http://digitalcollections.baylor.edu/cdm/compoundobject/collection/ab-letters/id/6078/rec/2 accessed July 17, 2015.
[179] Maisie Ward, *The Tragi-Comedy of Pen Browning: 1849-1912*, (London: Sheed and Ward, 1972).
[180] See Chapt. *Religious Controversy*.
[181] Maisie Ward, *Robert Browning and His World: Vol. 2, Two Robert Brownings, (1861-1889)*, (London: Cassell, 1969), 146.
[182] *Sheffield and Rotherham Independent*, May 3, 1879, 2. Browning to Elmore,31 January 1873, http://digitalcollections.baylor.edu/cdm/compoundobject/collection/ab-letters/id/8441/rec/3 accessed July 17, 2015.
[183] Alfred Elmore to Charles Barber, 10 March 1861, Alfred Elmore Letters, Letters and Papers of British Artists, Getty Research Institute Los Angeles, ID/ACC. No. 860525 (bx.2,f.79).
[184] A recently discovered sketch by Elmore (Fig. 43) appears to deal with the same incident as Hayez's painting (Fig. 44). The headwear of the figure in the background, complete with feather, and the outline of the costumes align with the period in which Byron's play is set and the pleading of the protagonist to the left mirrors Hayez's painting. The dress in Elmore's sketch points to a 15th century event if we note the head wear of the figure wearing a hat with plume and this coupled with the image on the verso of a female and an armed male (Fig. 45) suggests that the sketch is indeed a preparatory work for a lost or uncompleted painting based

on Byron's play. Byron's play did not come with many stage directions but guards are present in Act IV Scene I and the verso conforms in both participants and dress to the period of the drama. It is uncertain if Elmore's sketch preceded Hayez's oil but it points to Byron's influence on Italian painting and Elmore's interest in the same themes that had an Italian setting from early in his career. Verdi wrote an opera, *I Due Foscari*, based on Byron's play that was performed in London 1844 and 1847, *Morning Post*, December 21, 1844, 5, *London Daily News*, April 17, 1847, 1. Its popularity both as play and as opera and a Venetian setting that was familiar to Elmore, who painted *Beppo* from Byron (and also did a preparatory sketch for a scene from *Don Juan*, see En. 62, Chapt. 4), would suggest that he may also have wished to paint another of his well-known works.

[185] Gordon Campbell., ed., *The Grove Encyclopaedia of Decorative Arts*, Vol. 1, (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006), 181.

[186] Fernando Mazzocca, 'The Renaissance Repertoire in the History Painting of Nineteenth-Century Italy.', in *Reviving the Renaissance: The Use and Abuse of the Past in Nineteenth-century Italian Art and Decoration*, ed. Rosanna Pavoni, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 243 – 44.

[187] Ibid.

[188] Quoted in Mazzocca, 'The Renaissance Repertoire in the History Painting of Nineteenth-Century Italy'. The image shown here is a preparatory sketch for the larger painting in the Civic Museum at Lodi. The finished painting depicts one additional participant to the rear of the bed's headboard of a woman bringing a silver wine container. The work was originally thought to be by Francesco Hayez, Renzo Grandi, 'Un Pittore tra Rivoluzione.' in *Pelagio Palagi: Artista e Collezionista*, (Bologna, Grafis, 1976), 50.

[189] *The Art-Journal*, 1857, 114.

[190] *The Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser*, September 23, 1848, 6.

[191] *The Art-Journal*, 1857, 114, Graves, Vol. 3, 47.

[192] Grandi, 'Un pittore tra Rivoluzione e Restaurazione', 'l'artista avesse perseguito con mezzi pressoché teatrali il proposito di una sempre più puntuale regia degli affetti, furono la facolta che maggiormente incuriosirono l'anonimo recensore, il quale difatti continuando il suo discorso osservava che le figure variamente atteggiate 'fan sorgere la sensazione di un avvenimento reale e tragico'.

[193] *The Art-Journal*, 1857, 114-5, Julian Campbell, 'Alfred Elmore', 242.

[194] Giuseppe Mazzini, 'Modern Italian Painters: Hayez, Migliara, Azeglio &c.', *The Westminster Review*, Vol. 35, 1841, 376-7.

[195] Online catalogue exhibition entry, Carlo Virgilio, *Sublime e Pittoresco,Temi di figura e paese dal Neoclassico al Romantico*, Rome, 2006. http://www.carlovirgilio.it/mostre/sublime-e-pittoresco/le-opere-esposte/cola-di-rienzo-che-spiega-le-antiche-epigrafi-ai-romani/ accessed December 12, 2016.

[196] Barlow, 216-7. *The Art-Journal*, 1857, 114.

[197] *The Art-Journal*, 1857, 114. Elmore also sent two of his Italian paintings to the R.H.A. exhibition in 1844, maintaining his connection with the country of his birth from an early stage in his career, *Freeman's Journal*, July 22, 1844, 2-3. He sent *Peasantry in the Kingdom of Naples* to the Society of British Artists exhibition in 1843, *The Art-Union*, 1843, 94.

[198] Grandi, *Pelagio Palagi*, Georg Kasper Nagler, *Neues Allgemeines Künstler-Lexicon*, Vol.9, (Munich: Fleischmann, 1840), 469-71, Mazzini, 1841. Stendhal [Marie-Henri Beyle], *Rome, Naples et Florence*, (Paris: Delaunay, 1826), 55-6, quoted in Mazzocca.

[199] Valery, *Historical, Literary and Artistical Travels in Italy, etc*., trans. C.E. Clifton, (Paris: Baudry's European Library, 1839), 100- 101.

[200] Ibid.

[201] Grandi, 'Pelagio'.

[202] A painting by Palagi, *Merit Rewarded and Ignorance Unmasked*, was exhibited at the International Exhibition in London of 1862, the same year that Elmore exhibited *The Invention of the Combing Machine*, International Exhibition, 1862, *Official Catalogue of the Fine Art Department*, (London: 1862), n.p., Cat. No. 2330.

[203] Roy Strong, *And When Did You Last See Your Father?: The Victorian Painter and British History* (Hampshire: Thames and Hudson, 1978), 24.

[204] Mazzocca, 245-8, Mazzini, 377.

[205] Marilyn Palmer, 'Lee, William (*d.* 1614/15?)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., ed. David Cannadine, Oxford: OUP, 2004, http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.library.ucc.ie/view/article/16314 (accessed December 7, 2016).

[206] Lee had been expelled from Cambridge University following his marriage which had been deemed 'contrary to the statutes' of the College, Graves, Vol. 3, 47.

[207] *Britannica Academic*, s.v. 'William Lee,' accessed December 10, 2016, http://0-academic.eb.com.library.ucc.ie/levels/collegiate/article/47598. David J. Spencer, *Knitting Technology: A Comprehensive Handbook and Practical Guide*, Abington, 2001, 9. *John Cassell's Art Treasures Exhibition Containing Engravings of the Principal Masterpieces of the English, Dutch, Flemish, French and German Schools etc*., (London: W. Kent and Co., 1858), 138-41.
[208] *The Art-Journal*, 1857, 113.
[209] *Bolton Chronicle*, October 8, 1864, 4.
[210] It is not being denied that Elmore may have been present at these gatherings and evidence exists to suggest he did attend on at least one occasion. A sketch in the holdings of the British Museum, Accession Number; 1933-7-11-2, is signed to indicate that it was drawn at 18 St. John's Wood Road but the drawing is undated and has the appearance of a representation of an historical event.
[211] Graham Reynolds, *Victorian Painting*, (London: Herbert, 1987), 29.
[212] See note 238.
[213] See Chapt. *Religious Controversy*.
[214] Alison Smith, *The Victorian Nude: Sexuality, Morality and Art*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), 86.
[215] Campbell, 'Alfred Elmore', 243-5.
[216] Ibid.
[217] Ibid.
[218] John Bell to Lord Clarendon, October 3, 1854. British National Archive, FO27/1034 (1854).
[219] *The Literary Gazette*, 1850, 976, quoted in Roger Taylor, *Impressed By Light: British Photographs from Negatives, 1840-1860*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 312.
[220] *Catalogue of the Contents of the Studios of Solomon Alexander Hart, R.A., deceased, and Alfred Elmore, R.A., deceased, etc.,* (London: Christie, Manson & Woods, 1881), August 2.
[221] *Stirling Observer*, March 27, 1851, 2, *London Evening Standard*, June 17, 1871, 5.
[222] *Illustrated London News*, April 11, 1863, 19.
[223] *The Art-Journal*, 1867, 141,
[224] Ibid. Graves,Vol. 3, 48.
[225] *Illustrated London News*, May 11, 1867, 26.
[226] Ibid.
[227] *Bell's Life in London and Sporting Chronicle*, May 18, 1867, 7.
[228] Henry Blackburn, *Artists and Arabs or Sketching in Sunshine*, (London: Sampson Low, Son and Marston, 1870), 27.
[229] *Illustrated London News*, September 23, 1865, 10.
[230] Maurice Cottier, *Exposition Universelle de Vienne en 1873, Section Français, Rapport sur les Beaux-Arts*, (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1876), 61. Amédée Gabourd, *Historire Contemporaine Comprenant les Principaux Événements qui se sont Accomplis depuis la Révolution de 1830 jusqu'a nos Jours*, Vol. 5, (Paris: Librairie de Firmin Didot Freres, Fils et Cie., 1865), 310.

Chapter 3

The Religious Controversy

The paintings analysed in this chapter will be used to demonstrate a concerted engagement by Alfred Elmore with a topical and controversial subject in the public and political domain of his day. While there has only been limited examination of Elmore's works, Paul Barlow and Lindsay Errington being the few but worthy examples, these interrogations suggest an anti-Catholic bias on the part of Elmore. The analysis to be presented here will point to at least a neutral stance but more likely a pro-Catholic agenda on his part. In order to address this issue Elmore's oeuvre will be examined beyond the timeframe used in Errington's thesis and Barlow's interpretation of the artist's work will be expanded and invigorated. Elmore's biography and family will be reviewed to add weight to the argument that his work does not fit into an anti-Catholic categorisation as comfortably as has been suggested in previous examinations.

Numerous biographical elements suggest sympathy towards Catholicism on Elmore's part and in his immediate environment, adding an essential element to any analysis of his work. Apart from his father's position on Catholicism and Elmore's own Liberal outlook, both of which will be highlighted in the body of this chapter, there is also the matter of his being the beneficiary of his Irish uncle's will. Elmore's uncle Albert, the brother of his mother Marianne, is asserted to have made him the main beneficiary of his will.[1] Albert was also a contributor to the Mercy Sisters, along with other Catholic causes.[2] Albert would most certainly have been aware of his nephew's paintings as he collected engravings from London and from the fact that his early religious paintings toured Ireland, visiting Cork.[3] It seems most unlikely that an active supporter of the cloistered life would be willing to contribute to the upkeep and development of an artist, even where he is related, who sought to demonise

the convent life at a time when such positions were so divisive as to give rise to violence and revolt. Daniel O'Connell, *The Liberator*, was the major figure in the struggle for Catholic Emancipation and Alfred's father had very close connections him. Elmore himself had contact with O'Connell as he was a patron of some of the artist's earlier work including *The Martyrdom of Thomas á Becket* (Fig. 22) which remained in St. Andrew's Church throughout Elmore's life and is still to be seen there. During such a turbulent period in the Catholic Church's history, as the nineteenth-century was, it would be odd for the work of such an anti-Catholic artist, if he was such, to be retained in such a prominent position. Existing analysis of Elmore's work suffers from a lack of engagement with his family's involvement in the pursuit of Catholic Emancipation. Albert Callanan's support for the provision of a Catholic convent in the artist's native home of Clonakilty needs to be considered when discussing Elmore's 'nun' paintings. Elmore's paintings cannot be seen as just an isolated artistic process, dissociated from his life while his life was embedded in the debates surrounding viewer responses to his paintings. Nonetheless, it is evident that Elmore's paintings offered the viewers an opportunity to interpret them in their own way and to see them as pro-Catholic, as suggested by the reviewer in *The Tablet*, or anti-Catholic as suggested by *The Art-Journal*.[4]

While it cannot be definitively stated that all artists were biased toward one side or other of the many debates taking place during the mid- to late nineteenth-century around religion, science and religious fractures, there can be no doubt, given the public awareness of these debates, that their works would be viewed by an audience with these biases already ingrained. To understand how partialities arise and to provide a fuller context for the reactions to and interpretations of *Religious Controversy*, and Elmore's other religious paintings, it is necessary to begin with a discussion of the contentious issue of religious conflict and reform that was taking place in nineteenth-century Britain and Ireland. Although there has been

limited analysis of Elmore's religious paintings, these analyses will be examined and shown to conform to visual expectations within accepted tropes in Victorian art without having examined the possibility of alternative interpretations based on the artist's intention. It is my position that the artist did not intend his work to be overtly anti-Catholic but rather that he sought to encourage investigation into historical events and individuals that highlighted the ambiguities that existed in the past in relationships between Protestantism and Catholicism, ambiguities that continued to exist and to be debated in Elmore's own life time.

Elmore's political affiliations may also help us to define his position on religion and politics in general. Elmore was, for example, a member of the committee for the election of the former Liberal M.P. Jacob Bell during the 1854 election campaign.[5] Although Elmore's membership of the Bell committee occurs well after the Catholic Emancipation of 1829, the Whigs, from which the Liberals emerged, had supported the Act; there were still issues of contention around the debate when Bell was active politically and while he was a Member of Parliament. Elmore was also a member of the Sunday Society, a disparate group that campaigned for the opening of public buildings such as museums, galleries and libraries to be enjoyed by the labouring classes on Sundays. At the time of his death Elmore was vice-President of the Society; other members included Holman Hunt, Millais and Lord Dunraven.[6] As a result of its programme the Society was staunchly opposed by the Lord's Day Observance Society, an evangelical grouping consisting of members of the Established Church and Dissenters, both parties that had established anti-Catholic tendencies. The rhetoric that opposing sides engaged in when debating the idea of Sunday opening was couched in terms of class and either the protection of the labouring classes from exploitation, the stance of the L.D.O.S. and their fellow campaigners the Sabbatarians, or in enabling of lower class families the chance to view 'artistic wonders together' and to exchange thoughts and enjoy their leisure harmoniously'.[7] The rhetoric of class concerns was not the complete

story as there were elements of both sides that saw the objectives as securely founded upon scripture and differences arose between Anglican and Catholic M.P.s on the issue, Anglicans siding with the Sabbatarians and Catholics with the Sunday Society.[8] While Elmore's family background and his political tendencies may alter interpretations of his religious paintings the fact is that his paintings, and those of other artists that painted religious scenes, did operate in a highly volatile period of faith re-examination. The problematic nature of the religious debates of the period and of Catholic Emancipation needs to be outlined in order to proceed to revaluate Elmore's paintings and to embed them in the context in which they were being viewed.

Elmore's work, and its many religious subjects, occurs in a particularly controversial time for Catholicism, and his affiliations, both familial and political, operate within this context. When Elmore's religious and historical paintings are viewed in this climate it can become tempting to suggest, as writers such as those reviewed below have done, that these works would fit neatly into the anti-Catholic category. However, it must be remembered that Elmore, as the son of an Irish, Catholic mother and having lived in Clonakilty until the age of 12, would have been very much attuned to the debates surrounding both the land of his birth and his maternal family's religion and it is to be expected that this would inform his painting. Ireland during the 1800s was a place of struggle to bring to an end the remnants of the Penal Laws, many of which had been repealed towards the end of the eighteenth-century. Daniel O'Connell's Catholic Association had further progressed the status of the Irish Catholics' position in society in the earlier part of the nineteenth-century. The banning of Catholics from practicing law, sitting in parliament and even the 1704 Act, (which obliged anyone taking up a public office to receive communion within the Established Church), had been repealed in 1828, and allowed for major changes to begin to take place in Ireland. These laws applied equally in Great Britain but with different effects due the minority status of Catholicism

there. In Ireland, being a predominantly Catholic country, the impact of anti-Catholic legislation from the time of Henry VIII, through Elizabeth I and the anti-Catholic hysteria of the seventeenth-century, when fears and claims of Popish plots and Catholic uprisings were rife, would naturally be felt throughout the country in a very definite and very visual way. However, it might also be argued that concessions to Catholicism which would not be very readily accepted in England could be applied in Ireland for the sake of preventing outright rebellion against the Crown.[9] Attempts to appease Catholics prior to the 1798 rebellion in Ireland led to the Catholic Relief Acts of 1778, 1791 and to the opening of Maynooth College in 1795. However, throughout all these improvements there remained a veto to allow the King have an input into the selection of Catholic bishops based on their loyalty to the Crown.[10] Brian Girvin points out that this veto was supported by some Catholics but once Emancipation did not arrive with the Act of Union there was a growth in opposition to the veto and some who had initially supported it would go on to oppose it in those changed circumstances.[11] One important player in the veto controversy was Bishop Dr. John Milner. Milner had supported the veto and had been attacked for doing so; he was labelled a traitor and the 'No Popery Minister' and was threatened.[12] Milner would later change his opinion and become stridently opposed to the veto.[13] Milner died in 1826 but had been during his lifetime a prolific writer of letters, pamphlets and books.[14] It is interesting to note that Milner wrote two tracts one of which was initially unpublished at the request of his bishop; they were titled *End of Religious Controversy*, written in 1789 but not published until 1818, and *Vindication of the End of Controversy*.[15] Milner's *Controversy* was still being quoted in the press in association with conversions in 1845, was still being sold during the mid-1840s and was quoted from by John O'Connell, M.P., son of Daniel O'Connell, in 1846.[16] If Elmore needed a title from the present to link with his incident from the past then this was his opportunity to bring issues of Emancipation and debate to the fore even as it was still causing

divisions and realignments in Parliament. The provision of an increased permanent endowment from the state towards the training of Catholic priests in Maynooth caused uproar in Westminster in 1845. Prime Minister Peel only managed to remain in power after its passing into law with the support of the Whigs as many of Peel's Tory backbenchers, opposed to the Maynooth Endowment, deserted him.[17] Concessions to Catholicism in England might well have been seen to encourage a reinvigoration of the Roman faith, without any pressing need to quell dissent or open rebellion as was the case in Ireland, and this would have been a very unwelcome impetus in a country where anti-Catholic feeling had such deep roots. After the Reformation and the numerous laws imposed against Popery, England effectively became a mission state for the Catholic Church without the established parishes it had in other countries.[18] In the 1840s Pope Pius IX proposed the reintroduction of geographically based bishoprics in England and Sees, rather than the previous vicariates, were established in 1847; these were then interpreted by many as the laying of a temporal claim by Rome on the territory of England.[19] This was further exasperated when, in September 1850, this new hierarchy was given a leader, Nicholas Wiseman, who was then given the title of Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster.[20] There was immediate reaction to this appointment in the media of the day. *The Times*, *The Standard* and *The Illustrated London News* all deemed this action to be illegal and an insult and were adamant the move would not result in a return to "Roman bondage".[21] *The Times* was unequivocal in its assertion that 'the public opinion of this country will disavow and deride [the Pope's actions] whenever His Grace the titular Archbishop of Westminster thinks fit to enter this diocese.'[22] Wiseman had previously been a figure of controversy due to his interactions with the Oxford Movement, a grouping of Anglican priests and academics that sought the reintroduction of Catholic rites into the Anglican Church.[23] The Oxford Movement was also open to criticism due to its highly Catholic tendencies in terms of liturgy, ritual and conventualism and these aims and

inclinations were reflected in the artistic production of the period.[24] One of the most prominent members of the Movement, John Henry Newman, would later become a Cardinal of the Catholic Church following his conversion and it was Wiseman who confirmed him in 1845.[25] Wiseman's own pastoral letter in response to the reaction to his appointment added further fuel to the fire and resulted in increased anti-Catholic protest.[26] In fact even the timing of his sermon could not have been more inopportune when the letter was read on October 28th. Guy Fawkes Night, a prominent anti-Catholic event, which aroused all manner of ill feeling towards the religion as well as being seen as a justification for the suspicions shown towards Catholics and their underhanded endeavours to usurp the freedom of the English Church and State, was due to be celebrated the following week.[27] This period of 'Papal Aggression', and its aftermath, was the context in which artistic representations featuring religious subjects operated and were interpreted by the English population. As the early nineteenth-century developed, the debate surrounding religion was both far reaching and widely reflected in the literature, art and architecture of the day. Attempts to secure the legitimacy of the Established Anglican Church would give rise to many reassessing their attachment to the recognised order, and conversions, such as that of John Henry Newman, while not the order of the day, did happen to a degree which was unsettling and the debate became intense.[28] During this period there was an explosion of pamphleteering, sermonising and newspaper articles which reminded the English Protestants of the dangers inherent in Catholicism.[29] The Catholic Church was seen as superstitious, irrational and a hot bed of vice and perversion. Convents were 'brothels' and 'Popery' was a persecutor.[30]

The relaxing of anti-Catholic legislation coupled with an increase in the amount of Irish migrating to England as a result of the famines in Ireland had compounded the effect on the native, Anglican and Nonconformist religions. Emancipation allowed Catholics to become members of Parliament and, to many, it seemed illogical on the part of the state to allow for

the possibility of Members who had an allegiance to a foreign power, Rome, to be participants in the Parliamentary authority that was the guarantor of the Established Church's position in society. The Catholic population of England that had lived there throughout the Penal Law period had adapted to the English expectations of an alien religious body and were, to an extent, tolerated as long as they remained controlled and subdued in the practice of their faith, for example the function of Catholic churches was not to be able to be viewed by the public.[31] The prospect of Emancipation, when viewed in the light of radical nationalism in Ireland, perceived to be led exclusively by Catholics, and the increased immigration of Catholic Irish, rekindled the fervent anti-Catholicism of earlier periods from the Dissolution of the Monasteries up to the late eighteenth-century in England. The repeal of some of the Penal Laws, in place since the late seventeenth and early eighteenth-centuries, (which had been designed to subdue Catholicism in Ireland after the victory of William III over Jacobite forces), such as the Papists Act of 1778 were not welcome by many of the Established Churches and led to disturbances like the Gordon Riots which opposed any relief for Popery in England.[32] Although the anti-Catholic Acts were not completely enforced in England, they did ensure that Catholic practices were carried out in secret; up until the introduction of Catholic Emancipation, Catholic churches in England did indeed show little or no sign of their purpose.[33]

The extremes of anti-Catholicism could be read in the literature of many of the Gothic novels of the late eighteenth-century and early nineteenth-century that wrote of the depravity of Catholic practices in enclosed cloisters and in the places of secret worship. Novels such as *The Monk* or *Melmoth the Wanderer* told stories of priests and nuns of highly questionable moral standards. Elmore would have been aware of Boccaccio's treatment of the Catholic priesthood as he painted subjects from the *Decameron* but the satire and humour in such early works did not rise to the compelling, sinister nature of the eighteenth-century Gothic novel

which focussed on the Catholic Orders as 'Other' in opposition to the accepted and more civilised Protestant faith. Even such a renowned author as Charlotte Brontë does not escape some of her work being labelled as 'essentially anti-Catholic' and indeed while there may now be a view that her novel *Villette* works to permit a discourse on religion as a theme there can be very little doubt of this novel's narrator's anti-Catholic tendencies.[34] In addition to popular novels, there were also regular journals and broadsheets that carried serialised anti-Catholic stories.[35] The widespread anti-Catholic message delivered by the various written media of the day played into the hands of those who had been attempting to resist the spread of Catholicism and appealed to the uneducated labouring masses who could equate immigrant Irish Catholics with an undermining of wage rates and job security. The Irish influx, as a result of famine and poverty in Ireland, directed itself towards the expanding industrial towns in the north-west of England.[36] Towns like Liverpool and Manchester were particularly attractive and the Irish could find employment in the growing textile mills there. Ireland had suffered a decline in linen production due to a lack of investment while on mainland Britain it had expanded. Elmore's father had a particular experience of this and he commented upon it in his contributions to Parliamentary committees. In *The Report of the Committee for the Relief of the Distressed Districts of Ireland* Dr. Elmore blamed a lack of investment in manufacturing as a major obstacle to Irish industrial development and that this was the cause of much poverty.[37] In a further submission Elmore suggested an alleviation of poverty could be achieved by relocation within Ireland rather than emigration which he felt would undermine the terms and conditions of the indigenous workforce and 'from their numbers oblige the English artisans and labourers to apply to their parish for relief or aid'.[38] The native English labourers on Liverpool's docks and in the Lancashire mills were especially prone to competition from the Irish immigrant population.[39] Frank Neal lists a number of wage related riots in *The Irish in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Integrated or*

Assimilated and it can be suggested that incitement to riot played on the notion that these immigrants were not only Irish and a threat to wages but also predominantly Catholic.[40] Denis G. Paz also points out that the misfortunes of Ireland were largely attributed to its 'dominant religious faith' and this conflation of religious difference and the rise of an immigrant Irish population would allow for conflicts between the native labouring classes and the increasing Irish poor to be seen as one type of conflict while also serving the purpose of the other.[41] A quote from a report on the Stockport Riots of 1852 serves to illustrate this point:

> The religious jealousy appears to have been by no means unmixed; but the occasion was probably welcome as a vent for standing feuds between English and Irish, discontented factory hands and "knobsticks," as well as Protestant and Catholic.[42]

Interestingly, Elmore's father had warned against such prejudices and labour disturbances in his letters to the Earl of Darnley as early as 1828 when he was suggesting solutions to the problem of an Irish immigrant increase.[43] However, it would be a mistake to assert that the literature of the day alone gave rise to anti-Catholic sentiment; rather it would be more accurate to say that it illustrated spontaneous feelings of fear and suspicion that had surrounded Catholicism since the Reformation and which was now aided by the economic situation of excess labour, as discussed by Neal, Paz and Elmore, and the changing status of Catholics and their Church within the United Kingdom.

Elmore's Religious *Controversy in the Time of Louis XIV* (Fig.2) and his *The Novice Nun* (Fig. 5) have been used as examples of religious paintings popular during the mid-nineteenth-century and for their reflection upon the religious debates around Catholic Emancipation and the period of The Papal Aggression. Lindsay Errington examines these works in the context of the period 1840-1860.[44]

While Errington's overall proposal is comprehensive, and she uses examples of an immense array of artistic representations of religious subjects, she does not delve further into the considerations which may need to be applied to Elmore's own work rather than simply seeing it as part of a popular trope of the late 1840s. The artist's *The Novice Nun* receives just such a treatment by Errington and is assumed to reflect an anti-Catholic attitude prevalent in the day amongst commentators examining the life of the cloister.[45] However, Errington's chronological parameters and the limiting of her analysis to an obvious, specific genre excludes other works by Elmore which have religious references that are as important but have been dismissed with a description as historical paintings. This is an area of his oeuvre which needs to be interrogated and elucidated.

Paul Barlow, in his unpublished doctoral thesis, deals with Elmore's work more comprehensively.[46] In a comparative analysis of styles and theoretical impulses, Barlow views a much broader section of the artist's output than Errington as a member of *The Clique*.[47] *The Clique* was an informal group of artists including Frith, Elmore, Dadd, Nelson, O'Neill, Ward, Egg and other artists. It should be noted that although Elmore's friendship with Frith was a longstanding one Elmore was not in England for most of the time the group was together. Barlow's examination of Elmore's *Religious Controversy* insists upon depicting the feminine space of the canvas as a means of actual and painted divisions and societal and artistic conventions with respect to the Protestant/Catholic conflict. The division of the painting, argues Barlow, determines that the Protestant acts as a protector of the female from the 'corrupting artifice' of the Catholic clergy.[48] It must be acknowledged that Barlow seeks to unify the work of members of *The Clique* within the realm of Hogarthianism while he acknowledges that much of Elmore's work and that of other members of the group are not receptive to the 'logic of Hogarthianism' and that 'The careers of each artist or the features of particular paintings can no doubt justifiably be described in radically different ways.'[49]

However, he agrees with Errington's assertion that Elmore's discussed religious paintings are anti-Catholic in essence and he suggests they exhibit a 'rejection of Catholic 'idolatry'.'[50] There is support given to this position in his references to the spatial relationships within *Religious Controversy.*[51] Both authors, then, see an anti-Catholic stance in Elmore's painting. This was not a universal view when the work was exhibited nor should the lack of 'specific theological issues', as argued again by both writers, result in *Controversy* being dismissed or confined to a gendered or Hogarthian reading, albeit within a religious context, central to the portrayal of the debate, it is the very act of debate itself which is of import and this is especially so given the viewing public's awareness of such debates in their own time.

When it was exhibited at the Royal Academy *Religious Controversy in the Time of Louis XIV* was a great attraction for the public. *The Tablet*, a Catholic organ, said 'of Elmore's we saw little more, for the crowd it attracted' but when its correspondent did get to see the painting he could only add '" Controversy" is a striking picture, the Monk in which has the best of it in a dispute with one of the "Reformed".'[52] *The Lady's Newspaper* said that the work was one of the best offerings in that year's Exhibition in terms of execution but regarding the subject only states that 'It represents one of those theological disputes so common to that period.'[53] These two reports highlight the act of the debate as it is depicted and makes no reference to possible readings around the societal position of the protagonist or side actors in the painting. *The Illustrated London News* carried an engraving of the painting and deemed it to be 'one of the best painted pictures in the present exhibition.'[54] The painting itself must have been powerful, given the attention and coverage it received, yet the work is only half the effect. Elmore, as other exhibiters, was in the habit of accompanying his Academy submissions with lengthy explanatory statements. The label attached to *Controversy* would have had immense resonance with the viewing public during a charged period in Victorian England:

> The King had declared his intention to employ only good Christians in public situations, meaning Roman Catholics, and the most tempting encouragement was held out to such as should set a public example by abjuring their Protestant tenets. Accordingly it was not uncommon for an intending convert of rank to invite some leading Protestant clergyman to meet some leading Catholic in his house, there to debate respecting their differences, to satisfy the mind of their host which religion was preferable.[55]

Louis XIV had set out to encourage Huguenots in France to convert to Catholicism by forcing them to decide between religious and civil rights. Civil rights could only come with conversion to Catholicism and he was supported in his ambitions by the Pope of the day, Innocent Xl, '[For] that extraordinary zeal (never sufficiently commended by any praises) with which you have set as your illustrious goal to extend the Catholic religion and to guard it vigorously against heretics.'[56]

Although the painting could thus be seen as a warning against allowing Roman Catholicism to gain a foothold in England and of Popery at its most oppressive, it was, nonetheless interpreted by *The Tablet* as championing the strengths of the Catholic doctrine. For the painting to be seen as anti-Catholic in intention assumes that the artist harboured such views himself and this was most unlikely. It cannot be stated definitively that Elmore agreed with his father's ideology, as outlined in his letters to Darnley. The fact that O'Connell commissioned or simply purchased his *Martyrdom of Thomas á Becket* (Fig. 22) and that another of his early works was also destined for an Irish Catholic church suggests as unlikely that he was viewed in his own time as anti-Catholic by Catholics. The artist might well have been following the trend for the painting of historical works but he cannot have been unaware, due to the heated public debates around religion, of the interpretations that could be fixed on his work. The Catholic *Tablet* could read *Religious Controversy* as the Monk

winning the dispute against the heretic or, if the Bible is taken as the only 'antidote' against Popery, it demonstrates the strength of the Huguenot's weaponry against the 'ranting monk' with his tracts of Roman Catholic literature.[57] However as the painting was so popular and was engraved in newspapers such as *The Illustrated London News* it must have held particular purchase with the largely Protestant public who would have been very much aware of the persecution of the Huguenots by the Catholic Church, the Pope and Louis and the historical persecution of Protestants by Catholics in Europe.[58] Catholics, on the other hand could see the painting as a demonstration of the validity and authority of their faith. The ability of the painting to be seen as supportive of two differing views at the point of reception does not imply that one form of reception should coral the artist in to explicit support for that view; rather, the painting is constituted by an aware artist to appeal to both religions without antagonizing either. When the painting was engraved in *The Art-Journal* in 1868 they said that if it was 'a politico-religious, instead of an artistic journal it might not naturally be assumed that in introducing this subject at the present time we had an eye to the events which are now agitating the public mind throughout the entire kingdom.' Unlike *The Tablet*, however, they identified the main protagonists as a Huguenot and a Capuchin, the Capuchin exhibiting 'zeal which is scarcely tempered by discretion' while the Protestant is self-possessed and determined and the 'countenance' of the cardinal shows that his fellow Romanist is losing the debate.[59] The owner of the mansion, who watches on, is anxious at the debate being won by the heretic, according to *The Art-Journal*; certainly a reading very much the opposite of a Catholic interpretation. The public agitation which *The Art-Journal* referred to was most likely the growth of ritualism associated with Catholicism, and the Oxford Movement, which was illegal at the time and with the Royal Commissions set up in 1867 and 1868 which dealt with issues of candle use and religious vestments and other Catholic rituals.[60] Of course, when the painting was exhibited almost twenty years earlier, as we have

seen, it was immediately controversial given that the Maynooth question would still be fresh in the minds of the public and in 1848, the arch-nemesis of Protestantism and future Cardinal, Nicholas Wiseman, had just opened a new cathedral in Southwark near to the site of the anti-Catholic Gordon Riots of 1780.[61]

Elmore, given his biography, would have been of the opinion that investigation of the debates by the public could contribute to an acceptance of Catholicism that did not imply a destruction of Protestantism. Allowing for *Religious Controversy* to be seen as supportive of both sides of the debate it might well be interpreted as simply a reflection of the debate taking place rather than a stance in support of either side. Errington argues that the Privy Council debates taking place at the time were 'uninteresting' and that the painting could well have had a contemporary resonance if only it had been depicted as such but this approach does not fall into Elmore's style.[62] Errington's argument places Elmore's painting within the simple trope of religious paintings of the period and this position is well supported by her evidence within that limited framework; however the Parliamentary debates were reported and discussed across the media of the day and, as I suggest below, some debates in the public domain are echoed in the painting and its format. It is also necessary to acknowledge that while many artists of the period painted the modern world as it appeared, Elmore very rarely depicted his historical narratives in a contemporary costume and he painted his subjects within their own historical setting. This can be seen in his works that can be described as 'Hogarthian', that is to say a real depiction of real concerns that did not draw on analogy but dealt with the theme of the painting in its own terms; *On the Brink* is one example but there are others that will be discussed in other parts of this thesis. It is an essential aspect of many of Elmore's religious paintings that the narrative is constructed in the past while indicating to the viewer that there existed a contemporary circumstance analogous with the moment depicted. The debates around Catholicism were highly charged but there were supporters for

the Roman religion as well as detractors and these debates would have been influential in opinion forming; Elmore's father, O'Connell and Fr. Tom Maguire, of which more below, along with other proponents of Catholic equality depended very much on the power of debate.

Further support for the position that the idea of the debate was the theme of the painting is to be had from an incident referred to in his father's letter to Darnley where he mentions the celebrated dispute between the Catholic priest Fr. Tom Maguire and the Evangelical Richard Pope, of which Elmore would almost certainly been aware; the debate was chaired by Daniel O'Connell. [63] Maguire was notorious in the years preceding the painting of *Controversy* and he was recognised as a close associate of O'Connell. His activities were reported in the London press regularly including his repeated calls for public debates between himself and leading Protestants some of which occurred in addition to that involving Pope.[64] Alfred's father's close relationship with O'Connell most certainly points to his being aware of these events and the fact that Maguire died in 1849 could well have brought these activities to the fore in his mind and recalled the precedence of debate pursued in the time of Louis XIV and which is reflected in the painting. The centrality of debate becomes self-evident once we view the context of its making and leads to it being not an abstract portrayal of an event without a 'specific theological issue' as argued by Barlow and Errington, but, a concrete realisation of actual events taking place in the public domain and to which the public would have been attuned by the press of the day. *The Literary Gazette* gives pointed support to the public awareness when it said that the subject of Elmore's *Religious Controversy* was 'a debate worthy of Maynooth or Exeter Hall' although it was 'not easy to decide whether the Romish or the Protestant divine is the most wrathful in the argument and the diverse sympathies of the impatient listeners are happily delineated.'[65] Here we have a direct reference to the Maynooth debate and a suggestion that makes a direct link with a series of

debates held at Exeter Hall, and other centres around Britain, to discuss the state of Protestantism in Ireland and the impact concessions to Catholicism were having on the Established Church and its clergy.[66] The initial Exeter debates gave rise to an open challenge in the press by Fr. Tom Maguire for a further debate in a similar format to that which was held in Dublin but this time he suggested Manchester or London as the venue.[67] Seen in the context of such widespread debate the work becomes contemporary, relevant and representative of a reality rather than an abstract adherence to a particular belief system.

Religious Controversy was not Elmore's first work that could be read as having a message germane to the on-going religious debates. His *The Origin of the Guelph and Ghibelline Quarrel in Florence* (Fig. 4, 60&61), exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1845, has a theme based on the positions taken by the two groups representing the conflict between the claims of the Papacy and the Holy Roman Emperor to temporal authority. The passage which accompanied the painting showed the choice which a Guelph has to make in marriage; initially intending to marry a Ghibelline, he then rejects her as being 'one from the enemies of thy church and race' and instead takes as his wife a Guelph.[68] Barlow interprets this painting as part of Elmore's feminine aesthetic and while the painting does contain numerous females we should not ignore the quote attached to it:

> In the year 1265, a Guelf noble of the upper vale of Arno, named Buondelmonte, who had been made a citizen of Florence, demanded in marriage a young person of the Ghibelline house of Amidei, and was accepted. While the nuptials were in preparation, a noble lady, of the family Donati, stopped Buondelmonte as he passed her door, and bringing him to the room where her women were at work, raised the veil of her daughter: 'Here', said she, 'is the wife I had reserved for thee. Like thee she is a Guelf; whilst thou takest one from the enemies of thy church and race.' Buondelmonte, bedazzled and enamoured, accepted the proffered hand. *Sismondi*.

It is clear that Elmore's time in Italy had influence upon his work; the quote is taken from Jean Charles Léonard de Sismondi's *History of the Italian Republics,* a popular history that provided material for artists such as Henry Howard (1837) and G.F. Watts (1846), all dealing with incidents involving Buondelmonte.[69] Howard and Watts both spent time in Italy around the same period as Elmore and it could be expected that their interest would be aroused by Sismondi's writings. *Origin* fits well with Barlow's support for a gendered viewing and this is no surprise following the 'gender turn' in Art History but the writing that inspired the painting needs to be considered in terms of the political and religious circumstance that it describes. While it is not the brief of this chapter to be a history of Italy, the conflict between the protagonists in the painting's title needs to be outlined. The Guelphs supported the Papacy while the Ghibellines supported the Holy Roman Emperor, it was a conflict between secular and religious authority; a conflict that is also reflected in *Martyrdom.*[70] Although cities altered their allegiances from one faction to another, it is clear from the wording of the label attached to Elmore's painting that religious differences were of importance and the fluidity of these allegiances reflects the manner in which conversions and revaluations of doctrinal differences were being discussed and debated in the mid-1800s as outlined above. The rejection by Buondelmonte of his Ghibelline fiancée in favour of a Guelph to avoid intermarriage and thus give rise to the dispute that would have long term consequences for both factions is something of which Elmore would have been aware given his father's marriage to an Irish Catholic. The larger political issue of the clash of temporal powers with the Papacy was central to the period of Papal Aggression and the work reflects this without making a commitment as to the right of either side. The painting demonstrates the potential for destructive outcomes of religious intolerance rather than a bias towards one religious belief above another and, for those who had read or would be led to read Sismondi, it would show that religious difference and intolerance was a condition which could be, and had been,

overcome to judge from the manner in which the factions altered from one side to the other. Elmore, as he does with *Controversy*, highlights the issues of concern and allows the viewer to make a determination from the visual, and textual, portrayal based on their own context but with a central narrative of debate and acceptance being preferred above conflict and intolerance.

Elmore's 1843 painting entitled *The Novice* (Fig. 62) depicts a young monk, in contrast with his 1852 painting of the same name, which depicts a nun.[71] *The Monk/The Novice* of 1843 carried no title when exhibited but was named *The Novice* in *The Art-Union* review of the exhibition; it was not hung by the exhibition directors in a manner reflecting its excellence.[72] The painting is described as 'a young monk, recently professed, is seated at the door of his convent, while his former companions are seen at a short distance in full enjoyment of their favourite relaxations; the quality of the work is beyond doubt.'[73] In *The Art-Journal* over 20 years later we are further informed that 'the world and the cloister are striving for the mastery on the heart of the young recluse.'[74] The painting is in an Italian setting if we are to judge by the architecture of the belfry and the headwear of the females; that Elmore had only recently returned from Italy supports this conclusion. *The Art-Journal* also locates the later *Novice* in Italy.[75] The portrayal of monks was not universally seen as holding negative connotations, in many respects it was the way in which they were portrayed and the style adopted by the artist that gave rise to criticism. Charles Eastlake had painted a monk picture in 1840, the same year as Elmore's *The Martyrdom of Thomas á Becket*, which was well received by the press, although faults were noted, such as the repeated use of models. *The Salutation of the Aged Friar* by Eastlake was described as: 'Full of tender and religious sentiment', and 'the figure of the friar is the very impersonation of benevolence and humility.'[76] Thackeray's review of Eastlake's painting is important in the context of stylistic associations with the Pre-Raphaelites; in *Fraser's Magazine* he writes:

> The countenances of the monks are full of unction; the children with their mild beaming eyes are fresh with recollections of heaven. There is no affectation of middle-aged mannerism, such as silly Germans and silly Frenchmen are want to call Catholic art; and the picture is truly Catholic in consequence having about it what the hymn calls 'solemn mirth' and giving the spectator the utmost possible pleasure in viewing it.[77]

Such sentiments as these expressed by Thackeray can equally be applied to Elmore's style as he also avoided Pre-Raphaelite tendencies.

The Novice Nun of 1852, according to Graves, had the following accompanying label, a quote from *Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard* by Thomas Gray:

> For who, to dumb forgetfulness a prey,
>
> This pleasing anxious being e'er resigned,
>
> Left the warm precincts of the cheerful day,
>
> Nor cast one longing lingering look behind?

As in the earlier work, the novice here is glancing out at youthful companions enjoying a sun filled and life filled day; the world she is leaving appears to still hold an attraction over the future life at the end of her novitiate when she will move deeper into the cloister where old age, infirmity and the grave awaits her. She is looking from the door of the future to the window on the past but she does not forget her ritual as she attends to her Rosary, as the beads remain clasped in her hands. Perhaps a more significant comment on the life of the convent and its 'superstitions' can be drawn from the painting in the background. The painting shows an episode from the life of St. Teresa of Avila, her constant visitations from an angel who pierces her heart with a fire-tipped spear that makes her utter several moans of

pain and ecstasy. While we are not given a close and detailed representation of the ecstasy we need only look to Bernini's sculpture of the same subject to determine that the line between religious fervour and erotic response is a thin one. The contrast of the inner cloister with the outer festivities is further emphasised by the words of Gray. The poem is a reflection on the wastefulness of nature and the emptiness of the grave compared to the fullness of life and of the poet's contemplation and his juxtapositioning of life and death. What message did Elmore wish to convey with his painting? It is either a condemnation of the cloistered life or a celebration of the piety of taking the veil. Errington sees *The Novice Nun* in the mould of an anti-Catholic stance, following her decision to label *Controversy* as such, and she contrasts this with the Romanist sympathies that could be extracted from depictions of nuns in Pre-Raphaelite paintings.[78]

The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood paintings of nuns also had the difficulty of their being associated with Romanism due their medieval tendencies and there was also criticism of their new style, as we see from Thackeray's review of Eastlake's painting. The extreme attention to detail of the P.R.B. had been attacked by some writers of the day, such as Dickens and the aforementioned Thackeray, and the associations made between their work and the Oxford Movement, even from their supporters such as Ruskin who dissociated himself from their 'Romanist and Tractarian tendencies', would impact upon viewer reception of the P.R.B. religious works.[79] This was not the case with Elmore; he did not paint in the style of the P.R.B. nor had he been associated with those tendencies alluded to by Ruskin. Elmore's work is more nuanced and deals with the deeper psychological issues at play in the mind of the young nun: does she opt for the carefree life of her companions or for the contemplative, pious life of the convent? This more reflective view was expressed by French reviewers of the painting when it was shown at the Paris Exhibition in 1855 where it was described as 'arresting the attention, touching the heart…awakening in the mind thoughts of grave

import… *The Novice* placed the young novitiate between the seductions of life and the suggestions of death – between the illusions of time and the anticipations of eternity.'[80] In a further review, Elmore's work was described as not 'confining himself, like his brother artists, within the bounds of the narrow romance of familiar facts, he has sought to illustrate a philosophical reflection, and he has succeeded.'[81] When viewed in this light the painting ceases to be a 'contrast' to the P.R.B. work exemplified by paintings such as those of Charles Collins and becomes an illustration of 'spiritual liberation' through contemplation.[82] As Barlow points out, the inclusion of St. Teresa of Avila in a painting within the painting at such close proximity to the novice has an important role to play in directing the viewers' reading of the work.[83] However, Barlow suggests that the 'spiritual liberation achieved by St. Teresa' compares with the 'worldly liberation of the carnival' outside the convent window.[84] It is difficult to discern whether Barlow is fully committed to this analysis as he also suggests that the spatial relationship between the depicted novice and the representation of Teresa infers that the spiritual ecstasy of the saint can be achieved by the novice if she enters fully the to the cloistered life.[85] As Barlow states, this resolves 'the contradictions of a religious picture' yet it also serves to heighten the dual reading that can be implied in the work without investigating the intention of the artist.[86] As indicated in the introductory paragraph to this chapter, Elmore's family background would suggest a sympathetic approach to the convent life. It is not enough to state that the work implies an anti-Catholic stance because it follows a certain artistic subject trend, as Errington does, nor is it sufficient to argue that the spatial relationships within the painting resolve contradictions.[87]The work may have been liable to mixed readings by the viewer but it is unlikely that the artist intended it to be perceived as a carrier of an anti-Catholic message.

The Novice Monk was exhibited within three years of Elmore's *Martyrdom of Thomas á Becket* for O'Connell and we might assume that the work would not be carried out with the

intention of offending the religious beliefs of the artist's first and perhaps only major patron. *The Novice Nun* addresses the same issues, although at a later date, and it would involve Elmore, if it was anti-Catholic in essence, adopting a contradictory position, that is to decide to paint an anti-Catholic work, which would also be at variance with the ideas present in his other works to be discussed below. It is not without precedent in art that the intention of a work would not conform to its reception nor that the initial reception afforded a work would remain fixed and unaltered by a viewer's cultural or religious context. In the Victorian period this holds true also and the example of an earlier religious painting by David Wilkie demonstrates this. It has been shown by Bridget Elliot how Wilkie approached George IV for patronage of his painting *The Preaching of Knox Before the Lords of the Congregation 10th June 1559* (Fig. 63) only to be refused whereas the offer was finally taken up by the anti-Catholic Lord Liverpool. [88] However, this commission occurred from sketches Wilkie had prepared in 1822, ten years before it was exhibited at the R.A. In the period between the initial sketches and the finished painting being exhibited Liverpool had died, in 1828, and Peel had managed to have the Emancipation Act passed in 1829. By the time the painting was shown in the Academy critics largely ignored its blatantly religious aspect and focused on how it might be seen as an example of a 'fine academic history painting'.[89] In this context the Tory and Whig/Radicals could adopt the painting as a symbol - not so much of what it contained but of how its acceptance by the Academy symbolised the status quo - and maintain a tradition in art to influence a corresponding tradition in society; the Tories could laud the painting for its conservatism while the Whigs could attack it for the very same reason.[90] A painting intended to identify and associate itself with an anti-Catholic message altered to become a holder of a different message which was interpreted by two differing groupings to their own ends. It is worth noting that by the time of Elmore's *Religious Controversy* being shown in 1849 many of those who supported Peel within the Tories had

become part of the Liberal Party that Elmore supported.[91] Errington provides a further example of multiple utilisations of a painting to support opposing religious positions; John Rogers Herbert's *The Trial of the Seven Bishops* was used to illustrate the sermons of anti-Catholic Anglicans but similarly it was used at a meeting of the Irish Association to highlight the plight of Catholics in Ireland.[92] The examples of Wilkie's *The Preaching of Knox* and Herbert's *The Trial of the Seven Bishops* should not be considered as isolated and when the notion of bilateral interpretation is applied to Elmore's paintings this allows his works to be neither stationary on reception nor biased in intention.

In 1864 Elmore contributed another nun painting to the R.A.: *Within the Convent Walls*. While there is no image available for this painting, one description makes a conscious decision to convey its message as one of supporting an anti-Catholic or, at least an anti-convent stance:

> The title almost suggests that the nun who is presented as the principal in this picture regrets the step she has taken. She stands within, as we are told, the cloistered precinct, on the verge of the cemetery of the sisterhood. There is a grave at her feet which has been decked with flowers in dear remembrance of some departed sister; and it may be the tenant of this last homestead whom she is mourning. The face is that of a delicate woman who has been bowed by more than her share of worldly suffering. The execution of this picture is everywhere masterly.[93]

According to this description the nun is filled with regret for her choice and the 'cemetery of the sisterhood' could be interpreted to mean the physical location of the nun or the idea that the sisterhood itself is a grave for those who leave the preferred life of the Victorian woman.

There is agreement on the skill of the artist in another review but in this case the subject is treated in a more sympathetic light:

> A sister habited in mournful black, has come in her walk along the smooth gravel path – monotonous and even as her path of life now – to the grave of a friend grown over with flowers and bearing the wreaths of *immortelles*. She may be half envious of the perfect peace thus promised her, or the sweet expression of her face may simply betoken perfect content with the garden and the quiet walk under the melancholy bows of the dark yew trees. This is well suggested by the general quiet harmony of tone of the picture and by the group of nuns who, at least, are not insensible to the pleasures of good company and converse.[94]

In this exegesis the nun is saddened by the memory of her deceased friend but she is also contemplating the tranquillity of eternal peace while content in her own earthly garden of harmony and quietude provided by the sanctuary of the cloister. Other observers reacted by simply describing it as 'a pretty subject' in order to highlight the beauty and youth of the main protagonist in a state of contemplative melancholy. [95] This tension in the numerous paintings by Victorian artists of the solitude and retreat of beautiful, young females to the cloistered life existed not only in terms of religious differences but could further present the convent as usurping the Victorian, male, middle-class paradigm of ideal womanhood.[96] However, apart from this gendered viewing, the cloister itself was an issue of contention.

The idea of the convent and the cloister exerted a certain fascination among English Protestants of the nineteenth century. The secret world behind the wall was viewed with suspicion and derision, as is apparent from the many novels which used the nun and the monk as symbols of Catholic corruption and vice. The Dissolution of the Monasteries by Henry VIII had marked the very practice down as one which was counter to the idea of English Protestantism. Before the Dissolution, monasteries were inhabited by monks who held women for vile purposes and convents were 'no better than brothels of the worst

description.'[97]As for confession, Cobbin in his *Essay On Popery* has this to say: 'the secret interviews, at the confessional, with females of every class and character afford facilities for the indulgences of forbidden propensities, of which the priests have not failed to avail themselves.'[98] The reaction to convents and monasteries was not limited to literature and painting. A Select Committee was established in 1870 to investigate convents and monasteries and the Inquiry in its Report of 1871 outlined the historical position of these Roman Catholic institutions and the laws which applied to them. The Emancipation Act of 1829, under King George, prohibited religious orders and communities of the Roman Catholic Religion binding people by monastic or religious vows and it was 'a misdemeanour, punishable by banishment for life for any man to be admitted into any such religious order or community.'[99] According to the 1871 Report, up until 1832 the idea of convents and monasteries operating as charitable foundations and Roman Catholic charities in general 'were treated by our law as superstitious and void.'[100] The feelings and suspicions of the everyday Protestant Englishman against Roman Catholic cloistered communities was thus reflected in the laws of the land. However, within the Established Church there were those who saw benefit in founding cloisters and indeed argued for their creation under the auspices of the Anglican domain.[101] One argument put forward in support of Sisterhoods was that they had come to be misunderstood due to the 'delinquencies of Rome'.[102] Whatever argument was supported, the reality was that convents grew in number during the period and so continued to attract women interested in the life for multiple reasons.[103] While it is commonplace now to examine convents and the role of nuns from a gendered perspective it must also be remembered that the depiction of the convent in art and literature had a highly charged religious and political context during the Victorian period of which the general public would have been very much aware. This context was one of opposition to the idea of the cloister as a Catholic perversion, support for the idea in terms of a useful tool against the

attraction of the cloister to women who might otherwise convert to Catholicism or, simply, a Catholic belief in the spiritual benefits of the enclosed Religious Orders' self-exclusion from broader society or, as Susan Mumm points out, a 'solution to the problem of superfluous women.'[104] Elmore's convent and monastery paintings may offer support for all these positions and identifies once more his paintings' ability to allow his intention, which I suggest conforms to his pro-Catholic tendency, to be subverted by ambiguities in spectator reception. However, given his uncle's position on the convent life as outlined above it is unlikely that he wished the reception of his work to be one that aligned itself with an anti-Catholic stance.

Elmore had another monastery-based painting that received extremely high praise when it was exhibited in 1856. *The Emperor Charles V at Yuste* (Fig.13) depicts the former Holy Roman Emperor having retired to the monastery at Yuste following abdication from his position as Holy Roman Emperor. Charles was a devout Catholic, was crowned by the Pope and had sought to eradicate Protestantism at its outset by issuing an Edict against Martin Luther in 1521. The Edict branded Luther and his followers as 'political outlaws and ordered his books to be burned.'[105] *The Examiner* described the painting as 'free from fault', and 'there is no picture in the room more stored with quiet thought', 'As a mere combination of colour the work is delightful.'[106] The Emperor is contemplating Titian's *Last Judgement/La Gloria* (Fig. 64) while holding a copy of the Bible and his rosary beads, testifying to his devout Catholicism and his meditation on his own mortality. In the other painting before him is depicted his deceased Empress (Fig. 65).[107] Elmore's representational program for the painting was taken from William Stirling-Maxwell's *The Cloister Life of The Emperor Charles The Fifth* which had been published in London in 1851 and which had previously been depicted by W.M. Egley.[108] The book was Stirling's most popular and was published in multiple editions and languages.[109] Stirling describes how the Emperor, shortly before he

died, called for the image of his wife and for Titian's *La Gloria* to be brought before him.[110] The seated Charles reminds us of Titian's portrait of the Emperor (Fig. 66) but Elmore chooses to use a black palate for the clothing of the Emperor, the chair on which he sits and the cushion on which he rests his feet. To be able to retain a separation of these colour elements demonstrates a technical approach that justifies the praise Elmore received; *The Art-Journal* commented that it was 'such a repetition which we never remember to have seen before practised with such force of effect – such force as to nearly annihilate the remaining agroupments.'[111] The English fascination with Spain, where the painting is set, during this period is evidenced by the numerous other works featuring Spanish subjects during the same exhibition.[112] It is not surprising that England should have some interest in Spain; it was not so long since British soldiers had been fighting on the Iberian Peninsula, allied with the Spanish and Portuguese, against Napoleonic France, an issue that Elmore would have been aware of given his father's participation in the war. The complexities of the relationships between the two countries would be a deviation from the subject of this thesis but the relationship must be acknowledged. In turning back to the painting it is to Barlow we look for a sustained analysis of the work; Barlow concentrates on the feminine aspect of the picture through the depiction of the Emperor's wife, Isabella, by Titian and the female figure in *La Gloria*, also by Titian.[113] Barlow asserts that the painting concentrates on the image of Mary Magdalene in *La Gloria* to produce a link with Isabella thus allowing the writer to examine the spiritual nature of the female to perform a critique of the contrary nature of both paintings, one depicting his deceased wife as she lived the other depicting the Magdalene as resurrected.[114] However, it must be noted that the painting of Isabella was made after she had died and is thus rather an idealised than a true to life representation, resurrecting the deceased queen in the painted image as the Magdalene is resurrected in *La Gloria*. The *La Gloria* is not shown in its true nature either as the painting measures over 10ft high and almost 8ft wide. It

is seen in its true dimensions in a later painting by Joseph Nicholas Robert-Fleury (Fig. 67) and the side-on view of *La Gloria* that almost obliterates its detail suggests that the link between all three paintings is that which is most obvious – the spiritual contemplation of death and resurrection. In his engagement with the painting, Barlow points to its spiritual aspect, although again in a gendered context, and it is these spiritual links that Elmore is focused on and would want his audience to connect with too. This was the first painting that Elmore had sent to the Royal Academy after the death of his wife and this drives his motivation for the treatment of the contemplative aspect of Charles, his retention of the dark clothes of mourning and the symbolic nature of details within the painting and the presence of a dead wife. Elmore's inclusion of *La Gloria*, in which the Emperor along with his wife and other members of the Imperial family are depicted, is an assertion of the desire for resurrection and Titian's *Isabella* emphasises the transient nature of life at a personal level for both the artist and the Emperor. Looking deeper into the work we find the fallen leaf at the foot of Charles hinting at the autumnal time of his life, as he approaches death, contrasting with the full foliage of the trees beyond the court, the grapes symbolising the union with Christ through the Eucharist and the oranges reminding us of the Virgin.[115] The parrot, which seems out of place in such a solemn setting, is also symbolically loaded; drawing on an 'old idea of conception occurring through the ear, through the Word' the bird is thus associated with the Immaculate Conception. [116] Elmore was not unique in introducing the parrot as a symbol associated with the Virgin: Jan van Eyck had one in his *Virgin and Child with Canon van der Paele* (1436) as had Hans Baldung in *Madonna with the Parrots* (1533), Sebald Beham with *The Virgin and Child with the Parrot* (1549) and Peter Paul Rubens, *Holy Family with Parrot* (c.1630). The parrot located so near to Charles' ear reminds us of this symbolic relationship and thus refers the viewer to Mary and her role as intercessor with

Christ: Elmore's use of Marian symbols will be also evident in other works of his to be discussed later in this chapter.[117]

The infirmity of Charles was commented upon by reviewers of Stirling's book and this infirmity would certainly have been a human condition that Elmore had experienced; the artist had endured mental trauma resulting from the early death of his wife in 1854 and his son just one year previously.[118] Elmore had also recently experienced physical trauma as we learn from a letter from Frith to the cotton manufacturer and art collector, Thomas Miller, informing us that Elmore had endured an accident in late 1852 that resulted in the artist being 'on his back for six weeks' and unable to move his knee for at least a month.[119] It is to be assumed that this was in addition to the neuralgia from which he suffered throughout his adult life.[120]

Looking beyond the personal and direct religious references contained within the painting there is also the context of Charles' relationship with England in his own lifetime. That revolved around his defence of Catholicity against Protestantism, his aunt's marriage and divorce from Henry VIII and his alliances with Henry against France and Suleiman II. Later, Henry would form an alliance with Francis I of France against Charles; Francis had shifted from tolerance of Protestantism to outright persecution, Henry was initially a devout Catholic and Charles had his own conflicts with the Papacy. Even after the Act of Supremacy Henry allied himself with Charles against France during the Italian War of 1542-46. The complications and switching of allegiances during the period in which these monarchs and the Emperor reigned echo those circumstances that prevailed during the setting of Elmore's Guelph and Ghibelline painting. This history displayed not only the source of the divisions between the two religions and the Papacy but also identified the alliances and contradictions of religious intolerance in the past. In its review of Stirling's book, *The Morning Chronicle* referred to Charles' tolerance of heresy while pointing out his contradictory bigotry only then

to excuse this as being 'in strict accordance with the feelings of his age.'[121] This sentimental treatment in the press is effectively enhanced in Elmore's painting as the melancholia appeals to the sentiment of the viewer rather than the negative passion of religious bias; *Aris's Birmingham Gazette* asserted that the painting was 'full of tender feeling' while elsewhere it was the painting's 'truthful representation of the declining and feeble state of the aged monarch' and the depiction of Charles in his final days as 'powerful' which combine to suggest a reimagining of Charles as a man of his times seen through the soft focus of Victorian sentimentality.[122]

Elmore's painting is no doubt a tour de force in terms of execution and this was acknowledged when it was exhibited; however the technical and pictorial excellence of the work is just a part of its agenda. As with other of his works examined here, there is again the context it creates by reminding the Protestant, Victorian viewer of the long history of conflict between Rome and Protestantism while simultaneously subverting this conflict through the redemption of Charles for the Protestant spectator in the present, as demonstrated by Stirling's book and the reception that it received and also by the positive response to Elmore's depiction of Charles. It will be seen later when we view depictions of Mary Queen of Scots and Elizabeth of Hungary that this revision and reimagining of Catholics of the past appears to become a fascination for the Victorian audience. A space existed that allowed for a sympathetic view of Catholicism alongside that which demonised Romanism and it is evident that Elmore's paintings recognised this and that other prominent figures could also find sympathetic and rational motives for accepting Catholicism.

The rise in converts from highly regarded individuals such as John Henry Newman to the villagers of Abington demonstrated that fluidity between beliefs could exist in nineteenth-century England.[123] Elmore's referencing of similar historical fluidities such as the Guelph and Ghibelline conflict and Charles V's sympathetic reception in the contemporary press, in

terms of Elmore's painting and Stirling-Maxwell's biography, reflected the uncertainties and anxieties about the religious changes taking place in nineteenth-century England. Elmore's ability to animate the past's debates around issues of difference and likeness rather than discrimination and exclusion, identified for the viewer the religious instabilities that were impacting on his society while pointing to the unities possible through acceptance of difference rather than the conflicts that arise from forced conformity or rejection. In Elmore's approach to his work and in his use of recognisable text to accompany it he operated in a neutral space between two conflicting positions and chose to provide the viewer with instances that recalled this neutrality and tolerance rather than standing for anti-Catholicism as his reputation would nonetheless suggest.

Paintings such as *Controversy* and *The Novice*, as have been seen, show the opposite of an anti-Catholic bias. Moreover, there are many other works by Elmore which fall in to the category of religious paintings that are overtly sympathetic to the Catholic faith or, at the least, call on the viewer to see the Catholic subjects as non-threatening and in a sympathetic light.

Elmore's earliest painting at the Royal Academy, listed as *Subject from an Old Play*, for which there is no image available, was shown in 1834 but he would not exhibit there again until 1840. He did, however, continue to exhibit works in England and sent four paintings which were shown at the British Institution. Of the four paintings sent by Elmore to the Institution two were unapologetically religious in their choice of subject: *Christ Crowned with Thorns* and *The Crucifixion*; again we have no images for these paintings. In the Manchester Exhibition of 1878 there is listed a work by Elmore, on loan from Mr. F. W. Hooper who sold a large collection of paintings in 1880, including Elmore's *Rienzi*, called *The Crucifixion* (*Early*).[124] As this is identified as 'Early' we must assume that it is *Christ Crowned with Thorns* exhibited in 1837, according to *The Art-Journal*, which distinguishes it

from *The Crucifixion* of 1839.[125] The only other indications of the destination of these two religious paintings come from *The Art-Journal* that states the later painting went to a Roman Catholic church in Dublin, along with *The Martyrdom of Thomas á Becket*.[126] The later *Crucifixion* was said to have been influenced by Van Dyck's *The Dead Christ* (Fig. 68), whether a copy or an original, owned by Elmore's father.[127] The altar painting in St. Andrew's Catholic Church, Westland Row, Dublin conforms to the description given in *The Art-Journal*, and other papers that reviewed it, only in so far as it is a descent from the cross. St. Andrew's is also the location of *The Martyrdom*. It is, though, unlikely that the *Descent from the Cross* in this Dublin church is that by Elmore. *The Freeman's Journal* tells us that both Mary and the Magdalene in Elmore's painting have their faces obscured from view; this is not the case in the altar painting in St. Andrew's.[128] Further, the altar painting in the church has been attributed to J.S. Beschey (Fig. 13).[129] *The Crucifixion* was shown at the Royal Hibernian Academy in June of 1840 and when it was reviewed in *The Freeman's Journal*, it was given the title *Christ Crucified*, and described as 'one of the principal pictures in the room both in point of size, execution and design.'[130] The painting, along with *The Martyrdom* toured Ireland after the R.H.A. exhibition, visiting Limerick and Cork and returning to Dublin where it was shown at the Royal Irish Institution.[131] A fee of one shilling was charged per visit but it seems that there was generosity shown on the part of the exhibition organisers as one could revisit once one had signed a book of registration.[132] Even if there is no way of confirming the location of *The Crucifixion* or *Christ Crowned with Thorns* we can say with certainty that they were religious works done with a Catholic audience in mind due to their extensive tour in Ireland and that *The Martyrdom* would surely have not been purchased by O'Connell and given to St. Andrew's if the artist was intending that his paintings be associated with an anti-Catholic statement or if the artist was anti-Catholic in his own beliefs.

All of the paintings discussed so far in this chapter have highly charged images that address major themes using recognisable public imagery. Elmore also had an interest in depicting the simple ritual of Catholicism and even demonstrated an awareness of an Irish context in his works. Some of these paintings were exhibited in the R.A., some were not. Many of his paintings while not overtly religious in their subject and mistaken for simple narrative depictions of everyday life carried titles drawn from Biblical passages. *Two Women shall be Grinding at the Mill* (Fig. 14) comes from *Matthew 24*, *A Hewer of Wood and a Drawer of Water* (no image available) comes from *Joshua*, *That which ye have Spoken in the Ear in closets shall be Proclaimed upon the Housetops* (Fig. 59) comes from *Luke 12* and, of course, his 'Judith' paintings are based on the biblical book of the same name.

It is important to consider that representations of Judith had, since the Reformation, become a loaded image in terms of Catholic and Protestant stances. Elmore painted at least two Judiths for the Royal Academy, in 1869 and 1871; both paintings coincided with other Orientalist paintings contributed by Elmore to the Exhibition. Ubiquitous throughout the history of art, the image of Judith maintained a presence during the nineteenth-century in drama, music and painting; and Britain was no exception to this continuation.[133] Such was the awareness of Judith as a subject that *The Graphic* was driven to say 'Judith has been, perhaps, too often painted', but this did not deter artists such as Edward Poynter, (Grosvenor Gallery 1881), John Rogers Herbert, (Royal Academy Exhibition 1863 and 1876), and Edwin Long, (R.A. Exhibition 1884), in addition to Elmore's two paintings.[134] Judith had been adopted at different points in time to fit differing agendas but there can be no doubt that her position as a prefiguration of Mary was accepted prior to the Reformation and that this understanding of her status was highlighted and reinforced by the Catholic hierarchy as Judith became part of the arsenal of the Catholic Church to counter the Reform movement.[135] The use of Judith as an exemplar of Marian devotion was a key aspect of the Church's utilisation of her image to

secure lineage of Church dogma regarding Mary which ran counter to and conflicted with Protestant belief.[136] Judith could also be adapted to suit nationalist themes and this may have been the case for William Etty when he created his triptych, 1827-31, and her multiple roles as virgin, femme fatale and pious widow have been well documented and allow for multiple interpretations.[137] There can be little doubt that she retained purchase as a Marian icon in the nineteenth-century; when John Rogers Herbert's first attempt at Judith was exhibited at the R.A. in 1863 one reviewer made a deliberate reference to the artist's Catholicism in the context of the painting, while another made a suggestion that the subject was more suited to Elmore, perhaps urging him to paint Judith six years later, and Herbert's second treatment of the theme in 1876 was designated as a 'sacred subject'.[138] After Elmore's death, when Poynter's *Judith* was exhibited at the Grosvenor Gallery, his painting of Judith was described as that of a scriptural heroine much superior to Poynter's version.[139] Judith's status within the Catholic Church in England is reinforced by Hubert Parry's oratorio *Judith* commissioned in 1887 and performed in 1888.[140] Cardinal Newman and Henry Fitzalan-Howard, the Duke of Norfolk and President of the Birmingham Musical Festival for which the oratorio was written, were the principal guests at the oratorio's premier, suggesting that Parry's *Judith* was an important statement of Catholic belief.[141] The Duke of Norfolk was one the most prominent Roman Catholics at the time and is thought to have played a major role in Newman being created Cardinal.[142] The imagery used to portray Judith does not suggest that she needed to be depicted in a sympathetic light to adhere to a Marian reading; this is accomplished by awareness of the *Book of Judith* and by the expected familiarity of her previous depictions to British artists travelling to the Continent and in particular to Italy where they would have been exposed to her in the galleries and churches of Florence and Rome. Both of Elmore's paintings adhere to the Biblical narrative but his second Judith painting (Fig. 70) shows a more active Judith. Elmore's 1871 Judith illustrates the moment

between her resistance against Holofernes, and thus the preservation of her virginity, and her decapitation of the tyrant. This resistance and overcoming of evil is one of the many equivalences between the Old Testament Judith and the BVM of the New Testament. Such Marian themes are continued in some of Elmore's smaller paintings.

Supplication (Fig. 31) was painted in 1850 and was shown at the Cork International Exhibition in 1902. The painting shows a young woman deep in contemplation as she prays kneeling at her bedside, pallid faced and dressed in virginal white, her eyes cast imploringly towards heaven. Her engagement in deep, reflective prayer both echoes Judith's Biblical role and anticipates Elmore's revisiting directly the heroine as a Marian exemplar. [143] A similar, but more overtly Catholic painting, is *Portrait of a Girl Saying the Rosary* (Fig. 71). The face of the subject is pale, as in *Supplication*, and the palate of the dress differs only in the use of a light blue hem, a mixture of colour associated with the Virgin.[144] The thurible hanging nearby is closely linked with Catholic ritual and suggests the setting is an ecclesiastical one, (*Martyrdom* features a thurible prominently), and, finally, the title and presence of the rosary beads themselves are clear indicators of the sympathies of the artist in his attempt to depict a Catholic in a non-threatening and sympathetic light. *Portrait of a Girl Saying the Rosary* along with his other paintings of this type almost deliberately follow Thackeray's instructions for painting *good* Catholic art – heads tilted to one side, solemn simpers, censers and a virginal demeanour although Elmore uses a more subdued palette than Thackeray recommends.[145] Thackeray's 'good' Catholic art is described in tones of irony in an attack on the P.R.B. but this is coloured by his anti-Catholic stance, as we see from his *The Irish Sketch Book*, especially his attack on convents in Cork; nonetheless, it reiterates that Elmore's art conforms in some respects to an expectation of what Catholic art should look like.[146] A further painting featuring a rosary in a central position is a one that was sold at auction in 1974. *Lost in Thought* (Fig. 72) again depicts a young woman deep in contemplation in the

presence of her beads as if they have acted as an aid to her spiritual meditation. The use of the rosary in so many of Elmore's paintings that feature young participants in an appealingly sympathetic representation is especially important in viewing the artist's work as amenable to the Catholic faith rather than implicitly anti-Catholic. The practice of reciting the rosary had a particular resonance with Irish Catholics after the mid-nineteenth century as the religion was reinvigorated after Emancipation and was extremely popular as a form of devotion amongst English Catholics following the removal of sanctions against it.[147] Thomas Chisolm Anstey, M.P. for Youghal, a convert to Catholicism and supporter of O'Connell and Emancipation, spoke at length during the second reading of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill before the House in 1847 when he pointed out that it was high treason 'even to import into this realm, or use within it, any rosary' and that the removal of the penalty of high treason and associated punishments by the Customs Acts of 1824 still allowed for fines and punishments to be imposed.[148] In literature of the time the rosary was a particular target for those authors that were openly anti-Catholic in their writing; Catherine Sinclair, via characters in her novel *Beatrice*, described the rosary as 'trash' and in doing so Sinclair attempts to remove any intellectual approach to piety by its dependence on thoughtless repetition.[149] The links between the rosary and Catholic Mariology was a central difference between the faiths and the dangers inherent in depictions of such images might be viewed as contrary to all that Sinclair stood for in her opposition to Mary, the rosary and followers of such traditions that could lead to conversions and, eventually, the convent. The positive reception that *Beatrice* received from the press, as evident from the testimonies reprinted in the 1854 edition of the novel, suggests that a supportive representation of such a despised Catholic practice such as depicted in Elmore's painting implies that his works ran contrary to anti-Catholic bias prevalent in the literature of the period in their representation of the rituals of Marion devotion in an unthreatening and benign manner. Carol Engelhardt Herringer's survey and

discussion of Mariology during the nineteenth century suggests that Catholics, after Emancipation, used their different views of Mary as a means of 'assert[ing] their identity' and that Wiseman actively encouraged Marian devotion and that the rosary would have been an essential part of his program.[150]

Anti-Catholicism, as we have already noted, was not just a nineteenth-century phenomenon but was ever present from the period of the Reformation in Britain; and Elmore represented such historical realities. A watercolour by Elmore, auctioned in 2004 in Ireland, shows a mother and daughter offering up a young child to a wayside cross; *Allegorical* (Fig. 73) reminds us of the devotion Catholics maintained by secreted sites of worship; and this was especially true in Ireland during the Penal Period when mass rocks were identified in woods and secret locations by crosses and other religious symbols. *The Priesthole* (Fig. 74) illustrates an English reaction to the Penal Laws, where we see a room being entered by soldiers dressed in costume suggesting the event may possibly be taking place during the Cromwellian period but certainly during the civil war years from 1642-51.To the left of the open door we see a panel slightly ajar on the wall covered by a painting. The fallen chair and items strewn on the floor portray how close the priest had been to being captured. *Peveril of the Peak*, a novel by Sir Walter Scott and the source for another painting by Elmore, features just such a secret panel in Martindale Castle. These secret panels were popular in Catholic castles and houses of the seventeenth century and were used by Catholics to conceal priests within the walls of buildings not only in England but also in Ireland.[151] A painting by Rebecca Solomon, sister of the Royal Academician, Abraham Solomon, illustrates the use of a hidden compartment during the Civil War but on this occasion a Royalist is being sheltered by a sympathetic Puritan.[152] The discovery in Elmore's painting has led to the distress of the lady of the house and her servant while a male, perhaps also Catholic, leaps to defend her. The soldiers might well have come upon a Catholic marriage ceremony. In all these works

the subjects emanate a simple and pure devotion linked with their religious ritual and symbolism. It is difficult to identify these works as being anti-Catholic in nature and thus it is evident that the artist would not have had an agenda to depict Catholicism in a manner that sought to respond to Victorian, anti-Catholic propaganda by supporting it.

In what might be termed his final religious paintings to be shown at the Royal Academy, Elmore exhibited in 1873 *After the Expulsion* and *Saint Elizabeth of Hungary,* both now lost. *Saint Elizabeth* had a quote from Charles Kingsley's early play *The Saint's Tragedy* attached to it, 'Ah, God! What's here? A new crusader's cross.'[153] Shirley Brooks, the editor of *Punch,* liked Elmore's *After the Expulsion*. He called it 'Eve', and was particularly taken by the realism of Eve and her 'fine legs'.[154] He also liked *Saint Elizabeth*, mistakenly recording it as a scene from 'a saint's progress' even suggesting that Elmore invite Kingsley to view it.[155] Kingsley had written *The Saint's Tragedy* in 1848, twenty-five years before Elmore's painting, in the midst of the religious upheavals outlined earlier in this chapter. In his preface to the play Frederick Denison Maurice stated that the subject was 'certainly a dangerous one, it suggests questions which are deeply interesting at the present time.'[156] *The Athenaeum*, edited by Frederick Denison Maurice amongst others, made clear that the incident depicted in Elmore's painting is known from Kingsley's play and points to the introduction by the artist of a symbol that had an accepted cultural status as a Marian signifier – namely a lily-pot.[157] We have no image of the painting but this intervention by Elmore into the narrative contravenes the notion that the painting was supportive of Kingsley's ideology and intention for the book. Kingsley in his introduction to the play is unapologetically anti-Catholic and uses the work as an attack on the cloistered life of both male and female as an affront to the Christian duty of family and states that he would deem his play to have been a success if it "shall cause one Englishman honestly to ask himself, 'I, as a Protestant, have been accustomed to assert the purity and dignity of the offices of husband, wife, and parent. Have

I ever examined the grounds of my own assertion? Do I believe them to be as callings from God, spiritual, sacramental, divine, eternal? Or am I at heart regarding and using them, like the Papist, merely as heaven's indulgences to the infirmities of fallen man?"[158] Elmore's introduction of the lily, as with his use of the parrot, rosary and other Catholic ritual symbols associated with Mariology counters this stance rather than offering it support.

As we have seen, Elmore had earlier in his career painted *The Novice Monk* and would follow this, in 1849, with *Religious Controversy*, both of which were almost contemporary with the initial publication of *The Saint's Tragedy* and were not anti-Catholic in nature. It seems unlikely that Elmore intended his painting of Elizabeth to be a reflection of the anti-Catholic manner of Kingsley's play and more likely a reflection on the life of the saint in the manner of his other religious paintings by linking Elizabeth with Catholic Marian devotion. At the time Elmore painted his *Elizabeth* he had embraced a wide selection of differing subjects and had moved on from the Italian influences of his earlier works. Although there is no doubt that Elizabeth of Hungary could be depicted and interpreted in an anti-Catholic manner, such as had been the case with the later work by Philip Calderon, 1891 (Fig. 75), Elmore's Irish and Catholic connections would militate against him wishing to be seen as an advocate of Kingsley's anti-Irish and anti-Catholic prejudices. Reviewers, with the exception of *The Athenaeum*, did not seem to make any association between Elmore's painting and Kingsley's play and limited their comments to the composition, colour and expression and retaining their greater attention for *After the Expulsion*.[159]

Paintings regarding the theme of Elizabeth and more contemporary with *The Saint's Tragedy* came from members or associates of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood; Charles Allston Collins (Fig. 76), James Collinson (Fig. 77), Dante Gabriel Rossetti (Fig. 78&78a) and John Everett Millais(Fig.79) all depicted the saint in differing media and scale but none of the representations identify with Kingsley's attacks on either the character of Conrad, Elizabeth's

Confessor, or on Elizabeth herself for her rejection of the world. The P.R.B. paintings conform very much to the expectation of their work during this early stage of their development, aligned in the eyes of critics with Romanism or at the least High Anglican tendencies.[160] Jan Marsh has suggested that for the P.R.B. artists Elizabeth was 'something of a saintly heroine'; their treatment of the subject seems to align with Elmore's version of Elizabeth without the stylistic convergence required for Elmore to be associated with the P.R.B. inclinations.[161] Although the quote attached to Elmore's painting by Graves in his catalogue listing when it was exhibited at the Royal Academy is from Kingsley's play, it has its roots in earlier works such as Montalembert's *Life of Elizabeth of Hungary*. The incident depicted by Elmore was described by one reviewer, who named the painting *St. Elizabeth of Hungary finds the Crusader's Cross in her Husband's Purse*, as recounting the incident given in 'the old legend' thereby bypassing Kingsley and going directly to Montalembert's source material.[162]

The pathos associated with the historical incident of Elmore's picture is more likely to have been portrayed by Elmore in a fashion that reflected his tendency towards 'pathetic and passionate drama' rather than Calderon's stark and austere version of Elizabeth's renunciation and that the image's appeal to a sympathetic view of the saint is isolated from the object of Kingsley's attack, Conrad, Elizabeth's confessor; it is only with the Philip Calderon image that we see Elizabeth as an object to be pitied under the unfeeling eye of Conrad.[163] Allston Collins depicts a young, devout Elizabeth at the door of a church, Collinson illustrates the same incident as that of Calderon but his painting is more in keeping with Collinson's Pre-Raphaelite style and, given Collinson's devout Catholicism, it would be difficult to align his painting with Kingsley's version of Elizabeth.[164] Solomon Hart also treated the theme of Elizabeth in 1861 with a 'fine historical picture' of the saint distributing alms.[165] It is the Calderon version that conflates with the intent of Kingsley's play. When it

was being purchased for the national collection efforts were made to prevent the purchase due to the offence the painting gave to Catholics.[166] Although there does not seem to have been any intention on Calderon's part to link the painting with Kingsley directly, visually it does support the author's anti-Catholic bias. The uproar which surrounded Calderon's painting and its perceived anti-Catholic bias was absent from criticism of Elmore's work and the other artists that depicted the same subject.

Reviewers of Elmore's painting, such as the *The Graphic* which focused on the dramatic intensity of Elmore's *Elizabeth*, *The Morning Post* which saw it as 'powerful' and *The London Daily News* that identified the moment as 'pathetic', signal an emotional response to his depiction of the legendary event.[167] It may well have been the case for Elmore that his depiction of Elizabeth and her husband Louis in a moment of intense emotion sought to appeal to the same mindset that had seen the rehabilitation of the figure of Mary Queen of Scots in spite of her Catholicism, due to her embodiment of a romantic ideal in Walter Scott's novels and the historical biographies that appeared during the period.[168] Depictions of Mary appealed to the sentiment of the viewer and this is evident in Elmore's portrayals of the doomed Queen. The *ILN* review of Elmore's 1877 painting of the Queen with Lord Darnley is full of emotive language that directs the viewer to a sympathetic and 'soul-full' engagement with Mary; *The Athenaeum* also emphasised the sentimentality of the painting describing it as 'an unusually successful picture of a subject thoroughly in keeping with the artist's taste for pathetic and passionate drama.'[169] Elmore decorated her with a crucifix hanging from her neck thus ensuring that the Mariology of the BVM was linked to the Queen even to the extent that *The Art-Journal* felt comfortable suggesting that Elmore, like others, was a 'Mariolater', a term with strong Catholic connotations regardless of its possible links to idolising Mary Queen of Scots.[170] Nonetheless, from the many reviews that praised the painting it is evident that the subject was regarded with sympathy.

Elmore came to the theme of Mary Queen of Scots late in his career, much later than his associates Ward, O'Neil and Frith. His first painting of Queen Mary at the R.A. (Fig. 80) was not very well received other than for its technical treatment of colour, costume and historical accuracy.[171] It may have been the case that Mary had begun to lapse as a favoured subject by artists at this point in the nineteenth-century as there had been a hiatus in the almost continual presence of the Queen and scenes connected with her story from 1872 until Elmore reintroduced her to the walls of the Academy in 1875 with *Mary Queen of Scots with Christopher Norton at Bolton Castle,* a lengthy three year gap considering the almost ever present status she had as a subject since the early nineteenth-century. The revisioning of Mary and her popularity during the nineteenth century as an artistic trope arises only as a result of her being positioned as a subject that arouses both sensitivities in the viewer and as a counter to the image of Elizabeth I, who did not fit into the Victorian ideal of a romantic and tragic heroine as comfortably as Mary.[172] St. Elizabeth of Hungary and Mary Queen of Scots are depicted by Elmore as just such tragic heroines, conforming to a Victorian expectation of the idealised female role that allowed their religious beliefs to be subsumed into an acceptable and revised exposure of Catholicity in a sympathetic light, much as the image of a feeble Charles V moderates perceptions of the Emperor. Such a view integrates in a continual and conforming way with Elmore's depiction of females demonstrating clear, Catholic orientation engaged in rituals which were in conflict with Protestant beliefs but placed above religious rebuttal via their rendering within an appeal to the viewer's sympathy rather than an anti-Catholic impulse and thus allowing the paintings and the artist to escape accusations of anti-Catholic bias.

[1] *The Cork Examiner*, April 7, 1862, 2, May 17, 1862, 1.
[2] Ibid. October 2, 1861,2, *The Cork Examiner*, December 7, 1860, 3, February 1, 1861, 2 and May 21, 1862, 2
[3] Ibid. April 12, 1862, 2. Albert and Elmore both attended meetings of the Cork Literary and Scientific Society, *Examiner*, October 5, 1866, 4.
[4] *The Tablet*, May 5, 1849, 13; *The Art-Journal*, 1868, 156.
[5] *The Daily News*, December 16, 1854, 1.
[6] *The Times*, January 31, 1881, 10.
[7] Diana Maltz, *British Aestheticism and the Working Classes, 1870-1900: Beauty for the People*, (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 101-109.
[8] John Wigley, *The Rise and Fall of the Victorian Sunday*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980), 37-8.
[9] Denis. G. Paz, *Popular Anti-Catholicism in Mid-Victorian England*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992), 6.
[10] Brian Girvin, 'Making Nations: O'Connell, Religion and the Creation of Political Identity.', in *Daniel O'Connell: Political Pioneer*, ed. Maurice R. O'Connell, (Dublin: Institute of Public Administration, 1991), 23- 32. Girvin examines the issues around the veto and the stances taken by the Catholic hierarchy and its effects on the rise of a call for the repeal of the Act of Union.
[11] Ibid.
[12] Bernard Ward, *The Eve of Catholic Emancipation: Being the History of the Catholic Church in England, etc*., (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1911), 77-82.
[13] Girvin, 27.
[14] Bernard Ward, 'John Milner', in *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, Vol. 10, eds., Charles G. Herbermann, Edward A. Pace, Condé B. Pallen, et al.,(New York: Robert Appleton, 1911), 315-17.
[15] Ibid. A summary of the main points of *End of Religious Controversy* is by Milner given in *Vindication, etc.*, (Philadelphia: 1825), 11-5.
[16] *The Ipswich Journal*, November 29, 1845, 3, *Illustrated London News*, June 3, 1843, 16, *Dublin Weekly Nation*, October 11, 1845, 1, *Dublin Weekly Register*, December 5, 1846, 2.
[17] Paz, *Popular Anti-Catholicism*, 6.
[18] Edward Robert Norman, *The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), 1.
[19] Norman, *Anti-Catholicism in Victorian England*, (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1968), 53-5. D.O. Hunter-Blair, 'Nicholas Patrick Wiseman', in *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, Vol. 15, eds., Charles G. Herbermann, Edward A. Pace, Condé B. Pallen, et al., (New York: Robert Appleton, 1912), 670-74.
[20] Norman, *Anti-Catholicism*, 55.
[21] Quoted in Paz, *Popular Anti-Catholicism*, 9, n.33.
[22] *The Times*, October 14, 1850, 4.
[23] Michael J. Walsh, *The Westminster Cardinals*,(London: Continuum, 2008), 18.
[24] This is especially true in the case of depictions of nuns. For an expanded discussion on this theme see Casteras 'Virgin Vows', 157-184.
[25] Walsh, 20.
[26] Norman, *Anti-Catholicism*, 56.
[27] Paz, 9-10.
[28] Catholicism would expand in England and conversions would take place on a large scale. Evidence can be found of this in a newspaper report from *The Dundalk Democrat and People's Journal*, October 21, 1865, 3. Discussing the opening of a new Catholic church in Abingdon, the report points out that when the site for the church had been chosen six years previously there was 'not a single Catholic family living in the borough of Abington' 'but so earnestly was the work of the mission…the flock now numbers between two and three hundred while the schools are attended by one hundred children. The vast majority of the congregation are converts'.
[29] Paz, 54-66.
[30] Norman, *Anti-Catholicism*, 14-15.

[31] Wilfrid Philip Ward, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, Vol. 1,(London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1897), 220, quoted in Norman, *The English Catholic Church*, 8. *The Rambler: A Catholic Journal and Review*, (London: Burns and Lambert, 1858), Vol. 10, 11-27.
[32] J.H. Pollen, 'Gordon Riots', in *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, Vol. 6, eds., Charles G. Herbermann, Edward A. Pace, Condé B. Pallen, et al., (New York: Robert Appleton, 1909), 649-51.
[33] Norman, *The English Catholic Church*, 8-9.
[34] Diana Peschier, *Nineteenth-Century Anti-Catholic Discourses: The Case of Charlotte Brontë*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 91.
[35] For a comprehensive discussion and bibliography of pamphlets and serialisations see Paz.
[36] Frank Neal, 'The Irish in Nineteenth Century Britain: Integrated or Assimilated', in *Les Immigrants et la Ville: Insertion, Integration, Discrimination (XIIe – XXe siècles),* ed. Denis Menjot and Jean-Luc Pinol, (Paris: L'Harmattan 1996), 119-37.
[37] *Report of the Committee for the Relief of the Distressed Districts in Ireland*: *Appointed at a General Meeting Held at the City of London Tavern, on the 7th of May 1822*, (London: William Phillips, 1823), 95-6. The date of Richard Elmore's arrival in Clonakilty, 1807, coincides with a growth in linen sales and markets around Clonakilty; David Dickson, *Old World Colony: Cork and South Munster 1630-1830*, (Cork: Cork University Press, 2005), 396-7. However, Dickson makes no reference to Elmore or his role in this growth. Donnelly points to the rapid decline of the linen and cotton industry in West Cork during the late 1820s, the period when Richard Elmore's linen factory went into decline prior to his return to London; James S. Donnelly Jr., *The Land and the People of Nineteenth-Century Cork: The Rural Economy and the Land Question*, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975), 19.
[38] See En. 3 Chapt.2, *Third Report from the Select Committee on Emigration from the United Kingdom*, 1827, 464-6.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Ibid. see also Neal, op.cit.
[41] Paz, 54.
[42] *The Spectator*, July 3, 1852, 2.
[43] Elmore, *Letters to the Right Hon. The Earl of Darnley.* Elmore wrote to Darnley offering both moral and economic reasons for supporting Catholic Emancipation and it is clear from the collected letters that he was a very strong supporter of the cause. Dealing directly with the impact of wage rates Elmore states: 'Either the condition of the Irish working class must be bettered in their own country or they will bring down the condition of the working classes of society in England and Scotland to the level of their own misery.', *Letters*, 6.
[44]Errington, *Social and Religious Themes in English Art 1840 – 1860*.
[45] The attitude to the cloistered life and nuns in general during the period will be addressed further when discussing *The Novice Nun*, below.
[46] Barlow, '*The Backside of Nature'*, 216-48.
[47] Frith mentions the group briefly in his *My Autobiography,* 1888, 44. John Imray in 'A Reminiscence of Sixty Years Ago' says that *The Clique* operated from 1837 to 1842.
[48] Barlow, 228.
[49] Ibid. 376-7.
[50] Ibid. 216.
[51] Ibid. 226-6.
[52] *The Tablet*, May 5, 1849, 13.
[53] *Lady's Newspaper*, May 19, 1849, 271.
[54] *Illustrated London News*, May 26,1849, 356.
[55] Ibid.
[56] Quoted in Louis O'Brien, 'The Huguenot Policy of Louis XIV and Pope Innocent XI', *The Catholic Historical Review*, 17, 1931, 29-42.
[57] Norman, *Anti-Catholicism*, 14, Paz, 66, *The Tablet*, 13.
[58] Norman, *Anti-Catholicism*, 13.
[59] *The Art-Journal*, 1868, 156.
[60] Norman, *Anti-Catholicism*, 107.
[61] David Howarth, *The Invention of Spain: Cultural Relations between Britain and Spain 1770-1870*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press,2007), 60.
[62] Errington, 137-8.

[63] Elmore, *Letters*, 27-30. The debate proceedings were also published in pamphlet form as: *Authenticated Report of the Discussion which took place between the Rev. Richard T.P. Pope and the Rev. Thomas Maguire in the Lecture room of the Dublin Institution on the 19th, 20th, 21st, 23rd, 24th and 25th of April, Dublin,1827*, (Dublin: R. Coyne, 1827).
[64] *The London Evening Standard*, July 10, 1835, 3, carried and commented on his open letter to Protestant clergy '…to try the case of the Church of England versus Popery…' in a debate in London or Manchester. *The Morning Post*, May 28, 1838, 3, reports of another impending debate. As to his relationship with O'Connell, besides his chairing of the Dublin debate, Maguire attended O'Connell's Repeal Dinner in Dublin, reported in *The London Evening Standard*, September 21, 1844, 3-4, and in a scathing attack on O'Connell and his defenders in Ireland the same paper derided such defences stating 'The conductors of these journals [English newspapers] know that petulance and quibbling, vulgarity, perseverance in brazen falsehood [on the part of O'Connell and some Irish newspapers] - in a word Father Tom Maguirism – will not go down in this country whatever may be the case in Ireland.', June 16, 1838, 2. It should be noted that Richard, Alfred's father, had only retired from his position as director of O'Connell's National Bank of Ireland in 1841/2 and that Alfred was a shareholder in the Bank as early as 1836, *Newry Examiner and Louth Advertiser*, August 20, 1836, 2.
[65] *The Literary Gazette and Journal of the Belles Lettres, Arts, Sciences, &c*., London, 1849, 377.
[66] Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan, D.D. and Rev. Robert J. McGhee, A.B., *Romanism as it Rules in Ireland &c*., Vol. 1, (Dublin: Milliken, Grant and Bolton, 1840), 645.
[67] Ibid. 165-7. The reports of the debates and the letters to the press by Maguire and the respondents to these letters were widely circulated in the media; *Romanism as it Rules* provides ample evidence of the widespread, public coverage the episode received.
[68] Graves, Vol. 3, 46.
[69] Jean Charles Léonard de Sismondi, *History of the Italian Republic in the Middle Ages*. Originally published in French over the period 1807-18 and amounting to 16 volumes. Treuttel and Co., London, republished it in 1825, (*Stamford Mercury*, December 2, 1825, 4) This excerpt is taken from the 1832 edition published in English by Carey & Lea, Philadelphia, 69-70.
[70] Sismondi's *History* offers the most detailed analysis of the two factions in so far as it is the most likely to have been read by the artists depicting scenes involving the protagonists during the 19th century.
[71] *The Art-Journal*, 1865, 68.
[72] Ibid. 1843, 172.
[73] Ibid.
[74] Ibid. 1865, 68.
[75] Ibid. 1852, 171.
[76] *The Spectator*, 13, 1840, 452 and *The Polytechnic Journal*, 2, 1840, 463.
[77] William MakepeaceThackeray, *The Works of William Makepeace Thackeray*, Vol. 30, (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1904), 198-200. The French and German art he refers to is most likely the work of the Nazarenes and others who looked to medieval precedence in a similar way to the P.R.B.
[78] Errington, 235-6.
[79] Batchelor, *John Ruskin*, 124-6. Errington, 331-2.
[80] *The Art-Journal*, 1855, 298.
[81] Ibid. 1856, 78-9. It is interesting to note that 'The Origin of the Guelph and Ghibelline Quarrel', 'Religious Controversy in the Time of Louis XIV' and 'The Novice' (Nun) all featured in the 1855 Paris Exhibition, suggesting that there was a common theme between the three works.
[82] Errington, 336, Barlow, 233-4.
[83] Barlow, 234.
[84] Ibid.
[85] Ibid.
[86] Ibid.
[87] The proliferation of 'Nun' paintings throughout the nineteenth century allows for interpretations based on gender and the expectations of the role of the female as well as the religious significations inherent in the subject. A comprehensive list is provided in Casteras, 'Virgin Vows'.
[88] Bridget J. Elliot, 'The Scottish Reformation and English Reform: David Wilkie's *Preaching of Knox* at the Royal Academy Exhibition of 1832', *Art History*, 1984, 313 -328.
[89] Ibid. 319.
[90] Ibid. 321.

[91] John Prest, 'Peel, Sir Robert, second baronet (1788–1850)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. David Cannadine, May 2009, http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.library.ucc.ie/view/article/21764 (accessed December 7, 2016).
[92] Errington, 164-5.
[93] *The Art-Journal*, 1870, 367.
[94] *The Teesdale Mercury*, May 26, 1864, n.p.
[95] *Newcastle Guardian and Tyne Mercury* , May 7, 1864, 2. *Morning Post*, April 30, 1864, 5.
[96] Casteras, 'Virgin Vows',157-84.
[97] Ingram Cobbin, 'Essay on Popery' in *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, (London: Partridge and Oakey), 1848. http://books.google.ie/books/about/Foxe_s_book_of_martyrs_With_notes_by_rev.html?id=Ap8HAAAAQAAJ&redir_esc=y accessed: 03/03/2015, 20:09.
[98] Ibid.
[99] *Report of the Convent Inquiry, 1871*, quoted in Norman, *Anti-Catholicism*, 203. For a debate which was taking place contemporaneously with the exhibition of *The Novice Nun* see *Bath Chronicle and Weekly Gazette*, June 10, 1852, 1-2.
[100] Ibid. 205.
[101] Henry Parry Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, Vol. 3, (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1894), 1-32. Liddon's *Life* in the section referenced records the desire of the Oxford Movement members to initiate a Protestant convent structure in opposition to the Catholic convent life as a means to prevent a loss of congregation to Romanism.
[102] Joseph Masters, *Sisters of Mercy in the Church of England*, (London: Joseph Masters, 1850), 5.
[103] Casteras, 'Virgin Vows',160-1. *The Morning Post*, January 5, 1852, 2, reprinted the 'statistics of the extent of Popish missions in Great Britain from *The Catholic Directory*; in the Archdiocese of Westminster alone there were 10 convents.
[104] Susan Mumm, *Stolen Daughters, Virgin Mothers: Anglican Sisterhoods in Victorian Britain*, (London: Leicester University Press, 1999), xi.
[105] *Britannica Academic*, s.v. 'Martin Luther', accessed December 10, 2016, http://0-academic.eb.com.library.ucc.ie/levels/collegiate/article/108504. *Britannica Academic*, s.v. 'Diet of Worms', accessed December 10, 2016, http://0-academic.eb.com.library.ucc.ie/levels/collegiate/article/77510.
[106] *The Examiner*, (London), June 21, 1856, 390.
[107] Ibid.
[108] Graves, Vol. 3, 47.
[109] *Dictionary of Art Historians*, s.v. 'William Sterling Maxwell', accessed December 10, 2016, http://www.dictionaryofarthistorians.org/maxwellw.htm
[110] William Stirling-Maxwell, *The Cloister Life of the Emperor Charles V*, (London: John W. Parker and Son, 1851), 232.
[111] *The Art-Journal*, 1856, 165.
[112] *The Examiner*, see note 392 above, mentions Philip and a Mr. D.C. Gibson while *The Art-Journal* mentions C. Stanfield as all having had Spanish themed paintings. John Philip was also a member of *The Clique* and was noted for his Spanish paintings after visiting Spain in 1851 and Clarkson Stanfield's work was Spanish within his marine oeuvre.
[113] Barlow, 234-7.
[114] Ibid.
[115] George Ferguson, *Signs and Symbols in Christian Art*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), 31, 35.
[116] Herbert Friedmann, *A Bestiary of Saint Jerome*, (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1980), 281, quoted in Hope Werness, *Continuum Encyclopedia of Animal Symbolism in World Art*, (New York: Continuum, 2006), 317.
[117] Ibid.
[118] *The Examiner*, (London), June 21, 1856, 390.
[119] Frith to Miller, 8 August 1852, R.A.A. 236/42/14.
[120] Elmore to Stacey, see En. 7 Chapt. 2.
[121] *The Morning Chronicle*, November 10, 1852, 3. The book was reviewed extensively in the press after its publication and so the subject depicted would have been well known to the general public along with the sympathetic treatment given to the 16th century defender of Catholicity. Examples of reviews are to be found in the following, although this is not an exclusive list: *Wells Journal*, October 30, 1852, 7, *The Examiner*, October 23, 1852, 3, *Reynolds's Newspaper*, October 24, 1852, 2.

[122] *Aris's Birmingham Gazette*, May 12, 1856, 4, *The Morning Chronicle*, May 5, 1856, 7, *The Illustrated Times*, May, 10, 1856, 7.
[123] See En. 28 Chapt.3.
[124] St. John's Church, *Catalogue of the Fine Art Collection, at the Assembly Room, Free Trade Hall, in Connection with the Bazaar for Church Improvements,* http://www.jstor.org/stable/60239168 accessed 12/12/2016. William Roberts, *Memorials of Christie's : A Record of Sales from 1766 to 1896*, (London: George Bell and Sons, 1897), 313-5.
[125] *The Art-Journal*, 1857, 113- 4.
[126] Ibid. *The Magazine of Art*, 1881, Vol.4, xvii, also lists the Dublin Church as the destination and describes 'The Crucifixion' as 'among the best known of his works'. *The Sunday Times*, January 30, 1881 and the *New York Times,* January 27, 1881 stated that both paintings were 'in a church in Dublin'.
[127] *The Art-Journal*, 1857, 113-4. In 1843, at the Institute of Fine Arts, was exhibited 'A fine picture of a Dead Christ' contributed by Dr. Elmore. The idea that Alfred's work was influenced by the Van Dyck arises from it being referred to in *The Art-Journal*, 1857, 113. We can assume that this idea stems from S.C. Hall who mentions it in his memoirs, *Retrospect*, Vol. 2, 219-20. Alfred Elmore was amongst many living artists to show work at this inaugural meeting, *The Art-Journal*, 1843, 241-2.
[128] *The Freeman's Journal*, November 28, 1840, 2, in which Elmore is said to be in Rome.
[129] The Knight of Glin and J. Peill, *Irish Furniture: Woodwork and Carving in Ireland from the Earliest Times to the Act of Union*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 138-9.
[130] *The Freeman's Journal*, June 10, 1840, 3.
[131] Ibid., November 28th, 1840, 2, *Limerick Reporter*, October 13, 1840, 4. *Southern Reporter and Cork Commercial Courier*, September 5 & 22, 1840, 1. *Dublin Evening Post*, November 26, 1840, 2.
[132] Ibid. Although I credit the organisers, these newspapers credit Elmore with the free re-entry.
[133] For a non-exhaustive but extensive list of works involving Judith and Holofernes see Frank Capozzi, 'Judith and Holofernes: A Chronological List of Works', *Rivista di Studi Italiani*, Vol. 23, No. 2, December, 2010, 248-85.
[134] *The Graphic*, June 3, 1871, 7.
[135] Elena Ciletti, 'Judith Imagery as Catholic Orthodoxy in Counter-reformation Italy', in *The Sword of Judith: Judith Studies Across the Disciplines*, eds. Kevin r. Brine, Elena Ciletti, Henricke Lähnemann, (Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 2010), 345-68.
[136] Ibid.
[137] Denis Farr, *William Etty*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958), 50-1.
[138] *Bath Chronicle and Weekly Gazette*, May 14, 1863, 8, *Illustrated Times*, May 9, 1863, 10, *Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser*, May 10 1876, 6.
[139] *The Morning Post*, May 2, 1881, 3.
[140] *Bath Chronicle and Weekly Gazette*, November 10, 1887, 6*, Leamington Spa Courier*, September 01, 1888, 4.
[141] Ibid.
[142] [Anon.], 'Howard, Henry Fitzalan-, fifteenth duke of Norfolk (1847–1917)', rev. K. D. Reynolds, in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, eee ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. David Cannadine, May 2006, http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.library.ucc.ie/view/article/34020 accessed December 7, 2016.
[143] *Lancashire Evening Post*, April 4, 1902, 5.
[144] Ferguson, *Signs and Symbols*, 151.
[145] Thackeray, 'On the French School of Painting', *The Paris Sketchbook*, Vol. 1, (London: John Macrone, 1840; New York: Appleton, 1853), 78-9. Citations refer to the Appleton edition.
[146] Thackeray, *The Irish Sketch Book*, Vol. 1,(London: Chapman and Hall, 1845),122 -133.
[147] Cara Delay, 'The Devotional Revolution on the Local Level: Parish Life in Post-Famine Ireland', *U.S. Catholic Historian*, Vol. 22, no. 3, 2004, 43, 55, 57. Mary Heimann, *Catholic Devotion in Victorian England*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 58-69. While Heimann suggests that the rosary was not a novel introduction to the Victorian after Emancipation, it is evident from her discussion on the theme that the growth of Catholic churches impacted upon the public practice of the rosary.
[148] *Evening Mail*, December 10, 1857, 1.
[149] Catherine Sinclair, *Beatrice, or The Unknown Relatives*, Vol. 2, (London: Richard Bentley, 1852), 97, 271-2. The Preface to volume one of Sinclair's three volume work ends with the warning 'Beware of Romanism'. In her book of the same year *Popish Legends or Bible Truths* Sinclair condemns the rosary for its championing of Mary and Catholic Mariology, (London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1852), xxiii.

[150] Carol Engelhardt Herringer, *Victorians and the Virgin Mary: Religion and Gender in England, 1830-1885*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008), 11.
[151] Colin Murphy, *The Priest Hunters*, (Dublin: O'Brien, 2013), 122.
[152] *Illustrated London News*, June 21, 1862, 641.
[153] Graves, Vol. 3, 49.
[154] George Somes Layard, *Shirley Brooks of Punch: His Life, Letters and Diaries*, (New York: Pitman and Sons, 1907), 541, Brooks, *Diary*, 1873, M.S., London Library.
[155] Ibid.
[156] Charles Kingsley, *The Saint's Tragedy, or, The True Story of Elizabeth of Hungary, etc*., (London: John W, Parker ,1848), viii.
[157] *The Athenaeum*, May 10, 1873, 604.
[158] Kingsley, *Tragedy*, xxii.
[159] *The Athenaeum*, May 10, 1873, 603-4. *The Times* did not even mention 'Elizabeth', saving its praise for 'The Expulsion', which it saw as almost the only example at that year's exhibition of as what was considered to be 'the especial province of Academicians', May 3, 1873.
[160] Millais' drawing of Elizabeth is identified by Stephen Ponder, Wightwick Manor as being 'Queen Matilda of Scotland washing the Feet of Pilgrims', http://www.nationaltrustcollections.org.uk/object/1287908 (accessed December 8, 2016). Alastair Grieve has argued for the image being of St. Elizabeth, 'A Notice on Illustrations to Charles Kingsley's 'The Saint's Tragedy' by Three Pre-Raphaelite Artists', *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 111, 1969, 290-1, 293.
[161] Jan Marsh*, Pre-Raphaelite Women*, (London: Phoenix Illustrated, 1998), 36.
[162] Graves admitted to all of the quotations attached to paintings in his catlaogues, *The Royal Academy of Arts*, Vol. 1, viii- ix. Charles Forbes René de Montalembert, *The Life of Saint Elizabeth of Hungary,* trans. Mary Hackett, (Dublin: James Duffy, 1848), 102-3. The book was originally published in French in 1836 and at that time was giving an extremely positive review in *The Dublin Review*, 1837, 384. Montalembert was a supporter of the Emancipation Movement, George Gouay, 'Comte de Montalembert' in *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, Vol. 10, eds., Charles G. Herbermann, Edward A. Pace, Condé B. Pallen, et al., (New York: Robert Appleton, 1911), 513-16. De Montalembert's *Elizabeth* had already been translated by Ambrose Lisle Phillipps into English by 1839. Phillipps had converted to Catholicism and worked to try to reunify the Catholic and Anglican tradition, *Morning Post*, December 24, 1839, 1, *London Daily News*, May 3, 1873, 3.
[163] Quoted in H.C. Richardson, *Academy Criticisms, 1877, A Collection of the Principal Notices and Critiques, etc.*, (London: The Auxiliary Steam Printing Co.), 1877, 75.
[164] *The Morning Chronicle*, May 17, 1852, 5.
[165] *Liverpool Mercury*, September 13, 1861, 6.
[166] *Gloucestershire Echo*, June 18, 1891, 3. A series of letters were also published in *The Times* May 16th, 18th 21st, &c. debating the historical accuracy of Calderon's painting and the offence that it might cause Christians as a whole and not just Catholics.
[167] *The Graphic*, June 7, 1873, 18, *The Morning Post*, May 6, 1873, 6, *The London Daily News*, May 3, 1873, 3.
[168] Strong, *And When Did you last See Your Father?*, 44-5, 131.
[169] Richardson, *Academy Criticisms*, 1877, 75. The incident in the painting is, according to the reviews, taken from Joseph Adolphe Petit's *History of Mary Stuart' Queen of Scots*, trans. Charles De Flandre, (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1874). Petit's account of Mary's life was unapologetically pro- Marian, see his Preface.
[170] *South Wales News*, May 10, 1877, 4, *The Art-Journal*, 1877, 254.
[171] *The Morning Post*, May 18th, 1875, 6, *The Pall Mall Gazette*, May 22nd, 1875, 11.
[172] For a detailed analysis and listing of portrayals of Mary during the period see Roy Strong, *And When did you Last see your Father?,*128-35, 162-3.

Chapter 4

Temporality and Narrative Absence in Elmore's Paintings

As is evident from the differing interpretations of Elmore's paintings by contemporary reviewers, such as those of *The Tuileries* and *Religious Controversy* (Figs. 19&2), the images produced by the artist had no single message and perhaps were intended to be ambiguous. This leads us to question the accepted view of narrative in nineteenth-century British painting as being relatively transparent. Instead, to avoid equivocation, the viewers of these paintings needed to be directed by the artist using clear signposts. It has been argued here that Elmore's religious paintings brought his formative life and familial connections into play in an effort to engage in a didactic but not wholly confrontational discourse around the issues connected with religious debates during the early and mid- nineteenth-century. It can be seen from the differing interpretations of his religious paintings that they could present an ambiguous message if taken in isolation from his biography and if not contextualised within the further examples dealing with similar themes in his oeuvre. In any case, apparently contemporary viewers were inclined to find alternative readings given the opposing interpretations of *Religious Controversy* by an audience that may not have had access to other examples of Elmore's work or knowledge of his life. It has also been argued that certain of his works benefited from his bringing a surface expression of emotion to the fore in his religious paintings and identified responses to his works that relied upon this expression. This chapter will move beyond the desire to correct and establish the biographical context of the artist and the role this may have played in his artistic production. What will be addressed here is how his method of depiction affects or does not affect the reception of his narrative paintings. There is an absence of guided narrative in Elmore's paintings when compared to the accepted mode of narrative transmission in Victorian artistic output. Absence has been asserted as inherent in images and that by their very visibility they 'constitute the presence of an

absence.'[1] The clear construction of a narrative within the enclosed frame is jettisoned by Elmore. This lack of direction aids the viewer in creating and completing an imagined plot based on the initial depicted moment. This moment, separated from an expected chronological trajectory, becomes achronological, in so far as the temporal future of the painting is determined in the imagination of the viewer – an action outside of the frame of the painting. Switching between the represented present, or past, and the non-depicted past; potential futures can be constructed by the viewer freed to create her own narrative. To attend to this assertion it is necessary to compare the approaches to the treatment of narrative, or a particular narrative, by some of Elmore's fellow artists and his divergence from the accepted framing of the imagined, theatrical or historical moment. Elmore's work both recalls traditional artistic theories and anticipates future developments in the use of gesture and expression as a means of extracting emotional responses from the spectator. Vision, the eye and imagination are all in play in Elmore's paintings; these three areas are of immense importance both to the scholarship examining the world of the nineteenth-century and in the world of that period itself. Here we need to define that element which is most important to the discussion at hand: the imagination. The imagination being considered here is not the creative imagination of the artist in her transmission of an idea to a canvas; nor am I interested in the imagination which can define a picture as that which compels the viewer to imagine the depicted in stasis. The imagination does not cease in its imagining of visualising the painted work as being participated with in terms of reifying the fiction of the painting as real in its representation of an event, figure or location.[2] The binary of text and painted representation of an imagined real world happening is more than just fictionally creating in the mind of the viewer what the viewer sees in the painted work.[3] It is the unseen that advances the imagined narrative of the viewer, using the tools of the viewer's vital context. Unlike for Kendall Walton, the meaning of 'Mimesis as Make-Believe' in this discussion is not taken to be that

of believing in and thus imagining in the mind that which is perceived in the painting, mimesis is the origin of make-believe beyond the visibly depicted. The visibly depicted implies the eye performs a function in the imaginary, as it is defined here, but the eye is only a conduit in the process. This is not to devalue the eye as simply a device, as it also plays a role in the imagination in creating a connection between the viewer and the depicted when viewed in conjunction with connectivities within the depicted figures internal to the frame.

Kate Flint performed an important task in examining the role of the eye in Victorian visuality but in her examination of the imagination she does not fully engage with the imagination as a creative internal narrative constructor in the mind of the spectator.[4] However, Flint's statement on the importance of the imagination as 'speculative imaginative, fiction-creating mind, with its capacity for prevision, has the ability to travel backwards and forwards in time' does have major implications for examining Elmore's work.[5] Although this does suggest an interrogation of the creation of an imagined, internal narrative, Flint's most pertinent interrogation of the manner of spectatorship is her discussion of James Sully's investigation of the imagination, but Sully's dual-viewing considers the spectator as vacillating between the distinct and the obscure within the frame.[6] In the cases to be discussed here it is not the distinct and the obscure but the absent that is under examination. As a painter of 'problem pictures', that is pictures that did not have a defined conclusion within the frame, Elmore precedes the period of the late-Victorian era that is addressed by Pamela Fletcher.[7] Flint points out that '[b]y the later decades of the late nineteenth century' easy to read narrative paintings were falling out of favour and preference was being given to paintings that 'left their viewers asking questions about what, exactly, might be happening on the canvas.'[8] Elmore and others, such as John Everett Millais, had produced such 'problem pictures' much earlier and with identifiable impacts on the concept of the imagination as applied to

paintings.[9] The imagination thus requires investigation when addressing issues of spectatorship.

The poet and the scientist are both involved in just such an investigation of the imagination, in that both are concerned with foretelling the consequence of actions, explaining cause and effect and reasoning, from these, what is to logically follow.[10] The claim by John Tyndall that 'Man is prone to idealisation. He cannot accept as final the phenomena of the sensible world but looks behind that world into another which rules the sensible one' does not apply here.[11] The imagined world in the constructed narrative of the spectator's mind is not a revolt against the perceived nor is it a search for mastery over the perceived; it is a liberation from such constrictions of perception and an ownership taking of that which does not exist to create completion. The constraint placed on the spectator as an individual by the reviewers in the press of the period led the Victorian audience towards a completion of narrative in paintings, using the signs and clues as they could be read in the painting, as they did so in literature.[12] A quote by W.P. Bayley is of great relevance in the assertions being made here in terms of the eye, the imagination and their roles in Elmore's paintings, 'For it is not all that is before the outer glass of the eye, but only that which is drawn by consciousness towards the sentient mirror of the brain, that we actually see.'[13] Elmore's approach to narrative paintings challenges the concept that the eye is solely an internal apparatus that operates within a painting. Although this is not neglected by him and will be shown to be highly utilised as a means of communication internal to the depicted event, it also functions as a communicative device with the spectator and the 'mirror of the brain'. What is not being considered here is an attempt to define or redefine the aesthetic experience of looking, what is being suggested, or rather acknowledged as the accepted interpretive criteria, is that viewing narrative paintings involved the consideration of facts presented in painted symbols that allowed them to be read as a visual text and that this text needed completion. The viewer reads the painting

from beginning to end, to its narrative conclusion, directed by the symbols, words and conclusions contained within the frame. Elmore upsets this clear reading by introducing a narrative lacuna in to the work. The viewer's experience is thus expanded beyond the recreation of the depicted narrative in the imaginary and towards the creating of a completed imagined narrative that has not been concluded within the frame. Imagined narrative is not only subservient to the depicted narratives being uncompleted entities; it is also answerable to religious and societal laws. A public lecture delivered in 1862 looked at imagination as being both problematic and liberating; its purpose for mankind served to extend the 'realms of thought beyond his own narrow experience' but it needed to be controlled as it might 'introduce into the mind improper representations'.[14] Again, in terms of artistic production, the liberation, the refusal to 'allow itself to be governed' is part of the subject's freedom.[15] An incomplete narrative was therefore a danger in itself and anchors the demand for narrative to be enclosed within the frame and within defined societal moral expectation or commentary.

Hogarth influenced many of the artists associated with Elmore. Augustus Egg's most famous work, the triptych *Past and Present Nos. 1-3*(Fig. 18) imitates Hogarth in utilising a series of connected paintings each in its own right carrying a completed narrative directed by the symbolic hints and literary references contained within the individual frames. This series of paintings has been variously interpreted as representing the theme of the fallen woman, a theme linked with *On the Brink* (Fig. 4), or as a commentary on the 1857 divorce laws.[16] The symbolism within *No.1* links the fall of the female with 'The Fall' in paintings on the rear wall of the room while the abandoned husband is linked with Clarkson Stanfield's R.A. exhibit of 1856 *The Abandoned,* both paintings shown as pendants on either side of the mirror which reflects the open doorway.[17] The tumbling house of cards with which the children play and the discarded apple split in two next to the prostate wife reminds us of the

expulsion of Eve after her unfaithfulness to the rules of Paradise, again reflected in the painting above her portrait. All these symbols are utilised by the artist to allow the reader of the painting to follow a clear plot beginning from where the husband learns of her disloyalty in the letter he holds and supported by the symbolism within the framed space of the canvas to her being cast aside and causing a disintegration of the Victorian sanctity of the family home. This single element of the triptych manages to contain its own narrative sequence with a suggested chronology independent of the additional two segments. Martin Meisel suggests that for Egg to have compressed the narrative into a single painting would have 'impoverished the work of art' while at the same time he acknowledged that this form of compression would have been typical of nineteenth-century narrative painting.[18] However, as though following Hogarth, Egg expands the temporal line of events beyond the single frame to encompass the consequence of the morally questionable actions of the female depicted in *No.1*. The family finally disintegrates with the death of the father; Egg tells us this in the catalogue label that accompanied the three paintings: 'August the 4th. 'Have just heard that B—has been dead for more than a fortnight, so his poor children have now lost both their parents. I hear *she* was seen on Friday last near the Strand, evidently without a place to lay her head. What a fall hers has been!' Ruskin in his *Academy Notes* which he published in pamphlet form and distributed to visitors to the Academy Exhibition between 1855 and 1859 commented on *Past and Present* and in doing so provided the expanded narrative which could be used by the viewer to interpret the painting utilising the symbolic guidelines within the chronological structure provided by the triptych.[19] Stuart Sillars points to Ruskin's intervention as evidence of 'the essential role of the narrative and descriptive verbal text in contemporary cultural production' in ensuring that a painting was successful or not regardless of its technical display; the painting needed to be clear and definitive in its narrative to be accepted by the collector and understood by the viewer, a position already accepted in our

discussion on collectors and the reasons for their patronage.[20] Ruskin is not being deified here; he is referred to only in the context of rendering the position that the painting was to be read using the symbols within the work. Ruskin's interpretation is neither being privileged nor rejected for he too reads the painting using the symbolic aids. Meisel's assertion that Egg could have allowed the central image of the series, (the living room scene was placed in the centre of the series and flanked by the other two images when exhibited at the R.A.), to stand on its own due to it being replete with a pictorial language that allowed it to 'communicate what is half-expected and therefore can be half-supplied by the beholder' is overcome by the desire to ensure that there were no misunderstandings and that the triptych completed the narrative without any imposition on the viewer to construe an outcome independently.[21]

Hogarth used a similar technique to Egg in his images depicting a narrative along a linear chronology from initial circumstance to final consequence; each painting in his series *A Rake's Progress* (Fig. 82) also maintains its own narrative.[22] The first painting in the series serves as an example: the Rake has inherited his father's fortune and immediately sets about adorning himself in finery befitting a young man of his new found wealth.[23] The Rake's deceased father had spent his life amassing money and hiding it away, not happy to spend on the good things in life, but as soon as his son has the chance to take possession of his inheritance the young man begins his journey to Bedlam. The Rake pays off the mother of the young woman he had promised to marry and ignores the letters and engagement ring that illustrate his seduction.[24] According to John Trusler's analysis of the painting, the father's avarice and miserliness is contrasted by the flamboyance of the son and his willingness to begin the path of disloyalty and extravagance that blinds him to the greed of others willing to divest him of his new riches. The actions of the dubious legal practitioner demonstrate, according to Trusler, 'that one ill consequence is generally attended with another.'[25] The painting acts as a moral message against the two extremes of avarice and licentiousness. In

developing a serialised narrative Hogarth presents the viewer with a chronological plot in which each image presents and concludes a chapter internally while allowing the book/series of images to develop in an expected manner to an anticipated and predictable conclusion. This, according to Paul Ricoeur, is an essential part of the structure of narrative as 'we are pushed ahead by this development and that we reply to this impetus with expectations concerning the outcome and conclusion of the entire process.'[26] The completed Hogarthian narratives do just as Ricoeur suggests and depend on 'points of reference in the world' to ensure that this is achieved.[27] These referential points are, in the case of narrative painting, the symbols and frames that occupy the trajectory of the unfolding communication with the spectator. The paintings allow the viewer to move with the narrative both in an ocular and a psychological sense towards a completion.

The process of travelling through the narrative to the *telos* of a narrative conclusion is guided not only by disinterested expectation but 'by what we know or what we believe.'[28] If what we know and believe is culturally defined then, as Melvin Waldfogel asserts, the Victorian viewer was attuned by her cultural and social understanding to be alive to the hints and clues in a narrative painting beyond the surface interpretation that an uninformed, modern audience might ascribe to it.[29] The use of a linear narrative leading to an expected conclusion, either in the mind of the viewer led by the symbolism and clues within an individual frame or by a series of interconnected frames leading to an explicit ending, is thus one that must be delivered without equivocation to the Victorian audience. As discussed in analysing the habits of the collectors, the painting must be easily understood and contain all the elements required to reach the expected *telos*. This does not imply that the end has not already been defined, as in the depiction of an historical moment such as *Charles V at Yuste* or *Martyrdom*. In these cases the expected outcome cannot be anticipated beyond the actual, historical outcome but the *telos* having already being arrived at ensures that it is the episode depicted

that defines itself within its own punctuated and completed narrative moment.[30] Instead, it is to assert that the Victorian audience insisted upon this completion within the frame, or series of frames, whether the story had been a historically concluded moment or a moment referencing itself within the time frame of the viewer's own vital existence. If this conclusion could not be deduced with an amount of certainty to satisfy the spectator, as Martineau provides in *The Last Day in the Old Home*, then a strategy involving multiple frames, as utilised by Egg, becomes necessary.

Frith, as his colleague Egg had done in *Past and Present*, uses the example of Hogarth to engage with the completed narrative within the framework of the single image and the chronological devise of the episodic multiple images. His *Road to Ruin* provides us with related images, self-contained, that express themselves outside of the individual setting to fulfil the expectations required by narrative. However, even in non-serial works, such as *Derby Day* (Fig. 32), Frith provides performative instances that relate to the cultural understandings and expectations of the viewer by presenting multiple narratives related by visual proximities within the panorama of a single occasion. Frith's *Derby Day* has been subject to much analysis and it is not necessary to re-examine in detail the many images within the painting here. It is sufficient to state that the painting provides a record of a single overarching event, the attendance at the derby, but within that single framed event there is a multifaceted engagement within the various strata of Victorian society. There are group performances that are isolated and yet interconnected, leading the viewer to reconstruct internally the plot as it unfolds within a stationary moment.[31] The painting can be broken up into various scenes each with their own story to tell that can be isolated from the painting yet maintain its own existence as a narrative painting. On the left we see the country bumpkin, dressed in his smock to ensure identification of his social position, being held back by his wife from the lure of the thimble trickster as he watches with a naïve curiosity and is in

danger of being led to ruin. To the right of the thimble player we see one individual already having had his pockets emptied at the pop-up gambling table. This one incident has its own hermetic, linear plot, travelling in a direct chronological sequence from naivety to eager participation and finally to loss of wealth hard earned in the hope of a quick road to riches from luck. It reflects well the lesson of Hogarth's *A Rake's Progress* but here it is the simple farmer exposed for the first time to the complexities of the well-to-do, well-dressed city sophisticate. The moral message remains the same even if the status of the participants differs. On the extreme right of the painting we see the dandy and his lady in the carriage being distracted while a thief pilfers a wine bottle from under their eyes emerging from the dark underbelly of the carriage itself. The stories that unfold laterally in the painting, although identifying a diverse social gathering, also conclude within the frame; the choices and their consequences are clearly outlined and conclusions become possible for the viewer using the various devices of the characters, as actors, and their actions as provided for by Frith.

The unfolding of the moral plot line within a sequence of narratives unequivocally following Hogarth, and in the same manner as Egg, would result in Frith's *The Road to Ruin* (Fig. 35). *The Road to Ruin* was a series of five paintings depicting the descent from high education and wealth. The sequence begins at a gambling table where the main protagonist appears to have lost all his money to his fellow gamblers after an all-night session and ends with his suicide in a garret. The group works in a fashion following *A Rake's Progress*. While interlinked narratives occur through gesture and eye line in *Derby Day* across the wide stretch of the canvas, *The Road to Ruin* separates the instances in space by utilising isolated frames, allowing each to have its own internal and contained plot relying on the moral point against gambling while simultaneously reuniting the temporal contiguity of the story via the linked titles indicating stages of progression, or social descent, and the identifiable protagonists.

Elmore's *On the Brink* addresses the same themes of gambling and has been discussed in the context of its possible influence on Frith; however it also demonstrates that even with multiple symbols and clues within the painting the viewer is not presented with a definite outcome by Elmore. Shirley Brooks, in his poetic review of the Academy exhibition of 1865, said 'she is tempted to sin, will the Lily or Passion-flower win?' and the *ILN* found that the outcome of the struggle associated with the binary symbols was 'still dubious'.[32] The ending may be one of redemption or demise; information has been supplied in the form of symbolic indicators for the viewer to reach a conclusion but there is no concrete direction given as to what that conclusion should be. The narrative of the event is not completed within the frame of the painting. The viewer is compelled to participate in the game play of the action in order to evolve a narrative in her own imagination, in a continuing temporal linearity.

If then there is this accepted insistence on a completed narrative in Victorian painting from the examples discussed above, this insistence gives rise to a number of questions. Firstly, why is Elmore not so clear in his construction of narrative within the frame to allow a defined conclusion to the story to be reached, even where the symbols used in the represented moment might allow him to provide one and, secondly, why is he not so generous with his provision of visual clues in other instances that deny the viewer access to a full armoury of symbolic supports? It is my suggestion that he offers his work to the public in the knowledge that the expectations of the narrative direction can be extracted both past and future from the instant of the present, now, as it exists in the depicted image, whether that now is located in an historical past re-imagined, an imaginary past or an imagined present. Initially, one painting which helps to demonstrate this engagement with expectation that Elmore subverts, by allowing the viewer a freedom to bring to his work multiple interpretations and thus conclusions to the narrative, will be considered. *The Guardian* (Fig.83), which was shown at Gambart's exhibition at the French Gallery, Pall Mall, and was described as:

> a sort of Shylock and Jessica. The Jessica is as wayward, as coquettish, and bent on admiration, and not less beautiful as her Hebrew sister in the 'Merchant of Venice'. Her guardian is a grandiose, dignified, doge-like person with a head that would serve for that of Marino Faliero, and he appears watchful as Shylock and a very fit custodian for a wilful and imperious beauty. The story, such as it is, is very well told; the two figures are drawn and designed with great vigour and are capital in colour. The picture, as a whole, being, though not an ambitious one, a very credible example of the artist's manner and a fair indication of his resources.[33]

The Art-Journal said it was 'an old story , that of a watchful old uncle or father, and a niece or daughter, who looks much chagrined that no opportunity occurs of dispatching to her lover a letter, which she conceals with her muff'.[34] *The Sunday Times* stated that:

> a stately gentleman of the old regime walking with his lady ward through the cropped green alleys of an ancient garden. He is conscious of the beauty of the young creature on his arm and that consciousness gives a turn of suspicion to his eye; but she is too clever for him by half, as we say, and she manages, unperceived to hold out a billet-doux to her lover, who stands out of the picture on her hither side, and the spectator knows that he will receive it safely.[35]

The *Illustrated London News* posited that:

> The subject of the picture may well, however, excite curiosity and provoke speculation. We naturally form a host of conjectures about the obvious treachery and disobedience of the fair ward, and the exact relation in which the guardian stands to her. A French artist would probably have left us in no doubt as to the duped guardian being that encumbrance of the sex (once secured) called a husband and the disparity of age would have been considered a sufficient justification for the basest and

> unkindest form of deception, whilst a vulgar minded painter would have sought to heighten the contrast and increase the piquant humour of the situation by rendering the guardian ludicrous and contemptible in appearance. But it is quite evident that Mr. Elmore is nowise to be charged with a violation of good taste. It is the old, old story. Love is stronger than fate. The incident here depicted is one which dramatist and novelist have often made the pivot, the turning point for plot or story. Fate had, it would seem, divided the pretty damsel from the lover of her choice. But you might as well set watch and ward to control the laws of gravitation as seek to divide two hearts that have a natural gravitation towards each other. So, you see, the lady –women always being more fertile in sly ruses, cunning expedients and wicked tricks than men – contrives that the walk under surveillance shall be a means of communication with her lover and of facilitating ulterior arrangements. Under the very eye of her unsuspecting guardian she shows that she has prepared a billet-doux, written, perhaps, at the 'very witching time of night' and only waits a convenient opportunity for transmitting the same. Someone is of course on the watch for the all-important announcement thus telegraphed. Someone will follow with the most heedless, purposeless and objectless air he can assume – quite promiscuously, as Mesdames Malaprop, Gamp or Brown might say – till in passing that note be taken or till it may be dropped behind some tree, thrown into some shrub or left in some prearranged hiding place.[36]

These various interpretations all depend on an ability to conceive and speculate on what has led to the event depicted and on what will be the outcome. The present, as portrayed, only bestows upon us the two participants and a single prop, the *billet-doux.* From this we are offered the scenario of young woman on the verge of eloping from the grips of an oppressive family environment. In this scenario the woman is herself complicit in betraying the family

status and culture via comparison with Shylock and Jessica. Using the terminology of a Venetian setting familiar to those with an awareness of the Shakespearian play, Elmore empowers the viewer with the tools of recognition to derive a consequence that occurs outside the realms of the depicted image both in time and in its own representation. *The Sunday Times* has no hesitation in completing the narrative for the viewer as it knows that the lover will receive the letter, despite the close observation being performed by the father/uncle/lover/guardian. This indicates for us that Elmore is quite prepared to allow a plot to be completed by the viewer and implies an awareness on the part of the artist of the visual training and capacity of the Victorian audience to contemplate the progression of the narrative without the stimulus of excessive use of symbols to define the moment, its history and its future. This is not a surprising action on the part of the work's reviewers and is mirrored in the *ILN* review. In this instance the reviewer acknowledges the multiple meanings of 'speculation' such as anticipation or contemplation of the future, or of future narratives which might be created; and he colours his interpretation by juxtaposing the different treatments that could have been applied to the severed moment being depicted in Elmore's painting. The *ILN* is happy to enhance the story by engaging in a psychological pronouncement on the nature of the female in general. The reviewer in the *ILN* has created a narrative using the painted work as a prompt and at once inhabits a world in which this narrative unfolds, an unfolding which always occurs in a 'temporal world'.[37] In all examples the story is identified and the barest of evidence is utilised to construct the plot and bring it to conclusion. Importantly, Elmore used the participants in the painting to address directly the viewer and to involve them in the narrative as interpreted by one spectator who suggested that the *billet-doux* is not being offered to a missing beau but rather to the viewers themselves.[38] The viewer is further implicated in the narrative as the male protagonist looks towards the potential recipient of the letter and thus the spectator is rendered constituent in

the completion of the narrative as an acknowledged actor external to the frame but internal to the chronological framework of the narrative to be completed. The *ILN* interpretation is not an unexpected reaction as the Victorian viewing public demanded this convergence of text and image and through exposure to the doubling aspect of text and image had become accustomed to continuing a line of narrative construction devised from an assumed chronology and anticipated outcome. Having been trained via accustomisation to follow the plot of a painting or illustration with the aid of text then we would expect that the viewer would also adapt and proceed to apply this skill to paintings devoid of textual or symbolic hints while acknowledging that this could also lead to misunderstandings in the decoding of an image lacking in the plot devices that are included in many of the paintings by Victorian artists following in the mode of Hogarth. Elmore did not shirk his responsibility in conforming to this mode of communication as, along with almost all other R.A. exhibitors, he attached a textual reference point to his contributions to the Academy exhibitions. On the whole, for Elmore, this was in the guise of extracts from the play, novel, poem, or Biblical passage that he wanted the spectator to associate with on the surface of the work, or simply to allocate a title as an identifier. This reference point was then relayed by the printed media in their reviews of the Academy exhibition. It must be noted that literacy was on the increase during this period and that reading material was becoming more accessible to even the working class members of Victorian, English society.[39] The serialisation of novels in magazines and papers, which were sometimes displayed in shop windows, ensured that the public would invent or anticipate the plot development of a story and the use of illustrations to accompany text in printed media provided additional support for the development of a spectator active in the creation of the narrative chronology. Kathleen Tillotson describes how the growth of the serialised novel impacted upon the reader and their expectations; rather than 'skipping to the end' of a completed work, the reader was required to wait and it is this

waiting that provides space for the reader to speculate, anticipate and urge the author to conform to the desired narrative conclusion.[40] Edward Johnson provides us with numerous testimonies and pleadings from readers of Dickens' serialised work where the author responded by altering the endings or expected outcomes.[41] The availability of the text was not just open to a literate readership, as identified by Altick and Tillotson; Johnson, quoting John Forster, gives the example of a charlady who, along with several of her fellow lodgers, was read to every month from the serialisation of Dickens' *Dombey and Son*.[42] Ultimately, though, even allowing for the temporary suspension of conclusion, the author developed the story and brought it to its completion in a manner that in its final phase closed the narrative to further development. The question of 'what happens next?' risen in anticipation of the next episode is answered as the story is brought to conclusion; this illustrates the ability to imagine in the absence of further direction, the ability to expect a conclusion based on evidence, albeit fictional, and the demand that a conclusion be delivered ending the imaginative progression.[43] Where Elmore's paintings differ from the serialised novels and other narrative paintings is that, in the cases being discussed here, the chronology is not completed by the artist/writer but by the viewer and, as we have seen in the example of *The Guardian*, is thus open to multiple interpretations guided by the spectator's own mental formations as a speculator, although it is accepted here that the mind of the reader is also impacted upon by the social circumstance and environment in which that mind forms and functions.

The mind of the Victorian individual was being impacted upon by enormous cultural and societal changes and one particular change is of direct relevance here. The individual's perception of its place in time was being undermined and challenged throughout the first half of the nineteenth century and consciousness of time was changing as knowledge of the world changed around it. The religious debates, the interest in history, demonstrated by the

continued depiction of historical episodes in the Academy, the publications examining history and England's own place in it, and the scientific discoveries that assailed religious chronologies and thus the altering of the perceived trajectory of time, all served to impact upon the assumed linearity directed to an anticipated end.[44] Charles Lyell's *Principals of Geology* overturned the chronology of the world as defined by Ussher, (in 1654Archbishop James Ussher had calculated the creation of the world to 4004 years B.C.), which was still carrying force up to the end of the nineteenth-century and was still being printed within the covers of authorised Bibles.[45] If a lived narrative, in terms of understanding one's own place within time, can be undermined and altered by the scientific debates on time taking place then this fracture can also interfere with depicted narrative objects and their relationship to the viewing subject where both subject and object are inhabiting a 'temporal world'.

As has been suggested elsewhere in this thesis, the historical moments of Elmore's paintings, although located in the past were active in the present in their convergence with topical issues of debate. This transference of time past into time present and Elmore's expectation that this would ensure his work was well received and understood continued in his historical and religious paintings that have purchase, not as extinct historical moments but as moments in the now of the nineteenth-century viewer, having being situated there via theatrical and textual re-enactments and reanimated in pictorial representation.

The awareness of the historical past delivered through the medium of plays set in the earlier centuries impacted upon the audience's perception of the linearity of time as much as did the antiquarian detail delivered in the historical novels of Scott.[46] As we have seen, Elmore used this attention to historical detail to ensure that the moment of the past was identified as being situated in its own time as an authentic expression of the event being depicted. This authenticity serves the dual purpose of anchoring the painting in the past while the veracity of its implications for the present is supported in its adherence to its own temporal setting. This

is most evident in *Religious Controversy* where the historical detail animates the contemporary debate via the textual attachment to the painting and the surface expression of the past represented on the canvas.[47] To quote Paul Ricoeur, 'The plot, therefore, places us at the crossing point of temporality and narrative: to be historical, an event must be more than a singular occurrence, a unique happening. It receives its definition from its contribution to the development of a plot.'[48] In Elmore's historical paintings the 'singular occurrence' defines itself by its contribution to the development of the reference to a temporality outside its own jurisdiction and in the viewer's ability to transfer past to present in a simultaneous exchange of 'happenings' that allow a narrative to implicate itself in the social and cultural mind-set of the spectator and thus the development of plot in the viewer's own lived context. This can appear to be problematic in terms of the function of narrative painting. However, it is this problem of the expansion of the temporal beyond the confines of the depicted event within the frame that offers the opportunity to overturn the limitations placed on Victorian narrative paintings as acting as mere reflections of social realities and as moral commentators on social expectations, objects that are in themselves temporally static.

Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, writing in his *Laocoön- An Essay Upon the Limits of Painting and Poetry: With Remarks Illustrative of Various Points in the History of Ancient Art*, sought to establish the border that existed between poetry and painting.[49] Lessing argued that painting used 'forms and colours in space' while poetry 'articulate[d] sounds in time.'[50] Lessing's defining of painting as spatial rather than temporal, was an issue that needed to be overcome by the English Victorian artist and Richard Redgrave outlined how this confinement had and could be overcome. Julia Thomas quotes from a lecture given by Redgrave to the Associated Arts Institute in 1868 where this challenge is answered:

> It would appear almost to be an axiom that the painter differs from the poet or the writer in having to select for illustration a single moment of time in the action of his

> story when it culminates in interest and effectiveness. Yet even this rule has been set aside, and in some few cases with great success, proving that laws and rules are like crutches, of use to the feeble but worthless and only encumbrances to the strong… Some painters …have grouped together in one composition, incidents completely remote in time and space: almost, in fact, telling the tale of a life in a single canvas.[51]

Of course, we have seen that there was more than just 'a single canvas' used to overcome the temporal problem. However, the issue remains that there is an acceptance that this temporality must remain within the frame and therefore deny the creation of a temporal continuance the imagined narrative in the imaginary of the viewer; as Redgrave asserts, the tale of even a life is contained within the single canvas, there is no further space allocated to manoeuvre outside the frame. This issue is further problematised by the control that is inherent in narrative paintings that complete narrative expectation and the insistence, as evidenced above, of reviewers attempting to complete a narrative where there exists the raw material of a story but where the organisation of that story is deficient in the absence of completed narrative. The prioritising of the subject and moral statements, what Paul Oppé termed 'a sermon', above the painterly treatment applied to the work responded to the religious law.[52] Elmore's paintings, as discussed above, offer an escape from directed narrative and thus controlled imagination, to reintroduce a space, via imagined narrative time, to speculate. This escape, then, allows for a bridging of the spatio-temporal divide between poetry and painting, identified by Lessing, and permits painting to embrace its sibling's privilege. This could as easily be applied to Flint's discussion of Garland's painting and others, with the caveat that the looking of the depicted participants is contained within the frame, but in focussing on one artist here an initial step is being proposed for further analysis elsewhere. If, as Lessing states of plastic art, it 'pleases not the eye but the imagination through the eye' and that 'The same picture, whether presented to the imagination by

arbitrary or natural signs, must always give us a similar pleasure, though not always in the same degree', then it is the imagination which needs to be addressed and accepted as a continuation of the function of the painted work as a non-static spectacle.[53] Elmore does this in the manner outlined above, that is, he overcomes the spatial and the temporal problem attributed to 'static' art by neglect of 'arbitrary or natural signs' as controlling, narrative symbols and attends to them only as constituents of the raw material of the story without shackling the spectator/speculator to an organised and completed narrative *telos*.

Narrative time in the realm of the imagined does not limit itself to imagined narrative paintings as objects. If we consider narratives, imagined in text and realised as such towards their own completion and re-presented in pictorial depiction, then we can further interrogate time and the fracture that occurs between *it* as stasis within the frame and *it* as liberated in the appeal to the imagination. The imagination then liberates. That is to say that the control of the mind by the observer in the guise of the controlling mechanisms of state or religious panoptic manifestations of what and how the real, even as re-presented as image, is to be observed, is challenged. Gert Mattenklott has alluded to such a liberation, although in the context of imagination in artistic production rather than in the imaginary of the viewer of the production, in terms of the imagination being 'claimed by all and sundry as force conducive to self-empowerment.'[54] The image, in terms of Victorian narrative paintings, becomes more than mere reportage of societal conditions or moral messages; it becomes, in the examples discussed here, which are not to be deemed exclusive, an opportunity to reflect on Sartre's linking of the imaginary with an ontological freedom and its implications for temporality in painting; 'For consciousness to be able to imagine, it must be able to escape from the world by its very nature, it must be able to stand back from the world by its own efforts. In a word it must be free.'[55] Sartre does not specifically deal with the issue of time nor for that matter does he reflect on specific paintings but it is implicit throughout *The Imaginary* that the

actions of the imagination look to the future as well as the present. In the imagination Sartre can detach the present from the future. In doing so, he creates a possible future in the temporal world of the imagination.[56] There is a temporal continuance as well as a temporal laceration: continuance in the forming of the future from a current image and laceration in that he 'detach[s] the future from the present.'[57] Sartre is compelled to give the future to himself, to own it, just as the lacuna of completed narrative compels the viewer to take ownership of the future of the narrative.[58]

That Elmore was conscious of the importance of time and of separating an incident from its completed narrative is further to be seen in an examination of *Beppo* (Fig. 15). This painting was shown at the R.A. in 1847, the same year he exhibited *The Origin of the Stocking Machine*. *The Stocking Machine* would go on to be engraved and celebrated as being amongst his greatest works; *Beppo* entered into a private collection and remained unseen until put to auction twice in 2015. It failed to sell on the first occasion, and is now located in the Crawford Art Gallery, Cork, the county of Elmore's birth.[59] *Beppo* was initially purchased from the R.A. exhibition and one would have expected that it was destined to be engraved given that the purchaser was John Clowes Grundy, the noted art patron, publisher and astute judge of engravings.[60] The painting received mixed appraisals from reviewers, being preferred over *The Stocking Loom* by one and accused of being more theatrical than real by another.[61] Elmore's ability to convey the theatrical, in terms of dramaturgy that the spectator adapts, is the essence that allows him to locate a narrative moment in time and to animate rather than suspend further development of plot.

The painting represents a scene from Byron's *Beppo: A Venetian Story* when the presumed dead husband of the female protagonist, Laura, dressed as a Turk, surprises the young Count and he questions him.[62] All ends well when Beppo, the husband, remarries Laura and becomes friends with the Count, her former *Cavalier Servente.* By the time the painting came

back into the public domain in 2015 it had assumed the title *Les Amants Attrapés*, distancing it from its original context and from a preparatory watercolour sketch in the British Museum (Fig 84).[63] The B.M. watercolour is simply identified as 'a man and a woman standing over a reclining man'.

Both the painting and the watercolour deny the levity of the poem and Byron's cultural commentaries and comparisons, while extracting a moment with the potential for an intensity that can be seen developed from the watercolour to the finished painting. Stern confrontation in the watercolour is replaced with fear and curiosity in the finished oil but the viewer is still denied a completed narrative. Although the reader of Byron's poem will have been aware of the outcome, the depicted moment animates the text in a way that challenges the 'witty and informal' elements of the poem.[64] The novel spectator must create a plot from the visual information that provides only the merest of hints to possible conclusions. The blade in the waistband of Beppo, present in the watercolour, has been removed from the oil painting. The Count has a rapier clutched in his hand in the finished painting while he is unarmed in the drawing.[65] Laura appears to fear the Turk, Beppo, while the Count is ready to lunge if not for the restraint occasioned by Laura's grip on his arm. We are not as privy to the conjectural responses to *Beppo* as we were with *The Guardian* but the scene is set as a developing moment within a narrative described as theatrical and thus with characters at play and allows the viewer to engage in narrative construction towards a *telos*, whatever that is chosen to be. The play engaged in by the spectator may arise as a result of the suspense created in the picturing of the moment and the 'what happens next?' inquisition and it is this prompt, with the depicted moment as prop, which impregnates, in terms of both a filling out and of a planting of seed, the temporal line in the imagination of the viewer towards a narrative construction.

This moment of animated suspense is repeated in Elmore's diploma piece, *A Scene from Two Gentlemen from Verona* (Fig. 24). As with *Beppo*, Elmore extracts an instant of potential discovery and consequence. Here Valentine is seducing Sylvia while the Duke feigns sleep. Seated on the arm of his chair we cannot be certain if Sylvia is contributing to the tension by awakening the Duke or if she is about to rise from her position in order to avoid disturbing him. The scene is not from the play but rather from a report, in Act 3, Scene 1, by the Duke to Proteus in which he suggests that 'This love of theirs myself have often seen Haply when they have judged me fast asleep.'[66] There is no resultant or corresponding action in the play to the depicted scene and thus it works differently to other depictions of the play by other artists of the day who reflect actions that occur in the drama of the play as scenes acted out. Daniel Maclise provides numerous examples of the theatrical event being translated directly into a pictorial, representation of the staged moment. Maclise's *The Play Scene in Hamlet* (Fig. 86) depicts the scene of the play within the play but this is a representation of the staged event and makes no apology for being such as the presence of the partial proscenium in the upper left and right of the painting frames the event within a dramatic production. Similarly, his *Scene from Twelfth Night* (Fig. 87) is representative of a moment which occurs within the play and could be the equivalent of a modern cinema still. Similar treatments had been applied to events that had occurred outside of plays' direct narrative sequence, such as paintings of the death of Ophelia in Hamlet. However, in these cases the event depicted is singular and unambiguous. Arthur Hughes' *Ophelia*, (1851-3), as with Hunt's depiction of Two Gentlemen of Verona, references the text within its frame, thus disavowing any uncertainty in narrative direction. Other paintings of Ophelia add nothing to the narrative of the play, or to the viewer's freedom to play; Millais' *Ophelia*, (1851-2), presents a moment that is frozen in time, a record of an event that allows for no further narrative development in the mind of the viewer. When Elmore creates a moment not from within the play but of the

play he confuses the viewer who seeks replication of the dramatic narrative and who is instead faced with a representation of a verbalised moment that upsets the play's temporal movement. The moment occurs outside of the play's direction but within the world of the play and participates in it through the conduit of the unrepresented happenings via the character and utterances of the Duke. Elmore brings a non-dramatised event to the mind of the viewer separated from its dramatic context and thus allowing a freedom to play with the image depicted. William Holman Hunt's treatment of a scene from the same Shakespearian drama (Fig. 88) also reflects a moment of the play but it also secures itself within the play by using text from the scene re-presented and incorporating it within the physical frame of the painting. The narrative moment is thus anchored within the narrative chronology of the play by Hunt in contrast to Elmore who allows the incident to float outside of the frame by imagining an event described but not featured within a linear chronology and thus allowing the non-incident its own narrative freedom. The severing of the narrative from the controlling influence of the text acts in a similar manner to the lack of completion that is operating in the narrative paintings discussed earlier; the removal of the stable anchor of concrete reference to the text of the play, as acted, liberates the moment depicted from directed imagination.

A further example of Elmore deviating from the drama of a play by depicting an event which does not occur in the narrative sequence of the play is to be found in *Romeo and Juliet* (Fig.89). The attribution of this painting to Elmore is suspect according to Edward Morris; however Morris does not make reference to the watercolour in the Victoria and Albert Museum collection (Fig.89a), which appears to confirm, by comparison, that the Walker Gallery *Romeo and Juliet* is indeed a work by Elmore.[67] Morris points out that the painting is not of any scene in the drama and quite dissimilar to other paintings dealing with the same theme. However, as an instance of Elmore creating a moment outside of the play, in the manner of his diploma piece, it serves to highlight this tendency to appeal to the imagination

of the viewer and to set in play narratives differing and in contrast to those suggested within the framework of the established chronology of the drama.

Elmore's paintings rely on two essential factors, apart from the surface of the works, to ensure that disinterest is overcome and empathy with the viewed object as a participating phenomenon in the mind of the viewing subject is achieved. Firstly, Elmore needs an audience capable of creating narrative, a capability that we have seen existed, and, secondly, an image that connects with the audience and creates enough of an emotional bond to secure empathy. That the audience was capable of developing a narrative is evident from their ability to do so based on their experience of serialised novels at the time, as illustrated by Altick, Tillotson and Johnson, and by the examples of Elmore's works discussed earlier; creating an emotional bond required more involvement in the painting on the parts of the portrayed protagonists and the spectator. The notion of the Victorian era as one which was highly attuned to its own sympathetic and sentimental attachment to others is not new nor is it entirely true.[68] The novels of Dickens that, as we have seen, were available to the whole spectrum of society depended on his readership, or listenership, identifying with, and most importantly at an emotional level, the characters that inhabited his books.[69] The visual appeal inherent in paintings used its own lexicon of symbols and situation to ensure that sentiment was aroused in the viewer. During an era of uncertainties and change, when epidemics and death from cholera and other diseases touched all classes of society, the appeal of the image of the child and the mother was enough in themselves to ensure that the painting would be a success, through individual sale or through engraving.[70] *The Illustrated London News* printed paintings from the Royal Academy Exhibition, and others, on a regular basis but it also printed, and often as double sheet spreads in colour, images that made a direct appeal, without controversy, to the sentiment of the viewer.[71] These paintings, then, appeal to the sentiment, to feelings, and seek to have the viewer identify with the feelings implied by the

situation in which the depicted protagonists have found themselves.[72] However, I am not suggesting here that sentiment or a feeling of identifying with the portrayed serves only to ensure a static emotional response; it is the emotional response that works in tandem with the speculative inquiry that allows the trajectory of narrative to advance temporally. The identifying with a particular static emotion is, to refer back to an earlier statement on the imagination, a safe and welcome endeavour; it is the unidentified and unguided response, the free imagination of narrative, that confound the laws laid down by religion and expectation. Investing in the character through an empathetic connection rather than just an identification of common sentiment is a long term commitment to the character's development in the imagined narrative. Sentiment considers the depicted moment as situated in its own stasis; empathy considers the moment as part of the viewer's inner world. Elmore did not engage in a simple attempt to arouse ephemeral sentiment; his appeal to emotional connectivity, to empathy, instilled fear and repulsion even as the depicted event, real or imagined, contained elements of sentimentality or melancholia.

The emotional responses to the *Tuileries* and *Marie Antoinette in the Temple* paintings are not limited to these two examples of Elmore's works.[73] Reviewing the artist's *Eugene Aram*, R.A. 1876, (No Image), *The Art-Journal* described the intensity of emotion that the painting elicited from the spectator:

> A. Elmore's, R.A., imagination, for the most part vigorous and healthy, has a tendency every now and then to wander off into the regions of the forbidding and the unearthly. His 'Eugene Aram' is painful to confront even for a few minutes, because of its grim reality. Before his famous "tramp, tramp" [Lenore] picture we could stand for any length of time, because, however terrible the demon rider and his steed, we knew the whole thing to be a fabrication of the poet's brain and that it could never really happen. But, the picture of this "melancholy man" is the picture of reality. We

know he was arrested for murder one night, and the artist shows his murky and cheerless character, and his precise aspect and bearing when taken.[74]

Lenore, R.A. 1871, (Fig. 90) demanded that the audience engage with what was seen as a 'weird' painting when it was shown at the Sydney International Exhibition of 1879.[75] This referral to the uncanny and unearthly was aptly described by *The Art-Journal* in its review of the work when it was shown at the R.A. but in its initial mention of the painting, before the later comparison with *Eugene Aram*, *The Art-Journal* could not but insist that the imagination was moved by the realisation of Scott's interpretation of Gottfried August Bürger's eighteenth-century poem.[76] The 'weirdness' of *Lenore* was inescapable even in Philadelphia and Elmore's 'spiritual force' and 'imaginative powers' ensured that this bizarre painting was singled out for praise.[77] As *The Art-Journal* highlighted, Elmore's *Eugene* was a depiction of a real person given a melancholic reification by an artist which created an immediate bond with the viewer while also repulsing in its engagement with that very same reality. The painting elicited the same response when it was exhibited in Liverpool in 1876; *Lenore* was a fictitious event treated in the same way, but somewhat easier to physically tolerate.[78] Nonetheless, in both instances an emotional bridge is built between the surface of the painting and the mind of the spectator. Such was this emotional strength of *Lenore* that almost ten years after the exhibition one newspaper, reviewing a performance of Joachim Raff's Symphony No. 5 in E Major *Lenore*, contended that the final part of the symphony reached its crescendo when describing the final death ride of Bürger's ballad and that viewers of Elmore's painting at the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition were set to imagining and thinking of the poetic and musical rhythms of both the ballad and the symphony.[79] The strangeness and weirdness of Elmore's painting was used as an aid to describe the effect of the musical piece and thus the imagination of the listeners towards a response that was to be conjured up via a visual recall rather than a textual or poetic support. *Lenore* was to haunt the

viewer, so real was Elmore's rendering of the poet's idea.[80] The painting both 'startled' and 'fascinated' the audience, as did *Eugene Aram*, and would appear to repel the spectator through the depiction of a disturbing event but also seem to impact heavily on the imaginative activity within the viewer's mind.[81] It is no great wonder that Elmore's work would attract an audience in Philadelphia given not only the media's response but also that of critics. The artist and writer Xanthus Smith considered 'Elmore's work "decidedly the best" of the living British artists represented because its technical excellences contributed to its more ephemeral qualities: it was 'original and truthful looking. Good in arrangement and colouring, and so clear and powerful in effect, that it attracts and fixes the attention at once.'[82]

Throughout Elmore's oeuvre the presence of death scenes that engage the viewer on an emotional level without excessive symbolism insists on a reliance on gesture and expression to be realised on the surface of the painting in order to initiate the narrative sequence in the mind of the viewer. Emotion was a central part of the Victorian viewing experience and Elmore appears to have taken this to an extreme in some of his work without subverting accepted practices, as was the case with the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood in their depictions of accepted subjects in a style that undermined the thinking of the Academy.[83] However, it must also be acknowledged that Elmore's negotiating of the field of emotion was not as dependent on the situation within which the emotion is represented as it was on the expression and gesture of the participants active in the situation. This is not surprising given the sense of melancholy that we know from Frith's daughter to have permeated his living and working space. Rather than creating a series of frames or connections within the frame Elmore requires of his paintings that they breach the limitations of the pictorial space to instigate narrative progression.

The spatial frame that needed to be transcended involved the movement from the representation on the surface to the mind of the viewer. As we have seen from *The Guardian*, the viewer participated in the creation of the narrative but the narrative in that instance called not for an empathetic response but rather for an ability to expand the viewing experience in a creative impulse driven by the lack existing in the painting itself. To further secure the bond between surface of object and interior of subject the response needs to be grounded in an empathetic impulse which, as we have seen from *Lenore*, need not be sympathy as, in this case at least, fear was the emotion targeted by the painting.

The internal mind of the anonymous audience could not be accessed by Elmore without a certainty that his own mind shared a commonality with the viewers, in other words a universal empathy. Elmore may not have been certain that such a universality existed regardless of the artistic theories that he may have been exposed to but it is evident from the visual record of the works he produced that he had an awareness of accepted gestural and expressive criteria that communicated the emotion of the object being depicted to the subject engaging with the painted representation. This can be observed even his early works. In *Martyrdom* Elmore affords an opportunity to examine multiple facial expressions of the participants in the unfolding narrative. Fear, anger, horror and mental pain and suffering are all portrayed before us. On close examination of the actors in the frame we focus on their faces and see that their expressions respond to the drama taking place in a manner that echoes the teachings of Charles Le Brun.

Thomas á Becket (Fig. 91, detail) visually reflects the drawing by Le Brun,(Fig. 91a); the eyes portrayed in both images lift upwards in an invocation of pity and psychological anxiety, the lips, slightly pursed, appeal to the spectator's sympathy in an almost audible plea for mercy. In contrasting the eyes of Becket and his assailant we are reminded of Le Brun's diagrammatic study of heads and the role that the position of the eyes play in defining the

character of the subject. Jennifer Montague's writing on Le Brun's *Diagrammatic Heads* informs us that eyes which slope upwards are indicative of 'a spiritual character' while those that slope down indicate a baseness in the soul of the person portrayed.[84] The four knights all conform to this ocular disposition and Elmore's highlighting of the eyes of the attacker to whom Becket is pleading and the static assailant directly behind suggest that the artist intended the viewer to make a comparison between the perpetrators and the victim whose eyes are similarly highlighted but in the mode of piety rather than iniquity. Throughout the painting the participants are implicated in a character programme that can be defined with reference to Le Brun. The demands of seventeenth-century history painting, as outlined by Montague, were still being manifested in Elmore's history and religious paintings and the methods by which these demands could be met insisted upon the artist demonstrating an acute ability to convey the emotional realities of the participants in his narratives to the spectator in a manner that ensured an empathetic connection between object and subject regardless of the narrative line developed by the interested observer.[85] This deviated from other Victorian artists who relied on situational empathy to ensure an appropriate response from the viewer. Richard Redgrave's *The Outcast*, 1851, (Fig. 92), demonstrates how the multiple gestures within a developed narrative can only function within the event depicted. The girl with the child is not depicted with a facial expression that commands sympathy; the viewer must read the clues that are located in the actions of the other participants along with the letter cast on the floor and the painting on the wall that may be used to support the plea for identification with the narrative as was done by Egg in his *Past and Present*. According to some interpretations of Redgrave's *The Outcast*, the painting on the wall of the room might be that of Abraham condemning Hagar and Ishmael and the letter an entreaty for forgiveness from the daughter to the father.[86] We see a repetition of this dependency on the situational clues in the emotive *Broken Vows* by Philip Hermogenes Calderon (Fig. 93). The title of the

painting coupled with the floral symbolism and discarded jewellery encourages the viewer to identify the emotional position of the female depicted; there is no evidence in her own demeanour to convey the psychological mind-set in which she finds herself nor that the viewer could empathise with her without the symbolism within the setting. It is noticeable that the female's eyes are closed and deny us any access to emotions that might be expressed through their light or glance. Elmore, on the contrary, used the eyes of his objects of attention to communicate with the viewer the emotional intent as we have seen with *Martyrdom*.

Elmore's use of eyes and expression as a means of embedding an emotional and empathetic response from the viewer rather than a purely sentimental one finds support in modern discoveries of mental mechanisms within the body and specifically the mirror neurons in the brain.[87] The mechanical nature of the eye was an area of intense investigation during the nineteenth-century in terms of vision and visibility, nature and the supernatural and these investigations continued to seek answers as the century progressed. Scientific understanding of the operations of the eye enhanced by the discoveries of its physical properties and functions coupled with the physiological discourse that surrounded each technical advancement and scientific discovery is very well documented by modern scholarship and the writings on the subject during the period were well known.[88] However, for all the scientific and philosophical interventions there remained one problem that was not resolved and that was that the 'translation into meaningful images in the mind' of the exterior world 'remains somewhat cloudy.'[89] Current scholarship, such as that by Srdjan Smajić and Flint, has addressed the imagination in literature, the spiritual and the translation of the textual to the visual or when dealing with other unseens and with the spectral as seen; it has also addressed the revelation of the physically unseen that has the potential to become seeable through technological advancement. Here we are addressing the unseen that is neither transferred to the mind from a physical object, except through its function as a point of inception, nor

reflected back into the exterior world other than in attempts to textualise the imagined narrative derived from a physical object as just such a point of creative inception as we have seen in the interpretations of reviewers of paintings such as *The Guardian*. The conflict of the mechanical operations of the eye and its aspects which defy resolution as they drift into the realm of the metaphysical, when 'You do not see *with* the lens of the eye. You see *through* that, and by the means of that, but you see with the soul of the eye' exposes the nature of vision's complexities.[90] While Le Brun saw the expression of the passions as coming at the end of a process involving heart, soul, brain and body, the discovery of the mirror neuron system (m.n.s.) in the human brain in the twenty-first century confirms the necessity of the physical expression in any communication of passions between individuals. However, already before the discovery of the m.n.s., empathetic communication through the eye had been discussed by some of the most important and widely read authors, Adam Smith being one example who dealt with the issue directly. Smith addresses both the imagination and empathy in the context of mirroring

> As we have no immediate experience of what other men feel, we can form no idea of the manner in which they are affected, but by conceiving what we ourselves should feel in the like situation. Though our brother is on the rack, as long as we ourselves are at our ease, our senses will never inform us of what he suffers. They never did, and never can, carry us beyond our own person, and it is by the imagination only that we can form any conception of what are his sensations. Neither can that faculty help us to this any other way, than by representing to us what would be our own, if we were in his case. It is the impressions of our own senses only, not those of his, which our imaginations copy. By the imagination, we place ourselves in his situation.[91]

The capacity of the eye to communicate passion, or indeed any emotion or expression, is central to the issue of the role of the eye in painting as an object to be looked at and in

anchoring subjects which look out. Joseph Turnley's catalogue of the eye, its physiology and its expressive characteristics ('the eye of a woman of genius is always bewitching', 'hope has elevated eyeballs', 'the eye of dignity moves calmly', etc.) attempts to do in textual form what Le Brun does in illustration but both adhere to the ability and importance of the eye as a means of conveying expression.[92] Elmore's *The Deathbed of Robert King of Naples*, (Fig. 26), optimises the use of facial expression with specific reference to the eye as a means of communicating emotion across the temporal and spatial divide that exists between the historic moment depicted and the empathetic response of the viewer. In many ways echoing the influence of Le Brun on the Neo-classicism of Jacques Louis David, Elmore's *Robert King of Naples* utilises the full array of gesture and expression to intervene in the mind of the viewer and to impact upon the stimuli that fire the responses within the m.n.s. Although it is clear that the scientific discoveries of the twenty-first century would not have been available to Elmore, he would surely have been aware of the links between image and emotional response from the work of academicians such as Le Brun and from seeing David's paintings and the work of other artists influenced by his proposals from his time studying in Paris. As we have seen from our discussion around the influence of Pelagio Palagi on individual works by Elmore, continental artists impacted on many of his paintings. Taking all of these inferences and applying them to *Robert King of Naples*, we can now view the painting in its own right with reference to works by David as influenced by le Brun. The female participants in Elmore's painting remind us of David's *The Lictors Returning to Brutus the Bodies of his Sons* and *The Oath of the Horatii* (Figs. 94 & 95) in terms of foreboding, acceptance and consolation. The female and child in the foreground of *Robert* echo the notes of succour and fear to be found in both instances of maternal interventions in David's paintings. The stoic expression of the male actors, as active participants and observers, reminds us not only of *The Lictors* but of *The Deathbed of Socrates*, (Fig. 96). However, expression cannot work in

isolation as a means of conveyance and was required to situate itself in relation to the other constituent parts of the painting.

Montague points out, quoting the eighteenth-century artist and theorist Jonathon Richardson, that, as Le Brun's theories of expression were developed, attention was also paid to colour as an additional means of conveying emotion to the spectator.[93] It is interesting to note that Richardson suggested that literature came in second place to painting in its ability to speak to the imagination of the viewer when the full utility of form, colour and harmony is employed in a painting.[94] Elmore's painting *Judith at the Tent of Holofernes*, (1869), (Fig. 97) was just one of a number of paintings dealing with the same theme he contributed to the R.A. exhibition during his career. In terms of its execution *Judith* was praised and his use of colour was compared to Giorgione but it is telling and indicative of Elmore's work that the most important aspect identified by one reviewer was that 'there is no descent into realism, for appeal has been made, not to the eye, but through the eye to the imagination' and that she 'is looking at us rather than on the victim'.[95] On first viewing the painting appears to be no more, nor less, than a simple, pictorial incarnation of the Biblical scene but it has been stripped of all reference points one would expect in Judith imagery; there is no head of Holofernes, no maid and no sword, we only know the subject definitively from the title given to the painting by the artist. Elmore would demonstrate his ability to conform to such expectations in his next Judith painting exhibited at the R.A. in 1871. On closer viewing and armed with the title we have no choice but to visualise the preceding and succeeding moments of the narrative through use of the imaginative impulse. We are aware of the outcome and the events leading up to this moment but we insert Elmore's *Judith* into the narrative sequence as an aid to our own development of plot along a realisable line already established by the Biblical narrative. The 'realism' of the fully defined narrative is rejected in order to speak directly to the imagination. Elmore amalgamates the demands of Richardson

but exceeds these by omitting origins and completions. Richardson's theories continued to hold sway in the Academy through their influence on Sir Joshua Reynolds, so even though Elmore's painterly technique can be traced back to his continental experiences, both in Italy and France, it would have retained purchase amongst Academicians in the early part of his career.[96] Elmore's admission as an Associate of the R.A. followed on from his painting of other Italian subjects, *Rienzi in the Forum*, (1844), and *The Origin of the Guelph and the Ghibelline Quarrel*, (1845). The use of colour, form and harmony as demanded by Richardson was evident to the viewer as can be deduced from the review of the paintings in both *The Art-Journal*, referred to earlier, and in *The Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser*.[97] *The Advertiser* stated that 'We do not in any modern picture remember to have seen a bolder cast of drapery, accompanied with equal distinctive identity – the colour throughout is vivid, without glare – the light and shadows are powerfully contrasted and all is harmony'.

Elmore, then, uses the five elements of colour, form, harmony, expression and gesture in his effort to achieve a connection to the mind of the viewer through the visual encounter with the surface of the work. In many ways this aligns with Ingres' discussion of art and its requirements and so also does Elmore's approach to his subject matter and his manner of giving that matter representation. Ingres insisted upon expression being 'formulated with absolute exactitude' and bound with form rather than reliance on colour, not that colour was non-essential but that 'colouring is so little required that excellent painters of expression have not had, as colourists the same superiority'.[98] Elmore was able to unite both colour and form to give expression to the passionate emotion he wished to impress upon the viewer.

As we have seen, the ocular interplay between the protagonists in the *Martyrdom* takes place within the frame and this contained expression is connected with the viewer via the amalgamation of multiple devices and lacunae as discussed above. The same interplay

applies to many of his other paintings such as *The Stocking Machine* and *Robert, King of Naples*. Elmore's use of the eye, as a means to access and initiate imaginative impulse in the viewer, is enhanced too in paintings with fewer participants, although not limited to these, such as *The Guardian* and *On the Brink*. In these paintings Elmore deviates from the norm in Victorian depictions in so far as the person depicted looks not within and towards others within the frame but directly out to the viewer. The outward looking eye was not a welcome part of the painted vocabulary as can be seen from the reception of Millais' *Autumn Leaves*, (Fig. 98), a painting seemingly devoid of any narrative in itself, by *The Art-Journal's* rejection of the central female figure looking out to the spectator. [99] If this retinal, connective mechanism was not novel by the nineteenth century neither was it commonplace within English painting or among Elmore's contemporaries. This may be attributed to the lack of an English School and the type of patronage that existed from the Reformation to the altering patterns in artistic support as discussed in the chapter dealing with Elmore's influence and influences. While it cannot be claimed definitively and exhaustively of every English Victorian image, it is clear that almost all images that depict the female human face, with the exception of many but not all portraits, gravitate towards the sight lines of participants being directed toward each other, to the ceiling/sky, to the floor/ground or, indeed, anywhere except to the viewer. This use of the gaze directed outward to the viewer, rather than as part of an exchange present or even absent within the frame, may well have been seen as innovative when discussing French artists such as Édouard Manet, in particular his *Olympia* (Fig. 99) or *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* (Fig. 100), and the work of other Impressionist paintings that confronted issues surrounding the gaze and its implications. However, it is neglected when English art of the same period is addressed in terms of viewer confrontation and this serves only to highlight the lack of such paintings and the refusal of its acknowledgment in the work of Elmore.[100] The female is the object of spectacle, again to revert to Turnley, 'Man surveys

and observes, woman glances.', and this is challenged by the outward look of the females in *The Guardian* and *On the Brink*.[101] *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* was not completed until after Elmore's death yet many of the issues of spectatorship discussed in relation to Manet's painting also arise in Elmore's two paintings being discussed here, primarily that of the 'gaze'. Ruth E. Iskin has argued, when discussing *A Bar* that there was not a 'paradigmatic "female gaze" to counter the famous "male gaze" but that there was 'a range of gazes'.[102] Iskin grounds her analysis in a new form of female spectatorship that resulted from a change in the role of the female in an advancing consumerist society.[103] This change brought the female into a more exposed area of spectacle but it can equally be said that the female was already being portrayed in the English outside world in a crowded metropolis whether that be as a figure in a train or in an omnibus, (Figs. 101&102). In these instances the female gaze is averted even in the public domain, or perhaps especially in public. This 'looked-at-ness' of the female, challenged by Manet, is also challenged by Stephen Kern in his attempts to undermine the status of the 'male gaze' by arguing that the power of the averted female eye is, in the terms he uses, an assertion of a rejection of the subjugation of the female.[104] For Kern's proposal to have validity then the female 'gaze' is one that must avert itself from direct confrontation with the viewer and this is highlighted by the only use of direct ocular engagement with the painted female's audience in his chapter on prostitution; however, Kerns is forced to rely on French Impressionists rather than English paintings to support his position.[105] The critical reaction to Manet's *Olympia* is even more telling, in so far as it underlines how she ignores or confronts the assumed male gaze of her client and the viewer.[106] As this transformation of the female from object of the male gaze into an assertive subject was taking place in French painting, English painting was still following the protocols of the female location as a viewed object, as we see in Figs.101 and 102. Elmore's confrontational painted female viewer, in terms of looking outside the frame and thus making

a claim on her own right as a subject, both intrudes into the audience's space and regresses into a narrative vacuum. There is no denying that art history had, until the late twentieth century, allowed Victorian painting to remain 'a perpetual sideline' but has since been well served in contextual social relations, including the feminist readings most pertinent here.[107] If Parisienne 'modernity' as manifested in the art of the Impressionists served to locate and reflect the reality, or construction, of the female as spectacle then that is not an issue of concern here other than an acknowledgement that it was not exclusive to the French metropolis. The metropolis of London in the nineteenth century was not the equivalent of Paris in terms of pace and method of its own modernisation but within that difference Elmore confronts the issue of dominance.[108] As attempts were being made to define a distinctive school of English art, to introduce innovations of modernist continental styles into such a definition would only serve to undermine its purpose, and to imbue the art of an artist that 'ran the gamut' of Victorian paintings with such continental properties could breach the definitions of an English School.[109] Nonetheless, the 'looking-out-ness' implied by 'looked-at-ness' that functions to address directly the viewer and thus involve the viewer in the direction of the narrative and its completion operates in Elmore's paintings and ownership of the female as spectacle is invited not as a coerced object but as a participant, as narrative prop, a prop amongst others of equal value, in the construction of the narrative. Evidence suggests that when encountering the gaze of an 'other' we, as humans, will follow that gaze.[110] The gaze initiates a field of 'social interaction'.[111]In Victorian narrative paintings when the eye of the participant looks within, we follow, when the eye looks without, we follow, but it is only when the eye looks to us that we return the gaze and so communicate with the actor depicted. This communication had a scientific basis that had been accepted and pursued by Sir David Brewster in his letter to Sir Walter Scott to the extent that he presented

both diagrammatic and textual support for the ability of the painted eye to interact with the viewing eye and to pursue the viewer in motion.[112]

As in Manet's *Folies-Bergère*, the female in *On the Brink* looks outside of the frame, not in a peripheral way but directly at the viewer. The symbolism in the painting does nothing, as we have already seen, to define a narrative but rather acts to supply the tools for a narrative to be constructed; Elmore needs more to achieve or create a desire on the part of the spectator to become interested, as opposed to having a disinterested engagement, in performing the narrative completion in the imagination. This additional element becomes the openness of the ocular engagement. The theoretical supports for the notion of the gaze, regardless of which gender drives it, finds its foundation in the primitive idea of accessibility to truth, honesty and connectedness revealed in contact. The gaze, in narrative painting, made 'the viewers into confidants' and 'forced' such connectedness.[113] Research has shown that 'an observer shows much greater signs of sympathy when the person they are watching is in eye contact with them'.[114] The viewer becomes invested in the 'life' of the painted actor not by dint of symbols as directors employed by the painter but by the mirroring of social connectedness; the viewer becomes part of the story and thus needs to complete the narrative direction as much as the reviewers of *The Guardian* were compelled to do so. As the *ILN* stated, the image becomes 'The pivot, the turning point for plot or story' but, as we have seen, this 'pivot' is incomplete in its own representation and requires the viewer to become author.[115] In a manner similar to Manet's *A Bar at the Folies-Bergère* and Elmore's *On the Brink*, the eyes of the actors in *The Guardian* communicate beyond their own space and in doing so challenge the stasis of a frozen narrative confined within a work determined by a symbolised completion. Elmore's painted eye implores the spectator to replace the missing participant and insists on this substitution participating and completing the narrative commenced within the frame; such a substitution is acknowledged in another painting shown at the same time,

and in the same place, as *The Guardian*. *And She Gie Me a Glance wi' her Bonnie Blue Eye*, references the eye within its own title and although we have no image of the painting, it appeals directly to the concept of the gaze and of the ocular connectedness that establishes empathetic convergences, 'The lady leans back in her chair and blinks out witchingly on the spectator who here takes the place of the lover', allowing imaginative continuance.[116](There is without doubt space here for a revisiting of the male gaze and the assumed male spectator as the painting was described as having a certain 'piquancy' but neither can be achieved without a definite ocular encounter between viewer and viewed.[117])

The foregoing is not to deny that paintings such as portraits of real or imagined personages did not confront the viewer in the manner in which the imagined narrative paintings by Elmore sought to do. Portraits are required to at least attempt to be honest with the viewer in order to provide a psychological representation of the interior of the depicted's self and the mutual engagement of the eye is needed to achieve this end, but, this is not a construction of narrative.

In discussing Joseph Noel Paton's *In Memoriam*, Julia Thomas asserts that 'in order to create their stories [narrative pictures]…overcome their own temporal limitations…by symbols letters or texts'.[118] Thomas suggests that *In Memoriam* overcomes this reliance by the figures portrayed in the painting and their 'juxtaposing' of the participants within the frame which, she suggests, allows completion of the narrative being represented. Elmore goes beyond this in his rejection of completion and thus exceeds the limitations of the artistic expectations and, as Ralph Edwards claimed, went 'ahead of his times' in confronting painted narrative time and travelled beyond the geographical bounds of an insular, English school by dismissing the spatial limits of the constructed frame. Elmore's paintings, through their direct engagement with the viewer's internal imaginings, overturn the interpretive analysis of symbols and symbolism within the frame as directors of linear and finite narrative. His socialisation of the

depicted event, imagined or real, in an appeal to the empathetic and imaginative mind of the viewer through communication with the conduit of the eye instils both the individual portrayed and the individual spectator with a common drive to narrative conclusion. In essence, the depicted receives animation not from its own surface contained by the frame but from engagement beyond the surface.

[1] Bernd Huppauf and Christoph Wulf, *Dynamics and Performativity of Imagination: The Image between the Visible and the Invisible*, eds. Bernd Huppauf and Christoph Wulf, (New York: Routledge, 2009), 79.
[2] For more on depiction and imagination see Kendall L. Walton, *Mimesis as Make-Believe: On the Foundations of Representational Arts*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990).
[3] Ibid. 297.
[4] Flint, *The Victorians and the Visual Imagination*. In Flint's Preface she discusses Henry Garland's *Looking for the Mail Packet*, 1861, (Fig. 81) and it is used as the cover illustration for her book. The Preface leads one to understand that the purpose of the book is to interrogate the notion of internal imagining in the mind of the spectator, however Flint does not investigate this aspect of the Victorian spectator as much as she does the physical unseen aspects of the Victorian world.
[5] Ibid. 99.
[6] Ibid. 247.
[7] Pamela Fletcher, *Narrating Modernity: The British Problem Picture 1895-1914*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003).

[8] Flint, *The Victorians and The Visual Imagination*, 258.
[9] See En. 43 this Chapt.
[10] Flint, 112-5.
[11] John Tyndall, 'Atoms, Molecules and Ether Waves', 1882, in *New Fragments*, (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1892), 78-93.
[12] Flint, 198-200.
[13] Quoted in Flint, 202.
[14] *Hereford Journal*, March 1, 1862, 6.
[15] Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling, quoted in Gert Mattenklott, 'Imagination', in Huppauf and Wulf, 33.
[16] Edelstein, 'Augustus Egg's Triptych: A Narrative of Victorian Adultery', 202-212.
[17] Ibid.
[18] Martin Meisel, *Realizations: Narrative, Pictorial and Theatrical Arts in Nineteenth-Century England*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 27.
[19] Edward Tyas Cook and Alexander Wedderburn eds, *The Works of John Ruskin*, Vol. XIV, (London: George Allen, 1904), 166.
[20] Stuart Sillars, *Visualisation in Popular Fiction: 1860-1960 — Graphic Narratives, Fictional Images*, (London: Routledge, 1995), 50.
[21] Meisel, *Realizations*, 28; Edelstein, 'Augustus Egg's Triptych', 205.
[22] It may be more appropriate to use the term 'print' when discussing Hogarth's dramatic serialisations as his prints were more popular amongst the viewing public due to the demands of the purchasing patrons of Hogarth's time, as discussed in Chapt. *Influences*, and recognised by commentators on his work; *The Times*, June 7, 1862, 8.
[23] Rev. John Trusler, *The Works of William Hogarth in a Series of Engravings with Descriptions and A Comment on Their Moral Tendency*, (London: The London Printing and Publishing Company, 1833), 9-12.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Paul Ricoeur, 'Narrative Time', *Critical Theory*, 1980, 174. Ricoeur's analysis of narrative time is important here for its securing of the temporal aspects of narrativity as it commands and participates in the development of plot. The concern here is narrative's 'second relationship to public time', that is, the relationship with the audience; this aspect of time is acknowledged by Ricoeur in terms of the completing narrative; the challenge here is in the absence of completion and where public time is further extended to include the creation of narrative in the public's private and unseen imagination.
[27] Ibid. 170.
[28] John Berger, *Ways of Seeing*, (London: Penguin, 2008), 1.
[29] Melvin Waldfogel, 'Narrative Painting' in *The Mind and Art of Victorian England*, ed. Josef Altholz, (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1976), 159- 174.
[30] It is not being suggested here that the narrative continuance of a historical moment is voided by it being depicted. It is clear from Elmore's 'historical/religious' paintings that historical moments are used as a lucid

rendering of the repetition of historical narratives in his own time. For further discussion on historical repetition and narrative see, Paul Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, Vol. 1,trans. Kathleen McLoughlin and David Pellauer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984).

[31] For further reading on *Derby Day*, see Aubrey Noakes, *William Frith: Extraordinary Victorian Painter*, (London: Jupiter, 1978), 59-69 and Mary Cowling, *The Artist as Anthropologist: The Representation of Type and Character in Victorian Art*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), Chapt. 2.

[32] *Southern Reporter and Cork Commercial Courier*, May 12, 1865, 4, *Illustrated London News*, May 13, 1865, 7.

[33] *The Birmingham Journal*, December 9, 1865, 4. The complications that can be inherited by a painting are further implicated when we consider that *The Guardian* was altered to *Suspicions Aroused* by the time it was auctioned in 1991, Lot No. 521, November , 1991, Christie's, Glasgow, *Fine Paintings & Drawings* (Royal College). The renaming of the painting suggests that the imagining of the meaning of the painting, as controlled by its narrative and liberated by its lack of narrative conclusion, is a kinetic activity that reverts back on to the painting and alters its own reference points.

[34] *The Art-Journal*, 1865, 369.

[35] *The Sunday Times*, November 26, 1865, 5.

[36] *Illustrated London News*, November 18, 1865,480.

[37] Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, Vol. 1, 3.

[38] *Pall Mall Gazette*, December 21, 1865, 5.

[39] For a detailed examination of Victorian, English literacy see: Robert Altick, *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the English Mass Reading Public 1800-1900*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957). Altick identifies a selection of books, including works by Scott, Goldsmith and Shakespeare, that were available to even the lower classes of society at affordable rates through the numerous circulating libraries, 217-8.

[40] Kathleen Tillotson, *Novels of the Eighteen-Forties*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1856), 24-8.

[41] Edward Dudley Hume Johnson, *Charles Dickens: An Introduction to his Novels*, (London: Random House, 1969), 68-72.

[42] Ibid. 62.

[43] A painting by Elmore, for which there is no image and is mentioned rarely in reviews of the period, serves to highlight his drive towards a narrative that challenges the spectator to become a speculator. *The Rescue* was exhibited at the Exhibition of the Society of Artists in Birmingham in September 1862. Although the technical aspects of the painting, in terms of colour and draughtsmanship were equal or better than other works displayed it was deemed unsuccessful as there was not enough direction to allow a completed narrative within the frame. The viewer was 'compelled to own the story' as the painting did not complete it. The excellence of the painting as an object could not compensate for the compulsion placed on the viewer to create the narrative. *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, September 16, 1862, 2, *Birmingham Journal*, September 13, 1862, 7, *Birmingham Daily Post*, August 21, 1862, 4. This was that same year that Millais exhibited *Trust Me* at the Royal Academy, a painting that was also praised for its triumph of skill but questioned for its uncertainties. *The Cornhill Magazine*, Vol. VI, 1862, 118. Millais' painting is regarded as the first 'problem picture' but this is challenged by Elmore's work; David Stilton, 'Complex meanings in illustrated literature, 1860-1880' in *Transforming Anthony Trollope: Dispossession, Victorianism and Nineteenth-Century Word and Image*, Simon Grennan and Laurence Groves, eds., (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2015), 98.

[44] To catalogue the list of historical writings of the period is unnecessary but mention must be made of James Anthony Froude's *History of England*, (1856-70), (admittedly written from the early 1850s and into the 1870s), Thomas Macaulay's *History of England*, (1858) and Sharon Turner along with Sir Walter Scott and other historical novelists who were inspired by the interest in the past and the artists, in turn, who drew on these sources for inspiration.

[45] Josef Altholz, 'The Warfare of Conscience with Theology' in Altholz, 66.

[46] Stuart Sillars, *Shakespeare, Time and the Victorians: A Pictorial Exploration*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 19.

[47] For the use of textual attachments to paintings see Chapt. *Religious Controversy*. The reviewers of the Royal Academy Summer Exhibitions frequently refer to the attachments to identify and comment upon the paintings. Graves, in his listings of paintings exhibited by artists, also provides the attached textual labels. Egg's triptych is an important instance of the essentiality of the textual attachment in aiding the viewer in making the work more legible.

[48] Ricoeur, 'Narrative Time', 171.

[49] Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Laocoön- An Essay Upon the Limits of Painting and Poetry: With Remarks Illustrative of Various Points in the History of Ancient Art*, trans. Ellen Frothingham, (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1874).
[50] Ibid. 91.
[51] Quoted in Julia Thomas, *Victorian Narrative Painting*, (London: Tate, 2000), 11-2.
[52] Oppé, 'Art' , 141-2.
[53] Lessing, *Laocoön- An Essay Upon the Limits of Painting and Poetry*, 43.
[54] Mattenklott, 30.
[55] Jean-Paul Sartre, *The Imaginary: A Phenomenological Psychology of the Imagination*, trans. Jonathan Webber, (London: Routledge, 2007), 184.
[56] Ibid. 182.
[57] Ibid. 182.
[58] Ibid. see also En. 41 this Chapt.
[59] http://www.bernaerts.be/Page_catalogue.asp?lot=&estmin=&estmax=&key=elmore&sale=238&categorie=&artist accessed 07/09/2015. The painting was also offered for sale in April but did not sell, in the following September sale its estimate was reduced and did sell at this point. The painting was exhibited at The Gorry Art Gallery in December 2015 from where it was purchased and donated to the Crawford Art Gallery.
[60] Lucy Peltz , 'Grundy, John Clowes (1806–1867)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. David Cannadine, January 2009, http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.library.ucc.ie/view/article/11703 accessed December 7, 2016.
[61] *London Daily News*, August 4, 1847, *Morning Post*, May 27, 1847.
[62] *Beppo: A Venetian Story* is not the only of Byron's poems to be engaged with by Elmore; he also produced a watercolour sketch inspired by *Don Juan*. The watercolour (Fig. 85) is in a private collection but is based on an incident from Canto 2 where Don Juan has been washed up on the rocky coastline and is been cared for by Haidée and her servant Zoe. What is surprising is that the sketch contains two dogs which are not present in the poem at this point as Don Juan's spaniel had already been eaten to fend off hunger in the longboat.
[63] The present author identified the link between the B.M. watercolour and the finished oil and identified it as *Beppo* when invited to view the painting prior to the Gorry exhibition.
[64] Dinah Birch, ed., *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, (Seventh Edition), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 118.
[65] The Count may have his left hand on a sheathed rapier in the watercolour but it is indistinct. The finished painting suggests that Elmore may have contemplated the Count having a weapon in his left hand if we are to judge by the position of his fingers.
[66] William Shakespeare, *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Act 3 Scene 1, *The Norton Shakespeare*, Stephen Greenblatt et al. eds., (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1997), 106.
[67] Edward Morris, *Victorian & Edwardian Painting in the Walker Art Gallery & at Sudley House*, Vol. 2, (London: HMSO, 1996), 126. Robert Altick suggests that the Walker Gallery *Romeo and Juliet* could have been painted no earlier than 1870 as the 'warmth of the embrace' aligns with a move towards increased 'passion' in depictions of the two lovers around this time. Altick does not refer to the V&A study and further insists that by the 1870s there was a 'growing freedom to depart from the letter of the literary text', a departure already utilised by Elmore in his diploma piece in 1858, Altick, *Paintings from Books: Art and Literature in Britain, 1760-1900*, (Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1985), 296.
[68] David Newsome, *The Victorian World Picture*, (London: John Murray, 1997), 262-66.
[69] Ibid.
[70] Sonia Solicari, 'Selling Sentiment: The Commodification of Emotion in Victorian Visual Culture', *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, 4, 2007, http://www.19.bbk.ac.uk/ accessed November 1, 2016.
[71] This was especially so as Christmas approached and the end of year issues featured multiple colour engravings of children in keeping with the expected ethos of the season.
[72] There are many investigations into the role of sentimentality in Victorian painting: Solicari, 'Selling Setniment', Fred Kaplan, *Sacred Tears: Sentimentality in Victorian Literature*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), Pamela Fletcher, '"To Wipe a Manly Tear": The Aesthetics of Emotion in Victorian Narrative Painting', *Victorian Studies*, 2009, 457-469.
[73] See Chapt. *Influences*.
[74] *The Art-Journal*, 1876, 232.

[75] *The Sydney Mail*, November 29, 1879, 11.
[76] *The Art-Journal*, 1871, 153.
[77] *The Inter Ocean*, (Chicago), 28 October 28, 1876, 10. *Lenore* was exhibited at the 1876 Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia. Elmore was amongst those artists that received a bronze medal and diploma for his exhibits at the Exposition, *The Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser*, October 11, 1876, 5.
[78] *The Liverpool Mercury*, September 19, 1876, np.
[79] *The Courier-Journal*, Louisville, Kentucky, September 11, 1885, 3. It should be noted that although Raff's symphony was first publically performed in 1872, after Elmore painted *Lenore*, the Centennial exhibition took place in 1876.
[80] *Arthur's Illustrated Home Magazine*, Philadelphia, 1876, 564.
[81] Ibid.
[82] Kimberly Orcutt, 'The Artist's Hand and the Artist's Eye: Xanthus Smith at the Centennial Exhibition', *Archives of American Art Journal*, Vol. 51, 2012, 36-47.
[83] For more on the P.R.B and the Academy see: Michaela Giebelhausen, 'Academic Orthodoxy versus Pre-Raphaelite Heresy: Debating Religious painting at the Royal Academy, 1840-50' in *Art and the Academy in the Nineteenth Century*, eds. Rafael Cardoso Denis , R. and Colin Trodd, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 164-78.
[84] Jennifer Montagu, *The Expression of the Passions: The Origin and Influence of Charles Le Brun's Conférence sur l'expression générale et particulière*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 21.
[85] Ibid. 30.
[86] Thomas, *Victorian Narrative Painting*, 68.
[87] Vittorio Gallese, 'Mirror Neurons in Art' in *Art & the Senses*, eds. Francesca Bacci and David Melcher, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 458- 463.
[88] The literature on the scientific, technological and physiological nature of the eye and vision during the nineteenth century is expansive and not always in agreement. Jonathon Crary, *Techniques of the Observer*,(Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992), Flint, *The Victorians and the Visual Imagination* and Srdjan Smajić, *Ghost-Seers, Detectives and Spiritualists: Theories of Vision in Victorian Literature and Science*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), all offer comprehensive reviews of both technological and physiological approaches to vision and the eye during the period. Chris Otter, *The Victorian Eye: A Political History of Light and Vision in Britain, 1800-1900*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), is especially relevant in this area as he challenges the tropes of Foucault, the panopticon and the idea the *flâneur* , his assertion that 'Victorian visuality refuses to be captured by single paradigms', 61, is of immense import. Sir David Brewster's, *Letters on Natural Magic Addressed to Sir Walter Scott, Bart*., (London: William Tegg and Co., 1832), and also his *A Treatise on Optics*, (London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown and Green, 1831), were reprinted many times throughout the period. A debate on the eye and its properties and function broke out between John Fearn, (1786-1837), and Brewster that was attended to both in the press and in print*, An Appeal to Philosophers, by Name, on the Demonstration of Vision in the Brain, etc.*, (London: 1837). Although too many to list, there were numerous and constant advertisements for ophthalmic and other services related to the repair and improvement of the eye and vision during the period.
[89] Martin Jay, *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-Century French Thought*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 7.
[90] John Ruskin, *The Eagle's Nest*, (London: George Allen, 1905), 116. In the same lecture on the 'Relation to Art of the Science of Light' Ruskin insists that 'Sight is an absolutely spiritual phenomenon', 117.
[91] Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, (Edinburgh: A. Kincaid and J. Bell, 1759). This reference comes from the second edition, (Edinburgh: A. Kincaid and J. Bell, 1761), 2.
[92] Joseph Turnley, *The Language of the Eye: The Importance and Dignity of the Eye as Indicative of General Character, Female Beauty, and Manly Genius*, (London: Partridge and Co., 1856), 92, 94, 105.
[93] Montagu, 99.
[94] Jonathon Richardson, *An Essay on the Theory of Painting*, (London: Bettesworth, 1725), 3-5.
[95] *The Saturday Review*, May 22, London, 1869, 680, *The Athenaeum*, May 1, 1869, 610. Although Judith, in Fig. 97, does not seem to look directly to the viewer it is important to note that, from the quotes given, the contemporary viewer did read the painting this way. It may have been that the painting was hung in such a manner that a perceptual illusion created the effect of being looked at by the eyes portrayed.

[96] Carol Gibson-Wood , 'Richardson, Jonathan, the elder (1667–1745)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, eee ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. David Cannadine, January 2008, http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.library.ucc.ie/view/article/23571 accessed December 7, 2016.
[97] *The Art-Journal*, 1857, 114-5, *The Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser,* Sept. 23, 1848, 6.
[98] Jean Auguste Ingres, 'Notebooks' in *Art and Theory 1815-1900: An Anthology of Changing Ideas*, eds. Charles Harrison, Jason Gaiger and Paul Wood, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1998), 184.
[99] Flint, 86, *The Art-Journal*, 1856, 171.
[100] The gaze in itself is not neglected as it forms the basis of much discussion around issues of gender and class, see Lynda Nead, *Victorian Babylon: People, Streets and Images in Nineteenth Century London*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), Nead, *Myths of Sexuality: Representations of Women in Victorian Britain*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988), and more but the gaze is treated as a means of control of both the painted object looked at and the subject that object represents, the painted object acts as a means of confirming the oppressed status of the subject in the world. Manet's and Elmore's paintings confront and challenge this oppression in their subversion of the dominant gaze.
[101] Turnley, 52.
[102] Ruth E. Iskin, 'Selling, Seduction, and Soliciting the Eye: Manet's Bar at the Folies-Bergère', *The Art Bulletin*, 1995, 25-44.
[103] Ibid.
[104] Stephen Kerns, *The Eyes of Love: The Gaze in English and French Paintings and Novels 1840-1900*, (London: Reaktion Books, 1996), 14.
[105] Ibid. 12-52.
[106] Ibid. 136.
[107] Griselda Pollock, 'Victorian Painting by Julian Treuherz', (Review), *Victorian Studies*, 1994, 598-600. From Laura Mulvey, ('Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema', *Screen*, Vol. 1975, 6-18), through Pollock and Lynda Nead there has been a much greater intervention in examining the spaces and spectacular locations of the female in both real and representational contexts. However, it is in terms of the problematic and binary roles of the female that attention is drawn to, the prostitute versus the loyal mother and wife, the street versus the home.
[108] Nead, *Victorian Babylon*, 6.
[109] On the status of an 'English School' see En. 28 Chapt. 2.
[110] Chris Frith, 'Social Cognition', *Philosophical Transaction: Biological Sciences*, Vol. 363, No. 1499, 2034.
[111] Hans Belting, 'The Gaze in the Image', in Huppauf and Wulf, 106.
[112] Brewster, *Letters on Natural Magic*, Letters 2 & 5.
[113] Belting, 107.
[114] Frith, 'Social Cognition,, 2035.
[115] *Illustrated London News*, November 18, 1864, 480.
[116] *Sunday Times*, November 26, 1865, 5.
[117] *Pall Mall Gazette*, December 21, 1865, 5.
[118] Thomas, *Pictorial Victorians*, 130.

Chapter 5

Elmore's Drawings and Watercolours: An Artist Unatrophied

It has been shown here that Elmore reflected his own quotidian context and experience as much as he drew on sources from history and literature in his paintings. It has also been shown that the artists named as possible influences on the artist, as mentioned in *The Apollo* review of the Squire Gallery exhibition of his drawings and watercolours, can be detected in some of his works, with specific reference to Watteau. This chapter will attend to his drawings in this context but will also address both the manner in which his drawings inform his paintings while in many cases they undermine the expectations one has of the early to mid-nineteenth-century English artistic output with specific reference to his watercolours and sketches. Elmore's drawings and watercolours refute Paul Oppé's assertion that the 'primarily artistic instincts' of the Victorian artist were 'all but atrophied' by the demand for detail and 'sermon'.[1]

The Squire exhibition of Elmore's drawings and watercolours pointed to possible influences on Elmore; and Bonington was one of those artists mentioned. But in the catalogue for a 1937 exhibition of works by Bonington, and those that may have been influenced by him, Elmore gets a specific mention as an artist whose work differed from Bonington's but that had enough similarities 'to bridge the considerable gap between Bonington and the Pre-Raphaelites'.[2] The 'bridge' was built by Elmore's 'greater angularity and pronounced intensity' according to Paul Oppé.[3] This 'angularity' is not defined but Elmore's intensity is evident in his drawings. Oppé's observation suggests that Elmore extracts established motifs or styles but innovates to fit between, and into, multiple styles and genres of the period. It will be also proposed here that, in agreement with and expanding upon Ralph Edwards, Elmore was 'astonishingly modern'.[4]

Modernity in Elmore's drawings and watercolours cannot have been a spontaneous development. Elmore began, as did almost all other students admitted to the Royal Academy, by drawing from sculptures in the British Museum and on admission to the R.A. studied in the antique, life and painting schools. After becoming elected to the position of Royal Academician, Elmore attended as a visiting instructor and the importance he placed on the practice of drawing is attested to by his insistence on looking over every drawing by every student twice per night.[5] Elmore's experience as a student on the Continent and particularly in France led him to insist that the French drew 'better as a school'.[6] In his evidence to the *Parliamentary Committee of Inquiry into the Royal Academy*, Elmore pointed to the welcome changes that were occurring in the French methods of instruction around the same time that he was appearing before the *Inquiry*.[7] It is clear then that Elmore welcomed the move from academic standards to freer artistic expression, at least in drawing. This alteration in the French approach to drawing, an approach that had previously adhered to the classical, academic tradition, had not yet occurred while Elmore was copying artworks in the Louvre nor while he was also attending life drawing classes in Paris.[8] His comments suggest that he was, however, interested in and open to innovation in the field of artistic draughtsmanship and drawing as an end in itself.

Elmore's life drawings reflect a careful and studied approach to representing the male and female figure in the tradition of academic training. Figure 103 shows a nude male on paper treating the musculature and curve of the body in a manner that adheres to a strict mimesis of the human form as defined by the classical tradition. There is no hint of a break from tradition in the drawing and the same line of development continues in Figs. 104-106 where there is a formality that points toward a staged pose for the purpose of instruction. In Elmore's sketches of the female nude we can identify the differing approaches that he could take to representing the ideal form. In Figs. 107-108 Elmore is observed retaining academic lines, albeit with the

introduction of an intense expression, perhaps similar to that observed by Oppé, employing light shading to delineate the female form as he does for the male form in Fig. 104. Yet, here there is a stark contrast with the stripping away of shade and shadow in the study of a standing female nude viewed from behind (Fig. 52) to focus explicitly on the form defined by its own line and the inherent distortions in the non-idealised and flowing contours of a 'real' female. This adherence to the real in the depiction of the female nude was commented upon by reviewers of his painted nudes and other works by Elmore that contained the nude. In *Lenore* (Fig. 90), ('a painting which belonged neither to the grandiose nor the bread and butter school'), there were a number of nude figures featured in multiple poses both ascending from the waves and dancing in the distant clouds and for the reviewer writing in *The Building News* this demonstrated how 'Mr. Elmore drew and modelled the female nude superbly.'[9] The realism of Elmore's depiction of the female nude has already been commented upon when discussing Shirley Brooks' reaction to Elmore's portrayal of Eve in *After the Expulsion* and in discussing the 'Rubenesque' plumpness of his *Sabrina* (Fig. 42). The reviewer for the *London Daily News* could hardly contain his excitement on seeing Eve and Elmore's 'successful attempt to unite the style of the Old Masters… with the feeling for truth of fact sought for in the art of the present day.' Comparing Elmore with Titian and Raphael he noted that the 'hand of a master' was at play in the depiction of 'flesh' in the firm touch and the use of 'full rich impasto'.[10] Eve's realism and simultaneous patterning on classical and modern demand was praised. However, Sabrina's realism was also censored for the very same reasons and photographic reproductions of Elmore's *Sabrina* were banned and removed from display and sale in Liverpool on grounds of morality.[11] *The Liverpool Mercury* was ecstatic in its praise of the painting when it was exhibited at the Walker Art Gallery and pointed to 'the life-like suppleness of every part' of the river-nymph depicted.[12] The deviation from the correct proportions of the ideal female was identified by the *Illustrated*

London News and according to the *London Evening Standard* the 'ideal' was not 'exalted' by the painting of Sabrina.[13] Lawrence Alma-Tadema's *A Sculptor's Model* (Fig. 109) had received a similar censorial reaction when it was exhibited at the Walker Art Gallery in 1877, two years prior to Elmore's *Sabrina*; however even though both offended the opinion of the Liverpudlian moral guardians of the period Elmore's was perhaps the more offensive. The Neo-Classical depiction of the female nude in Alma-Tadema's painting had, at least, the aim of representing an ideal female that could be defended in terms of its context of adhering to an academic drive; Elmore, on the other hand, chose to depict a form that was at variance with the accepted norm, even though he was capable of producing Neo-Classical works as illustrated by his *A Greek Ode* exhibited in the same year as *Sabrina*. As we have seen, Elmore had begun painting, or had considered painting *Sabrina* much earlier than when it was shown at the Royal Academy and the Walker Gallery. William Edward Frost had also painted a version of Sabrina which was shown at the R.A. in 1875, two years after Elmore's communication with Robert Browning but still four years prior to his version being shown at the Academy.[14] Frost's *Sabrina* has multiple female nudes on display but all conform to an expected idealisation of the form; and the painting adheres closely to William Etty's 1841 version of the same subject in terms of depiction of the nude. Elmore's *Sabrina*, fills the frame and confronts the viewer both in its representation of the naked female as a real person undermining the mythological ideal of Milton's nymph and as an image that conforms more to the morally contentious issue of the female nude in the sphere of pornographic imagery than the classicism of Poynter, Leighton and Alma-Tadema; Sabrina appears in the form of, as J.B. Priestley would describe a watercolour of another female nude by Elmore, a 'splendid bare wench' with 'plenty of honest to God sex' (Fig. 110).[15] The freedom evident in this drive by Elmore to usurp the conventional, whether consciously or not, is to be found not

only in his depiction of the nude, although this serves to underline it, but more essentially in his works that did not reach completion or the walls of the Academy.

In Elmore's sketch books and individual drawings and watercolours we find this greater freedom expressed and also here in this less restricted arena we find the tendency to overturn the academic culture of conformity. Elmore's experimentation in drawing is to be found in the introduction of expression to the process, in the subject portrayed, the manner of line utilised in the portrayal, and the deviation from technical consideration of the drawn line. As can be seen in the watercolour drawings used to illustrate *The Apollo* review of The Squire Gallery exhibition, Elmore's work was both fluid and free (Figs. 111& 112) but we are reliant on Edwards for descriptions on the use of colour in the drawings exhibited, with the exception of *Santa Maria Della Salute, Venice* (Fig.113).[16] Elmore's *The Bathers Surprised* (Fig. 112) is 'Watteauesque', suggests Edwards, and we have discussed this possible influence using other examples from Elmore that support such an assertion. However, *Don Quixote* (Fig. 111) displays a sense of distortion and urgency that belies the period in which the work is produced and shows an awareness of medium and ground as functions in themselves.[17] The viewer is not led to the world of the Victorian, British artist but a world where shade, shadow and figure are unified as a means of expressing movement of the instrument of portrayal and the artist's touch as much, and indeed more than, the subject being portrayed. It is difficult to find a British watercolour from the period during the early years of Elmore's activity that shows such a revolutionary disregard for the accepted modes of representation and it is perhaps because of this that the work was not revealed to the public until the 20th century, over fifty years after Elmore's death. Edwards in his review of Elmore's watercolours and drawings used the words 'occult', 'sinister' and 'enigmatic', words that echo the feelings identified with *Lenore* and *Eugene Aram* and it has been shown that these paintings, while emotive and charged, were described as difficult to look at because

of their 'intensity' and 'weird' appearance.[18] Other examples of Elmore producing drawings in this style are known, such as Fig. 115 which depicts a woman entering a room holding a candle and a body lying in the bed behind the door. In this drawing, using graphite on paper, Elmore's intense use of hatching and his utilising of the white paper ground to differentiate light from shadow creates a paradox in which the main figure both recedes and advances from the darkness while, simultaneously, the prone figure begins to vanish in a miasma where both medium and ground contend for ownership of the body. There is no known painting by Elmore that signals its genesis in such a drawing and it may well be the case that it too was felt by the artist to be too challenging for the viewer even as he strove to heighten communicative expression within his completed painted works.

Completed works can be identified in many of the drawings and watercolours by Elmore that are available for examination but there are also those that point towards an intention of completion. This implies that there are drawings and watercolours that also persist as finite observations or exercises in imaginative experimentation, such as *Don Quixote* and, to apply a title, *Woman with Candle*.

Watercolours by Elmore that appear to be of the same period and which employ similar materials and techniques (Figs. 116& 118) are most likely intended to be preparatory works. Figure 84 has been shown to be in preparation for *Beppo* and Fig. 89a as a study for *Romeo and Juliet*.[19] The other scenes depicted have not been fully identified; Fig. 116 has been suggested by the National Gallery of Canada as illustrating a scene from *Faust* and there were listings for watercolours based on Faust in the 1934 Hodgson and Company sale of Elmore's works. One of Elmore's most known early works, *Hotspur and the Fop* (Fig. 117) was clearly in the mind of the painter when he drew the group for Fig. 118. The dispersal or loss of so many of Elmore's drawings and watercolours found by Ridgill Trout denies us access to what may have given us insight into his studies for completed paintings.

Nonetheless, the drawings that we do have access to allow us to examine his expressive use of medium and ground and his animation of the internal psychology of human expression.

The sketch book found by the Birmingham gallery, *Sigmund and Jocelyn*, provides multiple instances of Elmore's energetic use of medium while conveying his attention to figurative representation in a manner that reveals the many emotions conveyed in his paintings. Unlike many of his contemporaries Elmore's drawing was not limited to preparatory works or to academic and portrait studies. William Powell Frith, as one example, engaged in the creation of many studies that are known to have the intention of becoming finished oils and his practice and technique exemplifies a focus on the 'finished product' rather than experimentation.[20] Elmore's constant alteration of subject and theme in his finished works disallows a tendency to stability and vies towards experimentation.

The sheet from the Sigmund and Jocelyn collection illustrating four separate and disparate images (Fig. 119) highlights Elmore's investigation of facial expression and his readiness to alter his contact with the support's surface. All four figures convey differing emotions from the detached in the instance of the sole female depicted, to the threatening in the male head and shoulder sketch on the right, which has the least degree of finish. The application of the graphite is varied across all figures; the uppermost male contains broad hatching reduced in its impact on the paper ground, the female is defined by controlled line with minimal use of shadow and shading relying on precise facial construction to translate the remote psychological aspect of her visage. The standing figure is constructed using an array of defining lines, deep and intense close hatching in the trousers and looser diagonals in the arm to describe shading. However, it is the contrasting application of loose, threadbare lines in the hair with the even rubbing of the graphite in the face that conveys a sense of dark brooding and a sinister psychology that attracts the eye of the viewer and highlights Elmore's propensity for the 'eerie' and the 'occult' and his skill in rendering them. Elmore further

challenges the medium of the graphite pencil by undermining its ability to form distinct lines in Fig. 120. In this sheet of studies of character and motion we see Elmore developing an image from an abstract figure unsure of its own actions or feelings to a male figure stable in its own grounding and finally to a fully developed expression. On this journey from abstraction to defined characteristics, Elmore alters the use of the medium such that the strength of the pencil's accuracy in adhering to a static academic line is confronted by a fracturing of this stability and a reduction of the continuous contact with the paper ground to an infinity of touches that build towards the creation of expression in the face by translating each individual minute and erratic line into a syllabic presence in the sentence of the facial language of expression. This propensity to impose the line only to disrupt it in pursuit of a deeper rendering of the subject being portrayed conflicts with the Hogarthian 'serpentine line'.[21] For Elmore, the line is an object to be attacked, rubbed and obliterated in the quest to define the face, its aspect and character, (Fig. 121). Elmore's private approach to emotion through facial articulation does not compare to his finished oils; there, the expression intending to initiate communication with the viewer is dependent upon his formal ability to render the emotion in the viewed and ensure empathy from the viewer. Elmore's sketches, watercolours and drawings seem, as Ralph Edwards stated, 'to have been done …solely for himself' and so, with the exception of those we consider to be studies for oils, he is free to experiment and challenge in a way that is denied Frith and others who sought stability in delivering to the market, a stability we have seen Elmore undermine in his exhibited Royal Academy paintings.[22] This is not to suggest that Elmore avoided the academic style in favour of his more experimental drawings; we have seen from the earlier studies in this chapter that he did practice, as others did, in the conventional manner. This application can also be seen in his more controlled and subdued portrait studies; Figs. 122 and 123 testify to his technical skill in conventional drawing practice.

Elmore's drawings and sketches give an opportunity to examine other aspects of his works which is denied to us in his paintings. Elmore is known to have exhibited only one landscape painting during his career and is not known as a landscape painter; other than *An Italian Cornfield* sent to the British Institution in 1844 and the incorporation of landscape into some of his paintings there is little else of this genre produced by Elmore.

The sale of Elmore's sketches and watercolours at the Hodgson and Company auction listed a number of landscapes including views of Malvern, Hastings, Brighton, Dover and other unnamed locations. Elmore did travel to Malvern in August 1854, perhaps to attend the spas there to seek some relief from his neuralgia, with Killingworth Hodges, who would later be one of the executers of Elmore's will.[23] The landscape watercolours to which Trout had access may well have indicated their locations but even if they are only conjectural we do know that Elmore spent time on the south coast of England, apart from it being used as a departure point for France. Shirley Brooks' diary records the time Elmore spent in Folkestone in 1873, a popular resort for artists to visit; Frith and Alexander Cosens were there at the same time as Elmore.[24] Elmore's sketch book at the V&A contains a number of sketches that feature coastal scenes and landscapes.[25] It seems likely that the sketch book records part of Elmore's time in northern France, on his arrival there or as he waited to depart for England. On page seventy-seven of the sketch book (Fig. 124) Elmore depicts a small craft ferrying passengers in comfortable dress and included on the page is an intricate drawing of what appears to be a tiller, demonstrating both Elmore's delicacy in his drawing and the attention to detail that is found in his paintings. Amongst the many sketches of women and men in various poses and costumes and of inland landscapes there are at least six that are clearly of the coast and depict elements to be found in the painting attributed to Bonington that once belonged to Elmore and his son-in-law. The drawings on pages seventy-eight and seventy-nine (Figs.125 & 126) are simple yet expressive touches of pencil on paper; Fig.125 shows

the curved sweep of the beach and a small, almost insignificant cart and in the distance the solidity of a wall or pier jutting into the sea with a dense landscape behind. Figure 126 illustrates two horses, or donkeys, viewed both from the rear and the side as though merging into one mass, the head of a dog is seen in the most muted of touches and we also view the townscape as it marries with the bustle of the windblown sails tilting at the same angle as those in the style of a painting attributed to Richard Parkes Bonington.

Many of the works by Bonington in the public domain are questionable in their attribution and are designated as 'attributed to', 'after' or 'in the style of'. The painting 'in the style of' Bonington, which is located at the Ashmolean Museum, was owned by Elmore and later by his son-in-law Lindsay Hammond, (Fig. 127).[26] Bonington had just four paintings exhibited at the R.A., two of them were coastal scenes and all were in in the final two years of his life, 1827 and 1828. In Elmore's sketch the landscape element is compressed into the lower section of the sheet by a cloud formation that frames, without overwhelming, the man-made elements in either presence or density. The separated components of the Elmore sheet appear as though a preparation for the oil painting in the Ashmolean. This is not to suggest that the painting is by Elmore, rather it is to insist that, Elmore's movement through the spaces of his life are recorded in a manner that merely aligns with Bonington's outdoor scenes and that Elmore renders these spaces using his own vision of the fleeting nature of landscape and light. This hurried and delicate meeting of pencil, or brush, with paper confuses the viewer familiar with public aspects of Elmore's work. The detailed and considered finished oils of the Academy and the British Institution demonstrate no lack in surface representation while, as has already been shown in the discussion of motif in Elmore's work, a narrative *telos* is left suspended. Many of the drawings manifest themselves as ephemeral recordings of the physical world where complete ocular engagement is denied.

These sketches and watercolours in the sketch book at the V&A are similar to others we have examined thus far in that they allow us to view not only a genre from his oeuvre otherwise denied to us but also to reiterate his experimental approach to his work, an approach that anticipates later, or at least foreign, styles of painting, a style that would be described as 'the work of some minor French impressionist'.[27]

The drawings on page twenty-two (Fig. 128) are divided into three separate illustrations. The lower image is a beach scene showing individuals and groups on the shore, the drawing is evanescent and cursory but still manages to convey the activity of the people moving along the beach contrasted against the stillness of the females looking on underneath a sky that sweeps in parallel to the sea. The drawing is contained within its own frame as if imagined in completed form. There is no record of such a painting by Elmore but it is certainly one that might not have received the welcome that his other works did as this is a fleetingly constructed, almost diaphanous recording of an animated scene of life, weather and environment that manages to be almost ahead of its own time. The fugitive nature of the drawings, composed at speed, is more suggestive of the beach scenes drawn by the French landscape and Impressionist painter, Eugene Boudin than of Bonington's technical finesse. The single figure to the bottom left of the page adds a playfulness to the triad as we see a lady engaging with the sea, holding her long dress out of reach of the waves and barefooted. The final segment records the daily life of the coastal workers appearing to repair either nets or sails on a large frame and in the background, to give context without overwhelming substance, a light house that reflects the silhouette of the lighthouse at Calais.[28]

The drawing described above was created using pencil and chalk on paper and these materials are used throughout the V&A sketch book with few exceptions. The paper ground of the sketch book is not uniform and varies in colour and type. Elmore appears to show no preference as to which paper ground he uses for each drawing; watercolours appear on both

white and buff while landscapes and figures are to be found across all paper types. The landscape of Calais is joined by a number of others and one in particular, a watercolour, (Fig. 129), demonstrates Elmore's hurried use of the medium to create undulating and fluid movement of light and shade to render a landscape that is at once solid and transient in its nature. His brush strokes alternate between broad and precise while conveying a deft economy of touch. The palette used is in contrast to Elmore's use of greens, reds and blues in his oil paintings that cater to the subjects being depicted; here, in his landscapes, the graduation of colour combines with the opaqueness of the medium to impart both a sense of evanescence and atmospheric motion. A similar technique is to be found in a watercolour landscape at the British Museum (Fig. 130). In the British Museum sketch the range of media includes chalk but there is no definition of under drawing and the spontaneity of the V&A sketch is reproduced while using a limited palette to create both depth and expression of the artist's insistence on dissolution of the solidity of the depicted foliage and trees to create a transparent realisation in the foreground and peripheries in order to focus the eye on the sweep of the road and the density of the central arbour. The role of linear definition is dismissed, as with *Don Quixote*, but Elmore introduces the eerie once more in the construction of random yellow flashes that seem neither to conform to the demands of the image nor to the requirements of the viewer. The erratic and fugitive traces are out of context but participate in the agenda of presenting the medium as holding an equitable if not superior role in the transmission of the observed landscape. The fluid nature of the environment depicted allows Elmore to impart a similar instability in his use of medium, an instability that would be expected to be jettisoned in drawings of the more concrete and manmade structures in closed cityscapes.

Elmore's architectural drawings are more stable representations of environment and his attention to detail in this respect is reflected in his finished paintings as he endeavoured to

adhere to historical accuracy and to situate his retelling of narrative in a real locale. The artist's familiarity and awareness of the Italian architectural surrounding is evident in his paintings *Griselda* and *Beppo* and in his watercolour *San Giorgio Maggiore*. *Robert King of Naples* provided an opportunity to discuss Elmore's rendition of historically correct architecture and *Griselda* reinforces this. Chaucer's *Griselda*, from *The Clerk's Tale*, unfolds in Saluzzo, Piedmont and Elmore ensures that the Italian location is secured by the architectural background that he would have encountered. Although the structures are not individually identifiable they are generically correct for the setting as is the case with *Beppo* and *Robert*. *San Giorgio Maggiore* appears as an exercise solely in conveying the correct and accurate representation of an existing feature and Elmore achieves this by avoiding an overcrowding of activity on the water to allow San Giorgio Maggiore to stand in its own right prominent against the subdued sky and waterway. Any activity, such as the sailing boats and gondolas, is reduced by the most economical use of brush stroke and line while distant buildings are devoid of the distraction of detail.

Detail is, paradoxically, an ephemeral presence in the two images of the lanes and buildings of Rouen (Fig. 131 & 132). Figure 131 is emptied of human life with the exception of the fleeting trace in the distance. The line Elmore uses serves to at once represent the almost claustrophobic closeness of the medieval laneway and to anchor it in its own era by foregrounding the exposed timber of wattle and daub without the artist feeling compelled to replicate overwhelming detail and thus deprive the viewer of the space to navigate through the represented cityscape. The fugitive nature of Elmore's touch in his rural landscapes yields to the necessity of the concrete in his depicted buildings without surrendering completely to a demand for accuracy and completion. The facades of the buildings of Rouen evince more of the fluidity of the material than of the stability of the ground; they merge in shadow and line amongst the subdued tones of the muted colour. Elmore cannot refrain from the drive to

introduce an atmospheric mood in the absence of narrative with a touch that is both elusive and present.

Elmore's sketch books and watercolours act as both indicators of his working up to finished oils and his own uninhibited creative impulses. Although there is conformity to academic standards in terms of technique for many of his drawings, and this can be seen in the progress from studies to completed paintings, there is also an exaggerated deviation from the expected norm that translates itself to finished works only in terms of an emotional and atmospheric impact upon the viewer. This impact becomes effective when it instils in the viewer a feeling of both empathy and unease and these internal, intense responses are identified in the transmission of the 'eerie' and the 'unstable' from the mind of the artist as recorded in his drawings to the mind of the viewer who is confronted by this unease in some of his completed paintings.

Elmore's drawings can be seen as an origin of his impulse to challenge the spectator both in terms of their role as precursors to completed oils and as indicators of his approach to artistic creation. He acts as both innovator and imitator; imitative in responding to the needs and expectations of the Academy and innovative in his rejection of those very demands. In terms of his drawings and watercolours this may carry the caveat that these works were not intended for public scrutiny but their existence illustrates the reality that artists of the period did not all confine themselves to drawing for the sole purpose of perfecting an academic training or in preparation for completed oils. The question that increases in validity, but will not be answered here, is at what point a drawing becomes complete. Figures 59 and 118 sit as part of the process towards a completed work and as such attain their completeness in their essences as intimate actors in a stepped progression, Fig. 113 completes itself as a record of fact. However, the obliterations and excesses of drawings and watercolours such as those of Figs. 111 and 121 attain finality in their own stasis. In achieving circumscription without a

reliance on topographical recording of fact or restraint within a trajectory towards a definitive other, the watercolours and drawings by Elmore challenge the concept of completeness in a shifting of terms from line, form and colour to ones of motion, touch and fugacity.

[1] Oppé, 'Art',142.
[2] *The Scotsman*, June 3, 1937, 13. The exhibition was held at Burlington Fine Arts Club and the catalogue was written by Paul Oppé. It is also from Oppé's catalogue entry that we find one reason why an association between Delacroix has been cited (see also Campbell, 'Alfred Elmore') but Oppé's link between Elmore is based on Delacroix staying with an Elmore in Charles Street, London when he visited there in 1825. Elmore did not move to London until 1827.
[3] Ibid.
[4] *The Times*, November 23, 1934, 17.
[5] See En. 111 Chapt. 2, *Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Present Position of the Royal Academy, etc*., 367.
[6] Ibid. 368.
[7] Ibid.
[8] Campbell, 'Alfred Elmore', 243.
[9] *Bradford Daily Telegraph*, January 27, 1881, 2. *Building News*, May 28, 1875, 613.
[10] *London Daily News*, May 3, 1873, 3.
[11] *The Artist*, January 15, 1880, 9.
[12] *Liverpool Mercury*, September 2, 1879, 6.
[13] *Illustrated London News*, May 17, 1879, 18, *London Evening Standard*, May 5, 1879, 3.
[14] See Chapt. *Influences*.
[15] J.B. Priestlyy, *Particular Pleasures*, (London: Heinemann, 1975), 35-6.
[16] *Santa Maria Della Salute, Venice*, is not the correct designation for this image; the painting is more accurately of San Giorgio Maggiore, Venice. The watercolour was in the inventory of the National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne, in 2016. The gallery listed the watercolour as *A View of Venice*; this is the same painting that was exhibited at The Squire (Figs. 113&114). Henceforth, in this thesis it will be named *San Giorgio Maggiore*. (Present author's observation).
[17] In a review by the author of the collection of watercolours and drawings in the extensive collections held by the British Museum, the V&A and the R.A. there is no comparable watercolour or drawing to be found for the period 1830-80 by a member of the 'British School'.
[18] Edwards 'Drawings', 263-5.
[19] See Chapt. *Temporality and Narrative*.

[20] Sally Woodcock, 'The Painting Practice of William Powell Frith', in *William Powell Frith: Painting the Victorian Age*, Mark Bills and Vivien Knight, eds., (London: Yale University Press, 2006), 147. This tendency to remain within the genre and style that the artist found to be an artistic niche was not unique to Frith; many Victorian artists followed a similar trajectory, resorting to portraiture as an additional means of acquiring commissions and income.
[21] William Hogarth, *The Analysis of Beauty*, (London: W. Strahan, 1772), 38.
[22] Edwards, 264.
[23] *Worcestershire Chronicle and Provincial Railway Gazette*, August 23, 1854, 4, *Sheffield Independent*, April 15, 1881, 4.
[24] Brooks*, Diary*, Vol. 3, 243, M.S., London Library.
[25] The sketch book is from early in Elmore's career, around the time of his travels to and from Europe and most certainly during the time of his visits to the Louvre; the sketch book is signed by Francis Godfrey of the White Lion public house on Drury Lane. Francis Godfrey is named as the owner of the public house in 1841, *The Annual Register*, (Chronicle), (London: 1841), 8, but by November of 1842 he is listed as 'late of' the White Lion, *The London Gazette*, November 1, 1842, 3200.
[26] Catherine Casley, Colin Harrison and Jon Whiteley, eds., *The Ashmolean Museum: Complete Illustrated Catalogue of Paintings*, (Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 2004), 19.
[27] Edwards, 265.
[28] Ridgill Trout suggested in his notes for an exhibition of Elmore's drawings in 1934 that the sketches were made 'in and around Rouen and Le Havre'. Some of the sketches bear the designation 'Rouen' but it is more likely that Elmore sketched around Calais than Le Havre as it was the more popular transit point for cross channel ferries during the 1820s and 1830s.

Conclusion

Alfred Elmore was an unusual artist for the period in which he flourished and yet he is one of the many now forgotten Victorian artists who contributed to the artistic production of the times. Christopher Wood's *The Dictionary of Victorian Painters* lists up to 11,000 active artists during the years covered by his survey.[1] The definitions and interpretations of the artistic output during the Victorian era are, to a large extent, governed by the engagement with a limited number of artists and their works. This is to be expected. Elmore, as an artist denied the scrutiny and attention given to artists such as Frith, Leighton and Landseer, has become one of those artists whose output is only used to confirm the established view of the feminine or religious tropes in works like *On the Brink* and *Religious Controversy*. This denial creates its own lacuna and ignores the wider scope of his work, contexts and drives and thus illustrates by example the many other artists who have also faded from the texts of art history and that have fallen outside the search for images that support a given thesis or have just been deemed surplus to requirements in that need for support.

By expanding the source material used to interpret Elmore's religious paintings and by grounding that expansion in his own biography and roots, while looking to contemporary media reports and reactions to both Catholic resurgences and Irish immigration as its corollary, it becomes clear that Elmore could not have shared such anti-Catholic views, and thus anti-Irish sentiment. When Elmore's expanded oeuvre is viewed in the context of the religious debates of the period and reviewed in terms of the works' symbolic expression and historical setting and context, the attribution of anti-Catholicity loses all plausibility. Clearly Elmore did not conform to a divisive utilisation of tropes but circumvented those recurrent motifs to increase sympathetic awareness of Catholicism and to support its position. In the absence of other documentation, the images seem in conformity with the artist's political stances as a supporter of the Liberal Party, in the person of Jacob Bell, and as a shareholder in

O'Connell's National Bank. The nature of anti-Catholic art was not confined to the content depicted but also manifested itself in the style in which it was delivered. The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood in their opting for pre-Reformation guidance in their art could be, and were often, aligned with the growth of pro-Catholic tendencies in Oxford and throughout the United Kingdom to the extent that the Brotherhood's 'Romanist' tendencies had to be denied and rejected in any defence of their artistic innovation. Elmore escaped such criticisms and alignments as his portrayals of religious subjects did not offend the public or the Academy in their style and, as we have seen, his choice of subject was often seen as benign even as it illustrated and drew upon explicitly Catholic ritual symbolism. Daniel O'Connell's support of Elmore at the outset of the artist's career at the Royal Academy is indicative of the accepted pro-Catholic nature of his work along with his uncle's continued support for Elmore as indicated by his will.

The artistic and market influences affecting Elmore might be expected to have been similar to those affecting other artists of his time and status. This is not the case. Elmore's artistic output, and especially at the Royal Academy exhibitions, did not adhere to the expected trajectories of the market; indeed, the pattern of his choice of subjects suggests a desire to step away from this path while not denying himself the opportunities to engage with subjects that were of interest enough to him to produce paintings at points when the subjects had fallen out of favour. Elmore's recognised skill as a painter of historical subjects, such as Thomas á Becket, William Lee and Queen Mary, spanned his artistic career yet they were, according to Bayer, the least popular genre during that period. Elmore's decision to depict Mary happened at a point when she had been missing from the Academy walls for a number of years. Elmore's *Charles V at Yuste*, when it was exhibited in 1856, was amongst many paintings at the Royal Academy that concentrated upon what was 'a proliferation of pretty girls' and demonstrated the desire of artists to make 'a living while not ready to worry about

becoming great', a desire that Elmore did not respond to in exhibiting a historical painting against the demands of the market and the trend of his fellow artists.[2] Almost all artists reverted to, or never diverted from, the painting of portraits as a means of maintaining relevance in the market or ensuring that an income was forthcoming from that market. We have seen that Elmore did not engage in portraiture until the latter end of his career and even then his subject, John Simon, although known was not renowned and it is most likely that the portrait was a personal rather than a commercial endeavour given Elmore's and Simon's close friendship. The market, then, as it altered and evolved from domination by the aristocratic and landed patrons of the early nineteenth-century to domination by a demographic that required a different range of subjects and themes, did not entirely determine artistic output. It would be impossible to assert that Elmore was unique in his response among the many thousands of artists practicing during the period under discussion here and if it is the case that others existed then it casts doubt on the proposition that it was an artistic era confined by the market and the Academy; nonetheless Elmore's singularity, if it is such, itself casts doubt on the proposal.

While the market may be one influence on an artist's development there is also the influence of peers. Elmore did not look to his fellow Academicians in his choice of subject to the extent that one would expect as the Academy sought to ingrain the idea of an English School. Elmore's paintings show a technical influence, in terms of colour, texture and gesture that is firmly grounded in a continental experience. Importantly, the impact of Delacroix and Bonington is tentative at best and it is to an Italian influence that one must look to find the securest roots for any external effect on Elmore's artistic output. The Old Master influences were noted by critics at the time and while Palagi was not specifically identified as an influence clearly there are direct connections to Elmore's most noted works. Art critics in the printed media of the period saw that the Italian influence continued in Elmore's use of colour

and texture as his career progressed and this was not limited to English reviewers. This manifestation of a continental influence belies the tendency to categorise Elmore as part of an English School and allowed him to be innovative in his approach to his art, an approach that is evident in his drawings, watercolours and exhibited oil paintings. Elmore's innovation is particularly striking in his depiction of the female and in the manner in which his 'narrative' paintings call into question the operation of narrative paintings as enclosed and completed works within their own frames. When viewing Elmore's paintings it is of immense importance to see that the manner in which he depicted many of his subjects freed those subjects from static narrative; it is also important to note that this freedom from stasis offered the viewer a gateway to a liberating and imaginative construction of narrative.

Deviations from the accepted norms of painting that Elmore also incorporated into his public output demonstrate his modernity. His drawings conform to, while challenging, standards, always altering and confounding expectation. The confrontations that present themselves in his paintings not only attest to a modern continental influence but prefigure impressionist preoccupations with the model as a subjective entity rather than a passive conduit for societal stabilities and moral balance. Elmore was either a unique artist or a representative of others that have similarly slipped from view and thus needs to be re-interrogated in the context of a broadening interpretation of the idea of nineteenth century British artists. If his work is simply made to fit in with the output of other artists practising during the period it risks being sacrificed to the multiple artistic interpretive turns that have occurred during the late twentieth century. Whether spatial, temporal, feminist or Marxist, these interpretive turns imply a passive reception of readable painted texts and it is evident that Elmore's texts, in their incompleteness permitted an active engagement with his paintings, through gesture, ocular contact and narrative absence. The recognition of a narrative absence and the willingness, or necessity, to complete a narrative is evident in the reactions of newspaper

critics and their construction of completion. The treatment of popular Shakespearian themes by Elmore presents a means of engaging with the imaginary in their severing of the painted moment from the chronology of the dramatic sequence. Unlike other artists, such as Maclise and Hunt, Elmore did not depict a textual rehearsal but a visual originary that frees the imagination of the viewer to play with the source as an imaginary impulse rather than as a constricting directive.

In playing to his own artistic drives while operating within the Academy, Elmore maintained an independence through his running of the 'gamut' of Victorian art. The drawings and watercolours discussed here illustrate both an artist 'ahead of his time' but also one that understood the workings of his medium and its ability to convey meaning and presence through minimal touch. The minimal and its opposition, the loading of symbolic carriers, operate together not as definitive synthesisers of societal norms but as liberators of the imagination and thus the mind of the spectator.

As an artist, 'a singular fish', Elmore by his very existence as a painter of the period calls into question and challenges the status of the Victorian painting as no more than a means of mirroring its own society's standards, or those imposed upon it. Elmore alters the chronology of the 'problem picture' as well as its instances. In terms of his public and private output Elmore has become spectral not because of his death, but because of changing artistic taste toward the end of the nineteenth century and the refusal to see modernity in his works' encounters with spectator as a speculating rather than a passive reader of the non-painted imaginary and in his portrayals of the spectating object as a subject aware of its own subjectivity.

Notes: Conclusion

[1] Wood, *Victorian Painters*, 9.
[2] *Illustrated Times*, June 14, 1856, 15.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Author Unknown. *Authenticated Report of the Discussion which took place between the Rev. Richard T.P. Pope and the Rev. Thomas Maguire in the Lecture room of the Dublin Institution on the 19th, 20th, 21st, 23rd, 24th and 25th of April, Dublin,1827*, London, 1827.

Author Unknown. *Report of the Committee for the Relief of the Distressed Districts in Ireland*: *Appointed at a General Meeting Held at the City of London Tavern, on the 7th of May 1822*, London, William Phillips,1823.

Author Unknown. *St. John's Church, Catalogue of the Fine Art Collection, at the Assembly Room, Free Trade Hall, in Connection with the Bazaar for Church Improvements*, Manchester,1878.

Addison, Joseph. *Remarks on Several Parts of Italy, &c. in the Years, 1701, 1702, 1703*, London: J. and R. Tonson, 1767.

Beare, John. *A Letter to the King on the Practical Improvement of Ireland*, London: Clerc Smith, 1827.

Blackburn, Henry. *Artists and Arabs or Sketching in Sunshine*, London: Sampson Low, Son, and Marston, 1870.

Brewster, Sir David. *A Treatise On Optics*, London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown and Green, 1831.

—— *Letters on Natural Magic Addressed to Sir Walter Scott, Bart*., London: William Tegg and Co., 1832.

Brodie, Alexander, ed. *The Reminiscences of Solomon Alexander Hart, R.A.*, London: Wyman and Sons, 1882.

Brontë, Emily. *Villette*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992.

Brooks, Shirley. *Diary Vol. 3*, 1873, Unpublished M.S.

Brown, John. *John Leech and Other Papers*, Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1882.

Byron, George, Lord. *Don Juan*. Edited by T.G. Steffan, E. Steffan and W.W. Pratt, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.

—— "Beppo". In *Poems 1807-1824 and Beppo*. Edited by Andrew Nicholson, New York: Garland, 1998.

—— *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*, Vols. 1&2. Edited by Edward E. Morris, London: Macmillan, 1899.

—— *The Collected* Poems, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions, 1994.

Campan, Madame. *Memoirs of the Private Life of Marie Antoinette, Queen of France*, London, 1823.

Cassel, John. *John Cassel's Art Treasures Exhibition Containing Engravings of the Principal Masterpieces of the English, Dutch, Flemish, French and German Schools etc*., London: W. Kent and Co., 1858.

Cobbin, Ingram. "Essay on Popery". In *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, London: Partridge and Oakey, 1848.

Cottier, Maurice. *Exposition Universelle de Vienne en 1873, Section Français, Rapport sur les Beaux-Arts*, Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1876.

Dalziel, Edward and George. *The Dalziel Brothers: A Record of Fifty Years' Work in Conjunction with Many of the Most Distinguished Artists of the Period – 1840-1890*, London: Methuen & Co., 1901.

Eastlake, Lady. "A Memoir of Sir Charles Eastlake". In Sir Charles John Eastlake, *Contributions to the Literature of the Fine Arts*, London: John Murray, 1870.

Elmore, John Richard. *Letters to the Right Hon. The Earl of Darnley: On the State of Ireland, in Advocacy of Free Trade and other measures of Practical Improvement, more especially Calculated to Supersede the Necessity of Emigration*, London: James Ridgway, 1828.

Fearn, John. *An Appeal to Philosophers, by Name, on the Demonstration of Vision in the Brain, &c.*, London, 1837.

Frith, William Powell. *My Autobiography and Reminiscences*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1888.

—— *John Leech: His Life and His Work*, Vol. 2, London, 1891.

Gabourd, Amédée. *Historire Contemporaine Comprenant les Principaux Événements qui se sont Accomplis depuis la Révolution de 1830 jusuis nos Jours*, Vol. 5, Paris: Librairie de Firmin Didot Freres, Fils et Cie., 1865.

Hall, Samuel, C. *Retrospect of a Long Life*, Vol. 1, New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1883.

——*Retrospect of a Long Life*, Vol. 2, London: Richard Bentley and Son, 1883.

—— *The Trial of Sir Jasper: A Temperance Tale, in Verse*, London: Virtue, Spalding and Daldy, n.d. (after 1873).

Imray, John. "A Reminiscence of Sixty Years Ago", *The Art-Journal*, 1898. 202.

Jopling, Louise. *Twenty Years of My Life: 1867-1887*, London: John Lane, 1925.

Kingsley, Charles. *The Saint's Tragedy, or, The True Story of Elizabeth of Hungary, Landgravine of Thuringia, Saint of the Romish Calendar*, London: John W. Parker, 1848.

Lewis, Martin. *The Monk: A Romance*, London, 1797.

Liddon, Henry Parry. *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, Vol. 31, London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1894.

Masters, Joseph. *Sisters of Mercy in the Church of England*, London: Joseph Masters,1850.

Maturin, Charles. *Melmoth the Wanderer*, Edinburgh, 1820.

Mazzini, Giuseppe. "Modern Italian Painters: Hayez, Migliara, Azeglio &c"', *The Westminster Review*, 1841, 363-90.

Mill, John Stuart. *Considerations on Representative Government*, London, 1861.

Milner, Dr. John. *A Vindication of the End of Religious Controversy, &c.*, Philadelphia,1825.

O'Sullivan, Rev. Mortimer, and Rev. Robert J. McGhee. *Romanism as it Rules in Ireland &c.*, Vol. 1, Dublin: Milliken, Grant and Bolton, 1840.

Panton, Jane Ellen. *Leaves from a Life*, London: Eveleigh Nash, 1908.

Pigot and Co. *Pigot's Provincial Directory*, Cork, 1824.

Pike, Edgar, Royston. *Human Documents of the Industrial Revolution in Britain*, London: Unwin University Books, 1966.

Richardson, H.C.. *Academy Criticisms, 1877: A Collection of the Principal Notices and Critiques, etc.*, London: The Auxiliary Steam Printing Co., 1877.

Richardson, Jonathon. *An Essay on the Theory of Painting*, London: Bettesworth, 1725.

Roberts, William. *Memorials of Christie's: A Record of Sales from 1766 to 1896*, London, George Bell and Sons, 1897.

Royale, Madame Marie Thérèse. *Royal Memoirs of the French Revolution*, London, 1823.

Ruskin, John. *The Eagle's Nest*, London, 1905.

Simon, Sir John. *Personal Recollections*, London, 1894.

Sinclair, Catherine. *Beatrice, or The Unknown Relatives*, London: Richard Bentley, 1852.

—— *Popish Legends or Bible Truths*, London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1852.

Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, London: A. Kincaid and J. Bell, 1761.

Stirling-Maxwell, William. *The Cloister Life of the Emperor Charles V*, London: John W. Parker and Son, 1851.

Storey, George A. *Sketches from Memory*, London: Chatto and Windus,1899.

Thackeray, William Makepeace. *The Works of William Makepeace Thackeray*, Vol. 30, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.

—— "On the French School of Painting". In *The Paris Sketchbook*, Vol. 1, New York: Appleton, 1853. First published London: John Macrone, 1840.

—— *The Irish Sketch Book*, Vol. 1, London: Chapman and Hall, 1845.

Trollope, Anthony. *The Letters of Anthony Trollope*, Vol. 2. Edited by John Hall, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1983.

—— "The Irish Church", *Fortnightly Review*, Vol. 2, 1865, London, 82-90.

—— *Can You Forgive Her?*, London, Chapman and Hall, 1864. Reprinted as one volume with an introduction by David Skilton and new illustrations by Llwellyn Thomas. London: The Folio Society, 1989.

Turnley, Joseph. *The Language of the Eye: The Importance and Dignity of the Eye as Indicative of General Character, Female Beauty, and Manly Genius*, London: Partridge and Co., 1856.

Tyndall, John. "Atoms, Molecules and Ether Waves", 1882. In *New Fragments*, New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1892, 78-93.

Valery, M. *Historical, Literary and Artistical Travels in Italy, etc*.. Translated by C.E. Clifton, Paris: Baudry's European Library, 1839.

Newspapers & Periodicals:

Aris's Birmingham Gazette

Art-Journal

Arthur's Illustrated Home Magazine (Philadelphia)

Art-Union

Athenaeum

Bath Chronicle and Weekly Gazette

Bell's Life in London and Sporting Chronicle

Birmingham Daily Gazette

Birmingham Daily Post

Birmingham Journal

Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine

Bolton Chronicle

Chester Chronicle

Cork Examiner

Cornhill Magazine

Courier-Journal (Louisville, Kentucky)

The Crayon

Daily News

Dorset County Chronicle and Somersetshire Gazette

Dublin Evening Post

Dublin Review

Dublin Weekly Nation

Dublin Weekly Register

Dundalk Democrat and People's Journal

Dundee Courier

Edinburgh Review or Critical Journal

Evening Mail

Examiner, (London)

Freeman's Journal

Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle

Gloucestershire Echo

The Graphic

Hereford Journal

Illustrated London News

Illustrated Times

Inter Ocean, (Chicago),

Ipswich Journal

Lady's Magazine and Museum

Lady's Newspaper

Lancashire Evening Post

Lancashire Daily Post

Leamington Spa Courier

Limerick Reporter

Literary Gazette and Journal of the Belles Lettres, Arts, Sciences, &c.

Liverpool Mercury

London Daily News

London Evening Standard

Magazine of Art

Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser

Morning Chronicle

Morning Post

Newcastle Guardian and Tyne Mercury

Newry Examiner and Louth Advertiser

New York Times

Northern Whig

Pall Mall Gazette

Polytechnic Journal, Vol. 2, 1840.

Press, (Canterbury)

The Protestant Magazine

The Rambler: A Catholic Journal and Review, London, 1858, Vol. 10.

Reynolds's Newspaper

Saturday Review

Sheffield and Rotherham Independent

Sheffield Independent

Shields Daily Gazette and Shipping Telegraph

Southern Reporter and Cork Commercial Courier

South Wales News

The Spectator

Stirling Observer

Sunday Times

Sydney Mail

The Tablet

Teesdale Mercury

The Times

Wells Journal

Woman's World

Worcestershire Chronicle and Provincial Railway Gazette

Wrexhamite and Denbighshire and Flintshire Reporter

Yorkshire Post and Leeds Intelligencer

State of Ireland, Minutes of Evidence: Taken before the Select Committee appointed into the Disturbances in Ireland, in the last Session of Parliament, 13th may – 8th June 1824, House of Commons, London.

The Annual Register, (Chronicle), London, 1841.

The London Gazette, November 1, 1842.

Archives and Libraries Consulted:

Chief Secretary's Office Registered Papers, Francis J. Crowley Bequest, National Archives of Ireland.

The Browning Letters, Armstrong Browning Library, Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

Alfred Elmore Letters, Letters and Papers of British Artists, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles.

London Library.

National Art Library, Victoria & Albert Museum.

Royal Academy of Arts Library and Archive.

Sigmund and Jocelyn, Fine Art Gallery, Birmingham.

The Wellcome Library and Archive, London.

The British Library.

War Office Records, National Archives, Kew, United Kingdom

Letter to George Leslie, May 14, 1869, Tate, 9613/5/3/3, Letter to Ms. Stacey, 1868, National Art Library, M.S.L. 8/59-1984

Ridgill Trout, Alfred Elmore R.A., Senate House Library, M.S.: 862/4/4

Letter, Elmore to Horsley, 1861, Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. C. 2222 fols. 145-6

William Powell Frith to Thomas Miller, 10 February, 1850, Reference code: 236/41/1, 236/1, 236/34, 236/50/5, 236/41/3 Thomas Miller Papers, Royal Academy of Arts Archive, London,

R.A.A., 236/34/8 R.A.A., 236/39/3 R.A.A. 236/39/3. Royal Academy of Arts Archive, Letter, Reference code: 236/42/14

National Art Library, Victoria & Albert Museum, Letter, Reference Code: 1985/8/59

Alfred Elmore Letters, Getty Research Institute, ID/ACC. No. 860525 (bx.2, f.79), Letter 3.

Secondary sources

Altholz, Josef. "The Warfare of Conscience with Theology". In *The Mind and Art of Victorian England*. Edited by Josef Altholz, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1976, 58-77.

Altick, Robert. *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the English Mass Reading Public 1800-1900*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

—— *Paintings from Books: Art and Literature in Britain, 1760-1900*, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1985.

Arscott, Caroline. "William Frith's The Railway Station: Classification and Crowd". In *William Powell Frith: Painting the Victorian Age*. Edited by Mark Bills and Vivien Knight, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006, 79-93.

Ashton, Geoffrey. *Pictures in the Garrick Club: A Catalogue of the Paintings, Drawings, Watercolours and Sculpture*. Edited by Kalman A. Burnim & Andrew Wilton, London: Garrick Club, 1997.

Atkinson, Diane. *The Criminal Conversation of Mrs Norton*, London: Preface Publishing, 2012.

Barlow, Paul Jonathon. '*The Backside of Nature', The Clique. Hogarthiainism and the Problem of Style in Victorian Painting*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Sussex, 1989.

Barrell, John. "Sir Joshua Reynolds and the English of English Art". In *Nation and Narration*. Edited by Homi Bhabha, London: Routledge, 2003, 154- 176.

Barrington, Russell. *The Life, Letters and Work of Frederic Leighton*, Vol. 2, London: Allen, 1906.

Bashford, Christina. *The Pursuit of High Culture: John Ella and Chamber Music in Victorian London*, Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2007.

Bass, Michael. *Street Music in the Metropolis*, London: John Murray, 1864.

Batchelor, John. *John Ruskin: No Wealth But Life*, London: Pimlico, 2001.

Bayer, Thomas and John Page. *The Development of the Art Market in England: Money as Muse, 1730-1900*, London: Routledge, 2011.

Bell, Quentin. *Victorian Artists*, London: Academy, 1967.

Berger, John. *Ways of Seeing*, London: Penguin, 2008.

Best, Geoffrey. *Mid-Victorian Britain 1851-75*, London: Fontana Press, 1985.

Boase, Thomas, S.R.. *English Art: 1800-1870*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

Birch, Dinah, ed. *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Brewer, John. *The Pleasure of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century*, London: Routledge, 1997.

Briggs, Asa. *The Age of Improvement: 1783-1867*, London: Longman, 1983.

Brown, Ron. *Art of Suicide*, London: Reaction Books, 2001.

Bryan, Michael. *Bryan's Dictionary of Painters and Engravers*, Vol. 2. Edited by George Charles Williamson, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964.

Buckley, James. "The Skirmish at Ballinascarty, County Cork, 1798", *Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society*, July-September, 1903, 137-140.

Butler, Patricia. *Three Hundred Years of Irish Watercolours and Drawings*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1990.

Cahalane, Rev. P.. "Social Conditions in Ireland During the Napoleonic Wars", *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, June, 1916, 210-25.

Campbell, Gordon, ed. *The Grove Encyclopaedia of Decorative Arts*, Vol. 1, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Campbell, Julian. "Alfred Elmore". In *Art and Architecture of Ireland: Painting 1600-1900*. Edited by Nicola Figgis, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014, 243-5.

Capozzi, Frank. "Judith and Holofernes: A Chronological List of Works", *Rivista di Studi Italiani*, Vol. 23, No. 2, December, 2010, 248-85.

Casley, Catherine, Colin Harrison, and Jon Whiteley, eds. *The Ashmolean Museum: Complete Illustrated Catalogue of Paintings*, Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 2004.

Casteras, Susan P. "Virgin Vows: The Early Victorian Artists; Portrayal of Nuns and Novices", *Victorian Studies*, No. 2, 1981, 157-184.

Cherry, Deborah. *Beyond the Frame: Feminism and Visual Culture, Britain 1850-1900*, London: Routledge, 2000.

Chesneau, Ernest. *The English School of Painting*. Translated by L.N. Etherington, London: Cassell and Company, 1885.

Christ, Carol T., and John O. Jordan, eds. *Victorian Literature and the Victorian Visual Imagination*, Berkley: California University Press, 1995.

Ciletti, Elena. “Judith Imagery as Catholic Orthodoxy in Counter-reformation Italy.” In *The Sword of Judith: Judith Studies Across the Disciplines*. Edited by Kevin R. Brine, Elena Ciletti and Henricke Lähnemann, Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 2010, 345-68.

Collins, R., ed. *12 Views of Manet’s Bar*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Cook, Edward Tyas, and Alexander Wedderburn. *The Works of John Ruskin*, London: George Allen, 1904.

Coombes, James. *Clonakilty and District*, Clonakilty, C.Y.M.S., 1959, 63, 77-9 & 86-9.

—— “Doctor William O’Brien of Glenanaar”, *Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society*, 1977, 115-126.

Cope, Zachary. *The Versatile Victorian: The Life of Sir Henry Thompson*, London: Harvey and Blythe, 1951.

Cowling, Mary. *The Artist as Anthropologist: The Representation of Type and Character in Victorian Art*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Crary, Jonathon. *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century*, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1992.

Cronin, Sean. *Irish Nationalism: A History of its Roots and Ideology*, Dublin: Academy Press, 1980.

d’Alton, Ian. *Protestant Society and Politics in Cork: 1812 -1844*, Cork: Cork University Press, 1980.

Delay, Cara. “The Devotional Revolution on the Local Level: Parish Life in Post-Famine Ireland”, *U.S. Catholic Historian*, Vol. 22, No. 3, 2004, 41-60.

Del Re, Sonia, ed. *Beauty's Awakening: Drawings by the Pre-Raphaelites and their Contemporaries from the Lanigan Collection*, Ottawa: National Gallery of Canada, 2015.

Dickson, David. *Old World Colony: Cork and South Munster, 1630-1830*, Cork: Cork University Press, 2005.

Donnelly, Jr., James S. *Captain Rock: The Irish Agrarian Rebellion of 1821–1824*, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009.

—— *The Land and the People of Nineteenth-Century Cork: The Rural Economy and the Land Question*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

Dunne, Tom "Caroline Norton, A Study for the Great Fresco of Justice in the House of Lords". In *Daniel Maclise, 1806-1870: Romancing the Past*. Edited by Peter Murray, Cork: Crawford Art Gallery, 2008, 64.

—— "The Marriage of Strongbow and Aoife: Entertaining History in the Interests of the State". In *Creating History: Stories of Ireland in Art*. Edited by Brendan Rooney, Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2016, 134-143.

Edelstein, Teri J. "Augustus Egg's Triptych: A Narrative of Victorian Adultery", *The Burlington Magazine*, 1983, 202-212.

Edwards, Ralph. "Drawings of Alfred Elmore, R.A. 1815-1881", *Apollo*, 1934, 263-265.

Egerton, Judy. *English Watercolour Painting*, Oxford: Phaidon, 1979.

Elliot, Bridget, J.. "The Scottish Reformation and English Reform: David Wilkie's Preaching of Knox at the Royal Academy Exhibition of 1832", *Art History*, 1984, 313 -328.

Eltis, Sos. *Acts of Desire: Women and Sex on Stage 1800 – 1930*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Errington, Lindsay. *Social and Religious Themes in English Art 1840 – 1860*, PhD Thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, London: Garland Publishing, 1985.

Everitt, Graham. *English Caricaturists and Graphic Humourists of the Nineteenth Century*, London: Sonnenschein, 1893.

Facos, Michelle. *An Introduction to Nineteenth Century Art*, New York: Routledge, 2011.

Farr, Denis. *William Etty*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958.

Ferguson, George. *Signs and Symbols in Christian Art*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Finberg, Alexander Joseph. *English Watercolour Painters*, London: Duckworth and Company, 1905.

Fisher, Devon. *Roman Catholic Saints and early Victorian Literature: Conservatism, Liberalism, and the Emergence of Secular Culture*, Surrey: Ashgate, 2012.

Fletcher, Pamela. *Narrating Modernity: The British Problem Picture 1895-1914*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

—— "To Wipe a Manly Tear": The Aesthetics of Emotion in Victorian Narrative Painting", *Victorian Studies*, Vol. 51, 2009, 457-469.

Flint, Kate. *The Victorians and the Visual Imagination*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Ford, Brinsley. "The Englishman in Italy". In *The Treasure Houses of Britain: Five Hundred Years of Private Patronage and Art Collecting*. Edited by Gervase Jackson-Stops, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986, 40-9.

Foster, Michael, ed. *Art Treasures of England: The Regional Collections*, London: Merrell Holberton, 1998.

Frith, Chris. "Social Cognition", *Philosophical Transaction: Biological Sciences*, Vol. 363, 2008, 2033-2039.

Gallese, Vittorio. "Mirror Neurons in Art". In *Art & The Senses*. Edited by Francesca Bacci and David Melcher, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, 458- 463.

Gaunt, William. *The Restless Century: Painting in Britain 1800-1900*, New York: Phaidon, 1972.

Geoghegan, Patrick. "Act of Union". In *The Encyclopaedia of Ireland*. Edited by Brian Lalor, Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, 2003, 7.

Giebelhausen, Michaela. "Academic Orthodoxy versus Pre-Raphaelite Heresy: Debating Religious painting at the Royal Academy, 1840-50". In *Art and the Academy in the Nineteenth Century*. Edited by Rafael Cardoso Denis and Colin Trodd, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000, 164-78.

Gillet, Paula. *The Victorian Painter's World*, Gloucester: Alan Sutton Publishing, 1990.

Gilman, Sander L. "Who Kills Whores?' 'I do', says Jack: Race and Gender in Victorian London". In *The Body*. Edited by Tiffany Atkinson, Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005, 64-74.

Girvin, Brian."Making Nations: O'Connell, Religion and the Creation of Political Identity". In *Daniel O'Connell: Political Pioneer*. Edited by Maurice R. O'Connell, Dublin: 1991, 23-32.

Glin, The Knight of, and James Peill. *Irish Furniture: Woodwork and Carving in Ireland from the Earliest Times to the Act of Union*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

Goddard, Jonathan and D.E. Osborn. "Sir Henry Thompson 1820-1904: Scientist, Artist, Motorist, Gourmet, Traveller, Cremationist and Subspecialist Urologist", *De Historia Urologiae Europaeae*, Vol. 11, 2004, 11, 91-105.

Gouay, George, "Comte de Montalembert". In *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, Vol. 10. Edited by Charles G. Herbermann, Edward A. Pace, Condé B. Pallen, et al., New York: Robert Appleton, 1911, 513-16.

Grandi, Renzo. "Un Pittore tra Rivoluzione e Restaurazione". In *Pelagio Palagi: Artista e Collezionista*, Bologna: Grafis, 1976, 31-56.

Graves, Algernon. *The Royal Academy of Arts: A Complete Dictionary of Contributors and their Work from its Foundation in 1769 to 1904*, Vols. 1-8, London: Henry Graves and Company, 1905-6.

Greenblatt, Stephen, et al. eds. *The Norton Shakespeare*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company Ltd., 1997.

Grennan, Simon and Laurence Groves, eds. *Transforming Anthony Trollope: Dispossession, Victorianism and Nineteenth Century Word and Image*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2015.

Grieve, Alastair. "A Notice on Illustrations to Charles Kingsley's 'The Saint's Tragedy' by Three Pre-Raphaelite Artists", *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 111, 1969, 290-1, 293.

Hadfield, John. *Every Picture Tells a Story: Images of Victorian Life*, New York: Fact on File Publications, 1985.

Hardie, Martin. *Watercolour Painting in Britain*, Volume 2. Edited by, Dudley Snelgrove with Jonathan Mayne and Basil Taylor, London: Batsford, 1966-68.

Heimann, Mary. *Catholic Devotion in Victorian England*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Herringer, Carol Engelhardt. *Victorians and the Virgin Mary: Religion and Gender in England, 1830-1885*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008.

Hoock, Holger. "Struggling against a Vulgar Prejudice": Patriotism and Collecting of British Art at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century.", *The Journal of British Studies*, 2010, 566-591.

Houfe, Simon. *John Leech and the Victorian Scene*, Suffolk: Antique Collectors' Club, 1984.

Houghton, Walter, E. *The Victorian Frame of Mind*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.

Howarth, David. *The Invention of Spain: Cultural Relations between Britain and Spain 1770-1870*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.

Hughes, Clair. "Lady Audley: The Woman in Colour", *The Wilkie Collins Journal*, Vol. 5, 2002. Available at http://wilkiecollinssociety.org/lady-audley-the-woman-in-colour/ Accessed 28/11/2015.

Hunter-Blair, D.O. "Nicholas Patrick Wiseman". In *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, Vol. 15, Edited by Charles G. Herbermann, Edward A. Pace, Condé B. Pallen, et al., New York: Robert Appleton, 1912, 670-74.

Huppauf, Bernd, and Christoph Wulf, eds. *Dynamics and Performativity of Imagination: The Image between the Visible and the Invisible*, New York: Routledge, 2009.

Hutchison, Sidney, C. *The History of the Royal Academy: 1768-1986*, London: Robert Royce Limited, 1986.

Ingamells, John. *A Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy: 1701-1800*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

Ingres, Jean Auguste. "Notebooks". In *Art and Theory 1815-1900: An Anthology of Changing Ideas*. Edited by Charles Harrison, Jason Gaiger and Paul Wood, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1998, 184.

Iskin, Ruth E. "Selling, Seduction, and Soliciting the Eye: Manet's Bar at the Folies-Bergère", *The Art Bulletin*, 1995, 25-44.

Jay, Martin. *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-Century French Thought*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Johnson, Edward Dudley Hume. *Charles Dickens: An Introduction to his Novels*, London: Random House,1969.

Kaplan, Fred. *Sacred Tears: Sentimentality in Victorian Literature*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Kern, Stephen. *The Eyes of Love: The Gaze in English and French Paintings and Novels 1840-1900*, London: Reaktion Books, 1996.

Lambourne, Lionel. *Victorian Painting*, London: Phaidon, 1999.

Lamont, L.M. *Thomas Armstrong, C.B., A Memoir: 1832-1911*, London: Phaidon, 1912.

Landow, George. "The Art-Journal, 1850-1880: Antiquarians, the Medieval Revival, and The Reception of Pre-Raphaelitism" *The Pre-Raphaelite Review*, 2, (1979), 71-6.

Lane, Fintan. *In Search of Thomas Sheahan: Radical Politics in Cork, 1824-1836*, Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2001.

Langland, Elizabeth. "Nobody's Angels: Domestic Ideology and Middle-Class Women in the Victorian Novel", *PMLA*, 107, No. 2, 1992, 290-304.

Latné, David E. *William Maginn and the British Press: A Critical Biography*, New York: Routledge, 2016.

Layard, George Somes. *Shirley Brooks of Punch: His Life, Letters and Diaries*, London: Pitman and Sons, 1907.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. *Laocoon- An Essay Upon the Limits of Painting and Poetry: With Remarks Illustrative of Various Points in the History of Ancient Art*. Translated by Ellen Frothingham, Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1874.

Lippincott, Louise. "Expanding on Portraiture: The Market, the Public and the Hierarchy of Genres in Eighteenth Century Britain". In *The Consumption of Culture 1600-1800: Image, Object, Text*. Edited by Ann Bermingham and John Brewer, London: Routledge, 1997, 75-88.

Macleod, Diane S. *Art and the Victorian Middle Class: Money and the Making of Cultural Identity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Maltz, Diana. *British Aestheticism and the Working Classes, 1870-1900: Beauty for the People*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Marsh, Jan. *Pre-Raphaelite Women*, London: Phoenix Illustrated, 1998.

Maas, Jeremy. *Victorian Painters*, London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1969.

——*The Victorian Art World in Photographs*, London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1984.

Mazzocca, Fernando. “The Renaissance Repertoire in the History Painting of Nineteenth-Century Italy”. In *Reviving the Renaissance: The Use and Abuse of the Past in Nineteenth-century Italian Art and Decoration*. Edited by Rosanna Pavoni, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, 243 – 44.

McCourt, John. *Writing the Frontier: Anthony Trollope between Britain and Ireland*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

McGuire, James and James Quinn, eds. *The Dictionary of Irish Biography: From the Earliest Times to 2002*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

McNaught, William P. and Christopher P. Monkhouse. “The Salon D’Or, Homburg”. In *European Painting and Sculpture, ca. 1770-1937 in the Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design*. Edited by Daniel Rosenfeld, Providence: Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design, 1991, 89-91.

Meisel, Martin. *Realizations: Narrative, Pictorial and Theatrical Arts in Nineteenth-Century England*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Mitchell, W.J.T. “The Politics of Genre: Space and Time in Lessing’s Laocoon”, *Representations*, No. 6, 1984, 98-115.

Montagu, Jennifer. *The Expression of the Passions: The Origin and Influence of Charles Le Brun's Conférence sur l'expression générale et particulière*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

Montalembert, Charles Forbes René de. *The Life of Saint Elizabeth of Hungary*. Translated by Mary Hackett, Dublin: James Duffy, 1848.

Morris, Edward. *Victorian & Edwardian Painting in the Walker Art Gallery & at Sudley House, Vol. 2*, London: HMSO, 1996.

Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema", *Screen*, Vol. 16, 1975, 6-18.

Mumm, Susan. *Stolen Daughters, Virgin Mothers: Anglican Sisterhoods in Victorian Britain*, London: Leicester University Press, 1999.

Murphy, Colin. *The Priest Hunters*, Dublin: O'Brien Press, 2013.

Murray, Peter. "The Artist's Life and Artistic Training in Cork, 1806-1827". In *Daniel Maclise, 1806-1870: Romancing the Past*. Edited by Peter Murray, Cork: Crawford Art Gallery, 2008, 19-37.

Nagler, Georg Kasper. *Neues Allgemeines Künstler-Lexicon*, Vol.9, Munich: Fleischmann, 1840.

Nead, Lynda. "Seduction, Prostitution, Suicide: *On the Brink* by Alfred Elmore", *Art History*, September, 1982, 310-22.

—— *Myths of Sexuality: Representations of Women in Victorian Britain*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1988.

—— *Victorian Babylon: People, Streets and Images in Nineteenth-Century London*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

Neal, Frank. "The Irish in Nineteenth Century Britain: Integrated or Assimilated". In *Les Immigrants et la Ville: Insertion, Integration, Discrimination (XIIe – XXe siècles)*. Edited by Denis Menjot and Jean-Luc Pinol, Paris: L'Harmattan, 1996, 119-37.

Newsome, David. *The Victorian World Picture*, London: John Murray, 1997.

Noakes, Aubrey. *William Frith: Extraordinary Victorian Painter*, London: Jupiter, 1978.

Nochlin, Linda. *Women, Art, and Power and Other Essays*, Kampala: Uganda Publishing & Advertising Services, 1988.

Norman, Edward Robert. *Anti-Catholicism in Victorian England*, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1968.

——*The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century*, Oxford: Clarendon 1984.

O'Brien, Louis. "The Huguenot Policy of Louis XIV and Pope Innocent XI", *The Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 17, 1931, 29-42.

O'Brien, Patrick Karl. "The Impact of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, 1793-1815, on the Long-Run Growth of the British Economy", *Review* (*Fernand Braudel Center*), Vol. 12, 1989, 335-395.

Ó Coindealbháin, Seán. "The United Irishmen in County Cork – VI: South and South-West Cork – continued", *Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society*, July-December, 1951, 95-103

O'Driscoll, Justin. *A Memoir of Daniel Maclise*, London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1871.

Olson, Robert, J.M. *Italian Drawings: 1780-1890*, New York: The American Federation of Arts, 1980.

Oppé, Paul. "Art". In *Early Victorian England, Vol. 2*. Edited by George Malcolm Young, London: Oxford University Press, 1934, 101- 176.

Orcutt, Kimberly. "The Artist's Hand and the Artist's Eye: Xanthus Smith at the Centennial Exhibition", *Archives of American Art Journal*, Vol. 51, 2012, 36-47.

Otter, Chris. *The Victorian Eye: A Political History of Light and Vision in Britain, 1800-1900*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2008.

Paz, Denis G. *Popular Anti-Catholicism in Mid-Victorian England*, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1992.

Perkins, Jane Gray. *The Life of the Honourable Mrs. Norton*, New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1909.

Peschier, Diana. *Nineteenth-Century Anti-Catholic Discourses: The Case of Charlotte Brontë*, London, New York, Palgrave MacMillan, 2005.

Petit, Joseph Adolphe. *History of Mary Stuart Queen of Scots*. Translated by Charles de Flandre, London, Longmans, Green and Company, 1874.

Pollar, Arthur, ed. *The Victorians*, London, Sphere Books, 1970.

Pollen, J.H. "Gordon Riots". In *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, Vol. 6. Edited by Charles G. Herbermann, Edward A. Pace, Condé B. Pallen, et al., New York, Robert Appleton, 1909, 649-51.

Pollock, Griselda. "Victorian Painting by Julian Treuherz", (Review), *Victorian Studies*, 1994, 598-600.

Priestley, J.B. *Particular Pleasures*, London: Heinemann, 1975.

Redford, George. *Art Sales: A History of Sales of Pictures and Other Works of Art*, Vols. 1&2, London: Bradbury, Agnew and Company, 1888.

Redgrave, Richard and Samuel. *A Century of British Painter*, Oxford: Phaidon, 1981

Reynolds, Graham. *Victorian Painting*, London: Herbert, 1987.

Ricoeur, Paul. “Narrative Time”, *Critical Theory*, 1980, 169-190.

—— *Time and Narrative*, Vol. 1. Translated by Kathleen McLoughlin and David Pellauer, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Sitwell, Sacheverell. *Narrative Pictures; A Survey of English Genre and its Painters*, New York: Bloomsbury, 1972.

Sandby, William. *The History of the Royal Academy from its Foundation in 1768 to the Present, With Biographical Notes of All the Members*, Vol. 2, London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts and Green, 1862.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *The Imaginary: A Phenomenological Psychology of the Imagination*. Translated by Jonathan Webber, London: Routledge, 2007.

Savage, Gail L. “The Operation of the 1857 Divorce Act, 1860-1910: A Research Note”, *Journal of Social History*, 16, No. 4, 1983, 103-10.

Selborne, Joanna, ed. *Life, Legend, Landscape: Victorian Drawings and Watercolours*, London: The Courtauld Gallery, 2011.

Sillars, Stuart. *Shakespeare, Time and the Victorians: A Pictorial Exploration*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013.

——*Visualisation in Popular Fiction: 1860-1960, Graphic Narratives, Fictional Images*, London: Routledge, 1995.

Sismondi, Jean Charles Léonard de. *History of the Italian Republic in the Middle Ages*, Philadelphia: Carey and Lea,1832.

Smajić, Srdjan. *Ghost-Seers, Detectives and Spiritualists: Theories of Vision in Victorian Literature and Science*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Smith, Alison. *The Victorian Nude: Sexuality, Morality and Art*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.

Solicari, Sonia. "Selling Sentiment: The Commodification of Emotion in Victorian Visual Culture", *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, No. 4, 2007.

Spencer, David, J. *Knitting Technology: A Comprehensive Handbook and Practical Guide*, Abington: Woodhead, 2001.

Strong, Roy. *And When did you Last see your Father? The Victorian Painter and British History*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1978.

——*The Spirit of Britain: A Narrative History of The Art*s, London: Pimlico, 2000.

Taylor, Roger. *Impressed By Light: British Photographs from Negatives, 1840-1860*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

Thomas, Julia. *Pictorial Victorians: The Inscription of Values in Word and Image*, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2004.

——*Victorian Narrative Painting*, London: Tate, 2000.

Tillotson, Kathleen. *Novels of the Eighteen-Forties*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1856.

Timbs, John. *Club Life of London*, Vol. 1, London: Richard Bentley, 1866.

Trusler, Rev. John. *The Works of William Hogarth in a Series of Engravings with Descriptions and A Comment on Their Moral Tendency*, London: The London Printing and Publishing Company, 1833.

Turpin, John. "The Irish Background of Daniel Maclise", *The Capuchin Annual*, 1970, 177-94.

Valentine, Helen, ed. *Art in the Age of Queen Victoria: Treasures from the Royal Academy Permanent Collection*, London: Yale University Press, 1999.

Vaughan, William. "Britain and Europe c. 1600 – 1900". In *The History of British Art: 1600-1870*. Edited by David Bindman, London: Yale Centre for British Art/Tate Publishing, 2008, 56-77.

—— "The Englishness of British Art", *Oxford Art Journal*, Vol. 13, 1990, 11-23.

Vischer, Robert, et al. *Empathy, Form and Space: Problems in German Aesthetics, 1873-93*. Translated by Harry Francis Mallgrave and Eleftherios Ikonomou, Santa Monica: Getty Centre for the History of Art and Humanities, 1994.

Waldfogel, Melvin. "Narrative Painting". In *The Mind and Art of Victorian England*. Edited by Josef Altholz, Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1976, 159- 174.

Walsh, Michael J. *The Westminster Cardinals*, London: Continuum, 2008.

Walton, Kendall L. *Mimesis as Make-Believe: On the Foundations of Representational Arts*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Ward, Bernard. *The Eve of Catholic Emancipation: Being the History of the Catholic Church in England, etc.*, London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1911.

—— "John Milner". In *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, Vol. 10. Edited by Charles G. Herbermann, Edward A. Pace, Condé B. Pallen, et al., New York: Robert Appleton, 1911, 315-17.

Ward, Elizabeth. *Mrs. E.M. Ward's Reminiscences*. Edited by Elliot O'Donnell, London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, 1911.

Ward, Maisie. *Robert Browning and His World: Vol. 2, Two Robert Brownings, (1861-1889)*, London: Cassell, 1969.

—— *The Tragi-Comedy of Pen Browning: 1849-1912*, London: Sheed and Ward, 1972.

Ward, Wilfrid, Philip. *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, Vol. 1, London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1897.

Werness, Hope. *Continuum Encyclopaedia of Animal Symbolism in World Art*, New York: Continuum International, 2006.

Wigley, John, *The Rise and Fall of the Victorian Sunday*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980.

Wilton, Andrew. *Royal Academy Draughtsmen, 1769-1969: An Exhibition Catalogue*, London: British Museum, 1969.

Wingerden, Sophia A. van. *The Women's Suffrage Movement in Britain, 1866–1928*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999.

Wood, Christopher. *Olympian Dreamers: Victorian Classical Painters 1860-1914*, London: Constable, 1983.

—— *The Dictionary of Victorian Painters*, 2nd ed., Suffolk: Antique Collectors' Club, 1978.

—— *Victorian Panorama: Paintings of Victorian Life*, London: Faber and Faber, 1976.

Image Sources:

Fig. 1. Nottingham City Museum and Galleries. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/the-origin-of-the-stocking-loom-46967/search/keyword:alfred-elmore/page/1/view_as/grid

Fig. 2. *Illustrated London News*. Caoimhín de Bhailís.

Fig. 3. *Illustrated London News*. Caoimhín de Bhailís.

Fig. 4. The Fitzwilliam Museum. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/on-the-brink-4941/search/keyword:alfred-elmore/page/1/view_as/grid

Fig. 5. Bury Art Museum. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/the-novice-164133/search/keyword:alfred-elmore/page/1/view_as/grid

Fig. 6. Hadfield, John, *Every Picture Tells a Story*, 117.

Fig. 7. The Garrick Club, London. http://garrick.ssl.co.uk/object-g0793

Fig. 7b. The Garrick Club, London. http://garrick.ssl.co.uk/object-g0793

Fig. 8. The Witt Library, The Courtauld Institute, London.

Fig. 9. Auction catalogue. Christie's, *Fine Drawings and Paintings* (Royal College), Glasgow, November 13, 1991, Lot. 534.

Fig. 10. Hall, S.C., *The Trial of Sir Jasper*. Caoimhín de Bhailís.

Fig. 10a. Birmingham Museum Art Gallery. Alan Bean.

Fig. 11. Hall, S.C., *The Trial of Sir Jasper*. Caoimhín de Bhailís.

Fig. 12. Auction catalogue. Christie's, *Victorian British and Impressionist Art*, South Kensington, November 14, 2013, Lot. 37. Caoimhín de Bhailís.

Fig. 13. Royal Holloway, University of London. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/the-emperor-charles-v-at-the-convent-of-st-yuste-12821/search/keyword:alfred-elmore/page/1/view_as/grid

Fig. 14. Auction catalogue. Bonhams, *Fine Art and Antiques*, Oxford, July 16, 2014, Lot. 167. http://www.bonhams.com/auctions/21754/lot/167/?utm_source=auctions&utm_medium=www.barnebys.co.uk&utm_content=fine-art-general-and-antiques&utm_campaign=barnebys

Fig. 15. Crawford Art Gallery, Cork. Caoimhín de Bhailís.

Fig. 16. Victoria and Albert Museum. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/dulcinea-del-toboso-30762/search/actor:leslie-charles-robert-17941859/page/3

Fig. 17. Auction catalogue. Sotheby's, *British and Continental Pictures*, Olympia, October 13, 2004. Lot. 168.

Fig. 18. The Tate Britain.

Fig. 19. Blouin Art Sales Index. http://artsalesindex.artinfo.com/auctions/Alfred-Elmore-4184131/Asalto-al-Palacio-de-las-Tuller%EDas-1860

Fig. 20. Exhibition catalogue. Gorry Art Gallery, *An Exhibition of 18th – 21st Century Irish Paintings*, November 26 – December 6, 2003, Dublin.

Fig. 21. Royal Holloway, University of London. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/the-railway-station-12825/search/keyword:the-railway-station

Fig. 22. St. Andrew's R.C. Church, Dublin. Ros Kavanagh/*Irish Arts Review*.

Fig. 23. *The Athenaeum*. http://www.the-athenaeum.org/art/full.php?ID=28427

Fig. 24. Royal Academy of Arts, London.

http://www.racollection.org.uk/ixbin/indexplus?_IXSR_=RkQbJYZsyi6&_IXSP_=2&_MREF_=20704&_IXSS_=%252asform%3d%252fsearch_form%252fallform%26_IXresults_%3dy%26exhibitions%3dtrue%26_IXACTION_%3dquery%26all_fields%3dALFRED%2bELMORE%26archives%3dtrue%26_IX%252ey%3d0%26books%3dtrue%26_IX%252ex%3d0%26works%3dtrue%26_IXMAXHITS_%3d18%26_IXTRAIL_%3dSearch%2bResults&_IXACTION_=display&_IXSPFX_=templates/full/&_IXTRAIL_=Search%

Fig. 25. Auction catalogue. Christie's, *Victorian Pictures and Sculpture*, London, July 11, 1969. Lot. 45.

Fig. 26. Lytham Art Collection of Fylde Borough Council.

http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/the-deathbed-of-robert-king-of-naples-150457/search/keyword:alfred-elmore/page/1/view_as/grid

Fig. 27. Bradford Museums and Galleries. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/the-invention-of-the-combing-machine-22825

Fig. 28. Victoria and Albert Museum. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/an-anxious-hour-30676/search/keyword:an-anxious-hour

Fig. 29. Birmingham Museums Trust. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/the-travelling-companions-33550/search/keyword:the-travelling-companions

Fig. 30. Southampton City Art Gallery. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/first-class-the-meeting-18022/search/keyword:first-class-the-meeting

Fig. 31. Harris Museum and Art Gallery. http://www.the-athenaeum.org/art/full.php?ID=117957

Fig. 32. Tate Britain. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/the-derby-day-117675/search/keyword:derby-day

Fig. 33. Auction catalogue. Lyon & Turnbull Edinburgh, *The Forbes Collection at Old Battersea House*, November 01, 2011, Lot. 117.

Fig. 34. Tate Britain. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/the-last-day-in-the-old-home-200702/search/keyword:the-last-day-in-the-old-home

Fig. 35. Museum of London. http://collections.museumoflondon.org.uk/online/object/723922.html

Fig. 36. Rhode Island School of Design. http://risdmuseum.org/art_design/objects/913_the_salon_dor_homburg

Fig. 37. Wood, Christopher, *Victorian Panorama: Paintings of Victorian Life*.

Fig. 38. Library of Congress. https://www.loc.gov/item/2003679742/

Fig. 39., Laing Art Gallery. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/woman-with-lilies-37247

Fig. 40. Wellesley College. Maisie Ward, *The Tragi-Comedy of Pen Browning*.

Fig. 41. Worcestershire County Museum. http://www.the-athenaeum.org/art/full.php?ID=254281

Fig. 42. Raccolte Museali Fratelli Alinari (RMFA), Firenze. Ref. code: AVQ-A-000144-0344 http://www.alinariarchives.it/it/search

Fig. 43. Private collection. Caoimhín de Bhailís.

Fig. 44. Galleria Palatina (Palazzo Pitti), Florence.

https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/6/6f/Francesco_Hayez_-_The_Two_Foscari_-_WGA11217.jpg

Fig. 45. Private collection. Caoimhín de Bhailís.

Fig. 46. Pinacoteca Tosio Martinengo, Brescia.

https://askabiologist.asu.edu/sites/default/files/resources/articles/seecolor/Pelagio-Palag-Newton's-Discovery-of-the-Refraction-of-Light-1280.jpg

Fig. 47. Private collection, Bergamo.

https://iamachild.files.wordpress.com/2012/01/lincontro-di-carlo-viii-e-gian-galeazzo-sforza-a-pavia-nel-1494.jpg

Fig. 48. Location unknown. https://wwhttpw.carlovirgilio.it/mostre/sublime-e-pittoresco/le-opere-esposte/cola-di-rienzo-che-spiega-le-antiche-epigrafi-ai-romani/

Fig. 49. Museums Sheffield. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/solomon-eagle-71409/search/actor:poole-paul-falconer-18071879/page/1/view_as/grid

Fig. 50. The Witt Library. The Courtauld Institute, London.

Fig. 51. Musée du Louvre. Paris.

Fig. 52. Private collection. https://www.liveauctioneers.com/item/20373243_alfred-elmore-ra-1815-1881-study-full-length-stud

Fig. 53. Exhibition catalogue. Gorry Art Gallery Exhibition, 25 November – 8 December 1988.

Fig. 54. Auction catalogue. Phillips, *Early British and Victorian Paintings*, June 20, 1995, London. Lot. 65.

Fig. 55. Auction catalogue. Rago Arts and Auction Center, *Great Estates*, March 22, 2014. Lambertville, New Jersey. Lot. 273.

Fig. 56. Musee des Beaux-arts de Rennes. http://www.the-athenaeum.org/art/full.php?ID=138495

Fig. 57. Auction catalogue. Sotheby's, *Victorian Pictures*, November 12, 1922, London. Lot. 122.

Fig. 58. Unknown location. http://www.penccil.com/gallery.php?p=798540236694

Fig. 58a. Getty Research Institute. Accession Number: 889-322 2010.R.15.

Fig. 59. Victorian and Albert Museum. http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O143704/that-which-ye-have-spoken-drawing-elmore-alfred-w/

Fig. 60. Auction catalogue. Christie's, February 22, 1985, London. Lot. 156.

Fig. 61. *The London Art Union Annual,* 1847. The British Museum, Prints and Drawings Department. Accession Number: 1863,0509.360.

Fig. 62. The Witt Library. The Courtauld Library, London.

Fig. 63. Tate Britain. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/the-preaching-of-knox-before-the-lords-of-the-congregation-10th-june-1559-202859/search/actor:wilkie-david-17851841/page/1/view_as/grid

Fig. 64. Museo del Prado, Madrid. https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/0/09/Tiziano-gloria-1554.jpg

Fig. 65. Museo del Prado, Madrid. http://www.the-athenaeum.org/art/full.php?ID=36847

Fig. 66. Alte Pinakothek, Munich. http://www.the-athenaeum.org/art/full.php?ID=36845

Fig. 67. Wallace Collection, London. http://www.the-athenaeum.org/art/full.php?ID=132612

Fig. 68. Alte Pinakothek, Munich. http://www.the-athenaeum.org/art/full.php?ID=36751

Fig. 69. St. Andrew's Church, Dublin. Caoimhín de Bhailís.

Fig. 70. Exhibtion Catalogue. Gorry Art Gallery, May 1 – May 14, 1987, Dublin.

Fig. 71. Auction catalogue. Bonham's, March 8, 2005, Oxford. Lot. 73.

Fig. 72. Auction catalogue. Sotheby's, December 3, 1974, Belgravia. Lot. 109.

Fig. 73. Auction catalogue. Mullen's, September 26, 2004, Bray, Co. Dublin.

Fig. 74. Auction catalogue. Bonham's, *Fine Art*, June 27, 2006, Leeds. Lot. 886.

Fig. 75. Tate Britain. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/st-elizabeth-of-hungarys-great-act-of-renunciation-198093/search/actor:calderon-philip-hermogenes-18331898/page/1/view_as/grid

Fig. 76. The Maas Gallery/Private collection. *The British Art Journal*, Vol. XV, No. 3, 2015.

Fig. 77. Johannesburg Art Gallery, South Africa. http://www.the-athenaeum.org/art/full.php?ID=122021

Fig. 78. Birmingham City Museum and Art Gallery. Alastair Grieve, "A Notice on Illustrations to Charles Kingsley's 'The Saint's Tragedy' by Three Pre-Raphaelite Artists".

Fig. 78a. Birmingham City Art Gallery. Alastair Grieve, "A Notice on Illustrations to Charles Kingsley's 'The Saint's Tragedy' by Three Pre-Raphaelite Artists".

Fig. 79. Wightwick Manor, West Midlands. Alastair Grieve, "A Notice on Illustrations to Charles Kingsley's 'The Saint's Tragedy' by Three Pre-Raphaelite Artists".

Fig. 80. Private collection. http://www.artnet.com/artists/alfred-w-elmore/mary-queen-of-scots-and-christopher-norton-at-l0QPQ8fec1y5TtXyu3-8hg2

Fig. 81. York Museum. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/looking-for-the-mail-packet-8039

Fig. 82., Sir John Sloane's Museum, London. http://collections.soane.org/object-p40

Fig. 83. Auction catalogue. Christie's, *Fine Paintings and Drawings (Royal College)*, November 13, 1991, Glasgow. Lot. 521.

Fig. 84. British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings. Accession Number: 1933-7-11-7.

Fig. 85. Private collection. Caoimhín de Bhailís.

Fig. 86. Tate Britain. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/the-play-scene-in-hamlet-200624/search/keyword:maclise/page/2

Fig. 87. Tate Britain. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/scene-from-twelfth-night-malvolio-and-the-countess-200625/search/keyword:maclise/page/2/view_as/grid

Fig. 88. Birmingham Museums Trust.

Fig. 89. Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/romeo-and-juliet-97734/search/keyword:alfred-elmore/page/1/view_as/grid

Fig. 89a. Victoria and Albert Museum, Prints and Drawings Department. Accession Number: E884.

Fig. 90. Auction catalogue. Sotheby's, Victorian Oil Paintings, Watercolours and Drawings, November 6, 1995, London. Lot. 159.

Fig. 91. St. Andrew's R.C. Church, Dublin. Ros Kavanagh/Irish Arts Review.

Fig. 91a. Paris, Musée du Louvre. Jennifer Montagu, *The Expression of the Passions*.

Fig. 92. Royal Academy of Art, London.
http://www.racollection.org.uk/ixbin/indexplus?_IXSR_=vM54_GI9T4V&_IXSP_=0&_MREF_=20603&_IXSS_=work_date%3d%26%252asform%3d%252fsearch_form%252fworksform%26_IXresults_%3dy%26title%3d%26_IXACTION_%3dquery%26artist_role_sval%3d0%257cR1%252eK%26all_fields%3d%26submit%3dSearch%26sort_by%3d%26_IXTRAIL_%3dSearch%2bWorks%2bof%2bArt%257cSearch%2bResults%26type%3d%2522Painting%2522%26_IXSP_%3d0%26artist_name%3dRICHARD%2bREDGRAVE%26_IXMAXHITS_%3d18&_IXACTION_=display&_IXSPFX_=templates/full/&_IXTRAIL_=Search%20Works%20of%20Art%7cSearch%20Results

Fig. 93. The Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archaeology, Oxford.
http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/broken-vows-141767/search/actor:calderon-philip-hermogenes-18331898/page/1/view_as/grid

Fig. 94. Musée du Louvre, Paris. http://www.the-athenaeum.org/art/full.php?ID=65340

Fig. 95. Musée du Louvre, Paris. http://www.the-athenaeum.org/art/full.php?ID=26186

Fig. 96. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. http://www.the-athenaeum.org/art/full.php?ID=65338

Fig. 97. Auction catalogue. Sotheby's, *Arcade Fine Arts: European and American Paintings, Drawings and Sculpture*, October 7, 2003, New York. Lot. 142.

Fig. 98. Manchester Art Gallery. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/autumn-leaves-205592/search/actor:millais-john-everett-18291896/page/7

Fig. 99., Musée d'Orsay, Paris. http://www.the-athenaeum.org/art/full.php?ID=14702

Fig.100. Courtauld Gallery, London. http://www.the-athenaeum.org/art/full.php?ID=9941

Fig. 101. Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/to-brighton-and-back-for-three-and-sixpence-33637/search/keyword:charles-rossiter

Fig. 102., Tate Britain. http://artuk.org/discover/artworks/omnibus-life-in-london-198643/search/actor:egley-william-maw-18261916/page/1/view_as/grid

Fig. 103. Nial Smith Antiques, New York. https://www.1stdibs.com/furniture/wall-decorations/drawings/drawing-male-nude-alfred-elmore/id-f_4284243/

Fig.104. Victoria and Albert Museum, Prints and Drawings Department. Accession Number: E464-1933.

Fig.105. Private collection. Greens, Kent, U.K., https://www.rubylane.com/item/512597-SGA1700/Antique-English-Male-Nude-Pencil-Chalk

Fig.106. British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings. Accession Number: 1961-10-33-1.

Fig.107. Victoria and Albert Museum, Prints and Drawings Department. Accession Number: E890-1933.

Fig.108. Victoria and Albert Museum, Prints and Drawings Department. Accession Number: E801-1933.

Fig.109. Private collection. Alison Smith, *The Victorian Nude*.

Fig.110. Private collection. J.B. Priestley, *Particular Pleasures*.

Fig.111. Private collection. Ralph Edwards, *Apollo Magazine*.

Fig.112. Private collection. Ralph Edwards, *Apollo Magazine*.

Fig. 113. National Gallery of Australia, Melbourne. Ralph Edwards, *Apollo Magazine*.

Fig. 114. National Gallery of Australia, Melbourne. Accession Number: 615-4.

Fig. 115. British Museum, Prints and Drawings Department. Accession Number: 1933-07-11-3.

Fig. 116. National Gallery of Canada. Accession Number: 4373.
http://www.gallery.ca/en/see/collections/artwork.php?mkey=15600

Fig. 117. Location unknown. *The Art-Journal*, 1857. Caoimhín de Bhailís.

Fig. 118. Victoria and Albert Museum, Prints and Drawings Department. Accession Number: E894-1933.

Fig. 119. Private collection. Sigmund and Jocelyn Fine Art, Birmingham.

Fig. 120. Private collection. Sigmund and Jocelyn Fine Art, Birmingham.

Fig.121. Private collection. Sigmund and Jocelyn Fine Art, Birmingham.

Fig. 122. Victoria and Albert Museum, Prints and Drawings Department. Accession Number: E887-1933.

Fig. 123. Victoria and Albert Museum, Prints and Drawings Department. Accession Number: E889-1933.

Fig. 124. Victoria and Albert Museum, Prints and Drawings Department. Accession Number: E1064-1933.

Fig. 125. Victoria and Albert Museum, Prints and Drawings Department. Accession Number: E1064-1933.

Fig. 126. Victoria and Albert Museum, Prints and Drawings Department. Accession Number: E1064-1933.

Fig. 127. Catherine Casley, Colin Harrison and Jon Whiteley, eds., *The Ashmolean Museum: Complete Illustrated Catalogue of Paintings*, (Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 2004), 19.

Fig. 128. Victoria and Albert Museum, Prints and Drawings Department. Accession Number: E1064-1933.

Fig.129. Victoria and Albert Museum, Prints and Drawings Department. Accession Number: E1064-1933.

Fig. 130. British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings. Accession Number: 1933-7-11-5.

Fig. 131. Victoria and Albert Museum, Prints and Drawings Department. Accession Number: E886-1933.

Fig. 132. Victoria and Albert Museum, Prints and Drawings Department. E885-1933.