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6. “Royal Academy Exhibition Notice,” Athenæum (June 1, 1850): 590.

Art and Literature in Britain, 1760–1900 (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1985); Corrado Federici and Esther Raventos-Pons, eds., Literary Texts and the Arts: Interdisciplinary Perspectives (New York: Peter Lang, 2003).


18. The Spectator (December 19, 1874), cited in Thomas Hardy and His Readers, 26.

19. The Savoy (October 1896), cited in Thomas Hardy and His Readers, 142.
Notes to Chapter One


25. Reviewers did not object to the avant-garde qualities of the first Pre-Raphaelite paintings, Rossetti’s Girlhood of Mary, Hunt’s Rienzi, and Millais’s Isabella, which were exhibited in 1849 with the PRB initials. However, the following year, when the meaning of the initials was revealed, they became vituperative. Michael Rossetti recorded some of them and related the particulars of the divulgence of the PRB meaning. See Dante Gabriel Rossetti: His Family Letters and a Memoir by William Michael Rossetti, 2 vols. (London, 1895; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1970), 1:146, 161.


Notes to Chapter One


4. According to Elizabeth Prettejohn, Pre-Raphaelitism was the first avant-garde movement in British painting (18–19, 64).


8. Although Millais, Rossetti, and Holman Hunt were the dominant figures of this originally secret society, Thomas Woolner, James Collinson, Frederic George Stephens, and William Michael Rossetti were also members. Years later Hunt recognized Rossetti and Millais only as the founding members of the Brotherhood. See Hunt, Pre-Raphaelitism, 2:437.

At the time, the idea of a brotherhood was not new. Throughout Europe and America artists banded together as early as in the period following the French Revolution in order to limit the power of the academies. See Laura Morowitz and William Vaughan, eds., Artistic Brotherhoods in the Nineteenth Century (Burlington: Ashgate, 2000). Over the years, several anecdotes have recounted the choice of the name “Pre-Raphaelite.” See Hunt, Pre-Raphaelitism, 1:100, 101, 2:437. See also John Ruskin, The Works of John Ruskin (library edition), ed. E. T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn, 39 vols. (London: George Allen, 1903–1912), 12:321, 322, 357.


11. Though the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood lasted only until 1853, it continued to influence British art until the 1920s. See J. B. Bullen, The Pre-Raphaelite Body: Fear and Desire in Painting, Poetry, and Criticism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 1.


14. Millais’s Christ in the House of His Parents became the subject of so many debates and disputes that its notoriety attracted the attention of even Queen Victoria, who had it removed from the exhibition and brought to her for a special viewing. See William Fredeman, ed., The P.R.B. Journal: William Rossetti’s Diary of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood 1849–1853 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975), 71.

Notes to Chapter One

22. Quoted by Gordon Haight, George Eliot: A Biography (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), 107. It is interesting to note that John Ruskin had compared Dutch to Pre-Raphaelite art and deemed it inferior. The Dutch artists, unlike the Pre-Raphaelites, Ruskin pointed out in “Realistic Schools of Painting: D. G. Rossetti and W. Holman Hunt,” a lecture delivered at Oxford on March 9, 1883, failed to give “the life and beauty of little things in lower nature” (Works 33:290).
27. Like other contemporary critics of the novel, George Eliot also used terms borrowed from the visual arts when reviewing other novels. See “History, Biography, Voyages, and Travels,” Westminster Review 67 (January 1857): 175.
29. According to Prettejohn, Modern Painters “was the only substantial original work on art theory that had appeared in England for decades, and arguably since Reynolds’s Discourses of 1769–90” (58).
31. As Barringer and Prettejohn have already observed, Ruskin’s letters to the Times marked the turning point in the critical reception of Pre-Raphaelite art (Barringer, 61; Prettejohn, 59).


38. An exhibit held at the Yale Center for British Art, exclusively devoted to Rossetti’s “double work of art” intended to “illuminate the symbiotic relationship of Rossetti’s art and poetry.” See Maryan Wynn Ainsworth, Dante Gabriel Rossetti and the Double Work of Art (Hartford: Yale University Art Gallery, 1976; an exhibition catalog), vi. For representations of women in Rossetti’s sonnets and paintings see Lynn Pearce, Woman/Image/Text: Readings in Pre-Raphaelite Art and Literature (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991).


59. Ibid.
60. See Arthur Marks, “Ford Madox Brown’s Take Your Son, Sir!”
64. Cited by Faxon, 67.
68. Ruskin interprets in detail the symbolic realism of the visual signifiers in this painting. See *Works* 12:334–35.
73. George Eliot, *Middemarch*, introd. A. S. Byatt (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 213. In Eliot’s view a verbal portrait empowers the subject of visual art by endowing it with a voice, a quality the pictorial by its nature must deny. Thus Eliot anticipates recent critics, such as James Hefferman and Murray Krieger, who treat the relation between literature and the visual arts as *paragonal*, a conflict for dominance between the word and the image.
Notes to Chapter Two

2. Deirdre D’Albertis, *Dissembling Fictions: Elizabeth Gaskell and the Victorian Social Text* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997), 177. Elizabeth Gaskell herself recognized her warring and irreconcilable attributes, often manifested in her fiction. We can see these oppositions in one of her letters to Eliza Fox, in which she describes with humor and piquancy her guilt over the impending purchase of their new house, 42 Plymouth Grove:

   One of my mes is, I do believe, a true Christian—(only people call her socialist and communist), another of my mes is a wife and mother, and highly delighted at the delight of everyone else in the house, Meta and William most especially who are in full extasy [sic]. Now that’s my “social” self I suppose. Then again I’ve another self with a full taste for beauty and convenience whh [sic] is pleased on its own account. How am I to reconcile all these warring members? I try to drown myself (my first self,) by saying it’s Wm who is to decide on all these things, and his feeling it right ought to be my rule, and so it is—only that does not quite do. (Letters, 108; April 1850)

5. For references to Rossetti see 397, 444, 485, 484b (Letters). See also *Further Letters of Mrs. Gaskell*, ed. J. A. V. Chapple and Arthur Pollard (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2000), 199–201, 221 n. 1, 241–42 n. 2. For references to Millais see 155, 211, 234a (Letters); for those to Hunt see 386, 394, 444, 646 (Letters); 184 (Further Letters).
8. Not all reviews were negative, as Gaskell suggests; in fact, quite a few of them were positive. See the following, for instance: G. H. Lewes, “Review of Ruth and Villette,” *Westminster Review* 3 (April 1853): 245–54; “Review of Ruth,” *North British Review* 19 (1853): 151–74; “Review of Ruth,” *Prospective Review* 9 (May 1853): 222–47.
10. Felicia Bonaparte explains some of the reasons for Gaskell’s intense identification with Pasley. Whereas the two women’s situations were entirely different, their lives, she notes, shared remarkable similarities: “As Gaskell lost her mother in infan-
cy, so Miss Pasley lost her father. As Gaskell's father then remarried, so in Miss Pasley's case did the mother. Gaskell's father banished Elizabeth. Miss Pasley's mother banished her, sending her to an orphan school. . . . Miss Pasley's mother did not write or visit her while she was in school just as Gaskell's father did not. . . . Here in Miss Pasley, who shared her history, was the very incarnation of an image that had become, in her own imagination, one of the major representations of her own daemonic double.” See The Gypsy Bachelor of Manchester: The Life of Mrs. Gaskell's Demon (Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1992), 83.

11. Ruth, chapter VIII. All references to Gaskell's novels are to the Knutsford edition and are cited in the text by chapter numbers.


13. Alaistair Grieve in the Pre-Raphaelites catalog notes that Rossetti had inscribed on the original frame his sonnet explaining the symbolism, while a second sonnet, referring to the picture's subject, was printed in the catalogue of the Free Exhibition of 1849 (Parris, 65). This latter sonnet was revised for the 1870 edition of his poems. The lines I have quoted were changed to the following:

This is that blessed Mary, pre-elect . . .
Unto God's will she brought devout respect,
Profound simplicity of intellect,
And supreme patience. From her mother's knee
Faithful and hopeful; wise in charity;
Strong in grave peace. (“Mary's Girlhood,” I, 4–8)

14. Barringer notes the underlying sexual overtones of the Ecce Ancilla Domini: “The improbably small, haloed dove, representing the holy spirit, and the half-hearted fire burning at Gabriel's heels, are not sufficient to convince the viewers that this is a spiritual, rather than a sexual, encounter” (42). As Gaskell's redrawing of this painting indicates, she was aware of its erotic quality. Anna Unsworth notes Gaskell's unconventional acceptance of Ruth's sexuality: “The apparent contradiction in Ruth's character between her 'living with her lover in North Wales and positively enjoying it' compared with the nobility and spiritual maturity she later shows, without there having been any process of 're-adjustment,' still puzzles modern critics, as it enragd Mrs. Gaskell's contemporary critics.” See Mrs. Gaskell: An Independent Woman (Montreaux, London, and Washington: Minerva Press, 1996), 89. Commenting on the same issue, Malcolm Pittock observes, “Mrs. Gaskell is undercutting the basis of that sexual morality which no doubt she believed herself to be upholding. For what she is implying is that sexual relations outside marriage are not innately sinful, it is only society which makes us think they are. . . . Perhaps the furore the novel aroused had a more complex origin than mere disapproval of its subject matter.” See “The Dove Ascending: The Case for Elizabeth Gaskell,” English Studies 81 (6) (2000): 537.


17. Hughes recalled that “on the morning of the varnishing, as I was going through the first room, before I knew where I was, Millais met me. . . . [H]e said he had just been up a ladder looking at my picture and that it gave him more pleasure than any picture there, but adding also very truly that I had not painted the right kind of stream.” John Guille Millais, *The Life and Letters of Sir John Everett Millais* (London: Methuen, 1899), 1:146.


20. In her interpretation of *Ruth*, Kate Flint points out that the ending of the novel, rather than being didactic as various critics have assumed, is an attempt to turn the reader's disappointment into the motivation for challenging “the assumptions which lie behind such conventions.” See Elizabeth Gaskell (Plymouth: Northcote Publishers, 1995), 28.

21. Quoted by Uglow, 217; Thomas Carlyle to ECG, November 8, 1848, John Rylands, MS 730/14 (ibid., 642 n. 5).

### Notes to Chapter Three

1. Wilkie Collins brought to literature his unique background in law and art. His very first work, his father’s biography, *Memoirs of the Life of William Collins, Eq. R.A.* (1848), deals with the life and art of his father, a successful landscape painter. His godfather, Sir David Wilkie, R.A., was also a renowned painter. Wilkie Collins himself studied art for several years; as William Clarke has observed, he “would have found it as easy to drift into painting as into writing; and without his father’s somewhat oppressive personality, and his own independent streak, he might have done so.” See *The Secret Life of Wilkie Collins* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1991), 9.

As early as 1851 Collins wrote for *Bentley’s Miscellany* pieces connected with the visual arts. See Catherine Peters, *The King of Inventors: A Life of Wilkie Collins* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 102. The figure of the artist is a recurrent character in his short stories and novels. See, for instance, *Hide and Seek* (1854) and *The Law and the Lady* (1875).

In Collins's letters we perceive his active interest not only in his Pre-Raphaelite friends' paintings but also in the reception of their work as well. At times the same journals, like the *Athenæum*, for instance, published reviews of books and paintings. In a letter to Edward Pigot, where he suggests altering the arrangement of *The Leader* to include more space for the fine arts, he comments regretfully that Millais “is cut up in last week’s *Athenæum*, along with me.” See *Letters* 1:80 (January 12, 1852). For additional references to Millais, see *Letters*, 1:xxvi, 77 and note, 116, 117, 135, 140 and note; to Hunt, see *Letters* 1:184, 185n, 192, 202, 218, 255–56, *Letters* 2:302, 307, 365, 366, 485–86, 518, 521–22, 534, 550.


5. The Pre-Raphaelite women in white must have been particularly significant to Wilkie Collins, who met his own woman in white, Caroline Graves, in circumstances as sensational and mysterious as those surrounding Hartright's meeting with Anne Catherick. Ironically, Caroline Graves, who had Collins's children out of wedlock, was also considered a fallen woman by Victorian standards of morality. In his father's biography published in 1895, John Everitt Millais's son relates the dramatic incident of Caroline's sensational appearance (*Life and Letters of Sir John Everett Millais*, 1:278–81)


6. Like his Pre-Raphaelite friends, Collins created and shaped fallen women as distinct, individual figures rather than as types, ranging from the unrepentant Margaret Sherwin to the victimized Mary Grice, the repentant Sarah Leeson, the bewildered Lydia Gwilt, and the respectable Mrs. Anne Catherick.


13. In *The Sensation Novel and the Victorian Family Magazine* (London: Palgrave, 2001), Deborah Wynne points out that the serialization of *The Woman in White* underscored the intersection of the real and the fictional through the publication of sensational crimes along with the installments of the novel (54).


16. Critics were outraged by the representation of Christ as a common man rather than a glorified figure. *The Eclectic Review*, for instance, denounced the painting as an example of the Pre-Raphaelites' "utter neglect of form and elevation of type; that preference, in fact, for the revolting" (8). For details regarding the composition of the

17. Balee considers the Crimean war as the cause of this popular demand for a new ideal of womanhood: "Sensation fiction, and Marian's creation, had everything to do with a social dilemma that had begun in England in the 1850s. This dilemma centered on a proliferation of single women, who, as men emigrated to the colonies or were killed in the Crimea, would never find mates, would never have the chance to become those maternal angels beloved by Victorian iconography. Something had to be done for and about England's 'surplus women,' and Collins began to do it in the medium most likely to influence the millions—the serial novel" (199).

18. In "Breaking the Laws about Ladies: Wilkie Collins's Questioning of Gender Roles," Kathleen O'Fallon demonstrates that Collins's treatment of Marian Halcombe and Walter Hartright "shows the most significant beginnings of Collins' struggle to rethink gender roles" (231). According to O'Fallon, "the progress of the Collins heroine from novel to novel suggests that Collins became increasingly intrigued by the possibilities of his female characters and, at the same time, he seemed to lose interest in his male characters" (229–30). O'Fallon, in *Wilkie Collins to the Forefront*, ed. Nelson Smith and R. C. Terry (New York: AMS Press, 1995).

19. In *Telling Tales* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2002) Elizabeth Langland points out that the very quality, "asexual childishness," that leads to the idealization of Laura Fairlie also facilitates her condemnation as madwoman (74–75).


## Notes to Chapter Four


3. The germ of her first two works, for instance, were based on indirect impressions, narratives she had heard. In retrospect, Eliot seemed to be dissatisfied with *Scenes of Clerical Life*, in which she fictionalized the lives of actual clergymen; see John W. Cross, ed., *George Eliot's Life as Related in Her Letters and Journals* (New York: Harper, 1885), 2:85. Eliot traces the genesis of *Adam Bede* to another indirect experience, a narrative she had heard, which also conjured the image of woman torn by a "collision" (ibid., 2:48–49). The germ of Eliot's later works, however, were not stories she had heard, and they did not come with ready-made plots. For the germinal image of *Silas Marner* see *Letters* 2:427. A vivid visual experience in the British Museum, some fragments of glass "with dyes of sunset in them" (ibid., 3:70) most likely served as the germ of *Middlarmarch*; see Andres, "The Germ and the Picture in *Middlarmarch*" in *English Literary History* 55 (1988). The germ of *The Spanish Gypsy* most directly demonstrates the amalgamation of the visual and the verbal, for, as Eliot recalls, the story originated in Titian's "small picture" of the Annunciation in the Scuola di San Rocco in Venice (Cross 2:30).


5. Contemporary paintings reveal the extent of the Victorian interest in the young woman gambling. Three popular paintings may have confirmed for Eliot the germ’s popular appeal. See, for instance, Alfred Elmore’s On the Brink (1865), William Powell Frith’s The Salon d’Or, Homburg (1871), and Millais’s Hearts Are Trumps (1872).


9. This is Croesus’s advice to Cyrus, king of the Medes (Baker Notebooks 3:191). Croesus’s career is for Herodotus an illustration of “nemesis or divine retribution for pride over prosperity”; see Herodotus, trans. George Rawlinson (New York: Modern Library, 1921, xii). At the zenith of his power Croesus had a conversation with Solon, who warned him about the mutability of human happiness (ibid., 19). Disregarding Solon’s advice, Croesus attacked the Persians, was defeated and taken as Cyrus’s slave (ibid., 48). Cyrus, in turn, disregarded Croesus’s warnings, attacked the Messagetae, and was killed (ibid., 114).

10. Critics such as David, Linehan, and Meyer note Gwendolen’s and Grandcourt’s imperialist tendencies. Both Meyer and Linehan concentrate on Zionism and the gender politics in the novel. Neither writer, however, deals with the novel as George Eliot’s response to prevalent contemporary arguments on imperialism or as her attempt to interweave the sociopolitical and the artistic—one of the tasks of this chapter. Deirdre David, Fictions of Resolution in Three Victorian Novels: North and South, Our Mutual Friend, Daniel Deronda (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981, 176); Katherine Bailey Linehan, “Mixed Politics: The Critique of Imperialism in Daniel Deronda” in Texas Studies in Literature and Language 34 (Fall 1992): 324.

11. According to Rylance, Blacks were associated with subhumans like Caliban “and therefore the Eyre arguments touched scientific controversy in the context of the evolutionary debates.” Rick Rylance, Victorian Psychology and British Culture 1850–1880 (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000, 156).


14. In her recent work, George Eliot and the British Empire, Nancy Henry discusses Eliot’s reviews of travel and exploration narratives, including Burton’s work. Both Eliot and Lewes, according to Henry, through their reviews of such travel narratives, contributed to “the centralizing process by which information arrived from the margins of [the] empire to be assessed and assimilated as colonial knowledge” (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002, 35).


16. In her interpretation of the sonnet Rossetti wrote for this painting Faxon notes that the first word “mystery” also begins his sonnet “For a Virgin and Child: by Hans Memmelinck,” written in 1849 (194–95). Eliot also blurs the demarcation line between good and evil in her opening question referring to Gwendolen’s gaze: “Was the good or evil genius dominant in those beams?” (3).


18. Eliot’s fascination with the myth of Medusa is evident in her major novels, where she reinterprets it moving away from the conventional meaning adopted by other contemporary writers and painters. In Adam Bede, as in the myth of Medusa, the victim, Hetty, not the victimizer, Arthur, is punished for transgression of social boundaries (430). Dark skinned, with “gleaming black eyes,” the precocious young Maggie Tulliver in The Mill on the Floss, early on refuses to abide by Victorian standards of femininity by cutting her unruly hair, “looking like a small Medusa with snakes cropped” (161). Later in the novel, when the magnetism between Stephen and Maggie becomes overwhelming, Stephen attributes his attraction to the power of Maggie’s defiant look and relies on the conventional dominant/subordinate binaries of the gaze to reason his way out of the labyrinth of desire (489–90, 522–23). Even Dorothea becomes a Medusa figure in Casaubon’s eyes when she innocently asks him when he intends to publish his work (139).

Notes to Chapter Five

1. Christopher Wood notes that Edward Burne-Jones “could never really accept the aesthetic philosophy that art existed only for art’s sake, and for no other purpose” (The Pre-Raphaelites, 112). The term “aesthetic,” as Sussman succinctly defines it, describes “an art practice in which self-contained formal qualities are privileged over social and ethical signification”; see *Victorian Masculinities: Manhood and Masculine Poetics in Early Victorian Literature and Art* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995, 175). In his review of the 1877 Grosvenor exhibit, Henry James, referring to Burne-Jones’s paintings, distinguishes between the mimetic and the aesthetic by underscoring the lack of realism in the latter; see “Picture Season in London, 1877,” in *The Painter’s Eye*, ed. John L. Sweeney (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1956, 144).


7. According to Christopher Wood, “Androgynous, almost sexless figures were to become a feature of Burne-Jones’s mature style, so there can be no doubt that both Swinburne and Solomon influenced his work in this direction. Burne-Jones converted it into something quite different, and quite his own, but it is an important element in his highly complex, eclectic style”; see *Burne-Jones: The Life and Works of Sir Edward Burne-Jones, 1833–1898* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1998, 41).


11. See, for instance, L. M. Findlay’s “D. G. Rossetti in *Jude the Obscure*” in *Pre-Raphaelite Review* 2 (1978). Winnifred J. Assmann notes that Fancy Day’s physical appearance in *Under the Greenwood Tree* resembles that of the women of Pre-Raphaelite art and concludes: “As a Pre-Raphaelite beauty in a painting of the Dutch school, however, she seems out of place”; see “A Pre-Raphaelite Beauty in ‘Rural Painting of the Dutch School’: The Characterization of Fancy Day,” *Thomas Hardy Year Book* 25 (1988, 4). In “Hardy’s Dutch Painting,” Norman Page also claims that Fancy Day’s representation “strongly recalls the kind of Pre-Raphaelite type of female beauty that Hardy might have encountered . . . on the canvases of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood”; see *Thomas Hardy Year Book* 5 (1975, 41). More recently, Bullen points out that Eustavia Vye’s appearance resembles that of *Astarte Syriaca* (The Pre-Raphaelite Body 170). Hardy also identifies Sue with early Pre-Raphaelite representations of women when he describes her on the morning she is to wed Phillotson: “The bride was waiting, ready; bonnet and all on. She had never in her life looked so much like the lily her name connoted as she did in that pallid morning light” (445).

12. Cox recognizes Havelock’s essay as the most important article written on Hardy before the publication of *Tess of the D’Urbervilles* “and one of the most notable during his lifetime” (103).
13. In the 1903 and 1912 editions of the novel Hardy revised “female human” of the 1895 edition to “female animal.” Arabella in Jude's eyes is below the human species, yet he marries her. Ironically, by the end of the novel, she appears more perceptive than Sue herself about the nature of Sue's attachment to her cousin. When Mrs. Edin informs Arabella that Sue claims to have “found peace,” Arabella astutely responds, “'She may swear that on her knees to the holy cross upon her necklace till she's hoarse, but it won't be true! . . . She's never found peace since she left his arms, and never will again till she's as he is now!'” (408).


16. Critics have long debated the question of whether Sue or Jude is the protagonist of the novel. Though the story is told from Jude's perspective and we know Sue only through others' observations, quite a few critics privilege Sue as the leading character. Hardy himself seemed to shift the focus of the work when in 1897 he chose the titles “The New Woman” and “A Woman with Ideas” for the dramatic version of the novel; see Millgate, Thomas Hardy: Career as a Novelist (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994, 312).

17. Dale Kramer explains Gosse's comments in terms of Sue's possible homosexuality: “With present-day awareness of the psychological anguish caused by suppression of homosexual feelings, this potential aspect of Sue's situation will reward a more coherently addressed scrutiny than any I have seen yet”; see “Hardy and Readers: Jude the Obscure” in The Cambridge Companion to Thomas Hardy (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 173). Shanta Dutta, however, suggests that Hardy was probably aware that by the end of the century sexologists were defining the New Woman as lesbian, but he takes care “to protect Sue from the charge of lesbianism”; see Ambivalence in Hardy: A Study of His Attitude to Women (London and New York: Macmillan and St. Martin's Press, 2000, 114).

18. Kevin Moore comments that in this scene “Sue characterizes herself as [an] Epipsychidion mother-wife figure from whom Jude drinks a nourishing intellectual beauty.” He also contends that Hardy casts Jude as a Shelleyan type, identifying him with Alastor and Prometheus. Considering the allusions to Cupid and Psyche, Shirley Stave’s arguments that in Jude the Obscure “the mystical glimpses into the other world which the other novels offered have disappeared” and that Sue lacks “mythic grandeur” do not seem valid. Moore, The Descent of the Imagination: Postromantic Culture in the Later Novels of Thomas Hardy (New York and London: New York University Press, 1990), 229; Stave, The Decline of the Goddess: Nature, Culture, and Women in Thomas Hardy’s Fiction (Westport and London: Greenwood Press, 1995), 123, 133.

19. The Cupid and Psyche series eventually became a mural frieze commissioned by George Howard for his new home at Kensington. The story of Cupid and Psyche was popular with late-Victorian artists, particularly with J. W. Waterhouse, but the themes Edward Burne-Jones represented are most closely related to the scenes in the novel. To my knowledge there are no references to Waterhouse in either Hardy's letters or notebooks. See Stephen Wildman and John Christian, Edward Burne-Jones: Victorian Artist-Dreamer (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1998), 122–27).

20. See Kestner (Mythology and Misogyny 91) for a detailed account of the myth of Cupid and Psyche.

Notes to Conclusion


23. For an overview of the scholarly dispute over the novel’s temporal setting, see Kramer (“Hardy and Readers,” 169–71, 180). Whereas most critics argue for the 1860s or the 1890s as the temporal setting of the novel, Robert Gittings maintains that Sue is representative of the Comtean woman of the 1870s, not the feminist of the 1890s; see his Young Thomas Hardy (London: Heinemann, 1975), 93–95.

Notes to Conclusion


4. See Karen Z. Sproles, “D. H. Lawrence and the Pre-Raphaelites: ‘Love among the Ruins,’ ” The D. H. Lawrence Review 22 (3) (Fall 1990): 299–305; Margaret Bozena Gosciłło, “John Fowles’s Pre-Raphaelite Woman: Interart Strategies and Gender Policies,” Mosaic 26 (1) (Spring 1993): 63–82. Chevalier’s Falling Angels is set in Edwardian London in the early years of the twentieth century, between 1901 and 1910, dates of the death of Queen Victoria and of her son Edward VII. Early in the novel the Colemans and the Waterhouses meet at the cemetery, where they have adjacent plots. The story revolves around Kitty Coleman and her daughter Maude and Gertrude Waterhouse and her daughter Lavinia. Whereas Kitty represents the New Woman, who desperately attempts to extricate herself from the stifling conventions of the Victorian age, Gertrude rigidly abides by its strictures. At the very beginning of the novel, Kitty, referring to her recent acquaintance with the Waterhouses, comments: “no relation to the painter . . . (Just as well—I want to scream when I see his overripe paint- ings at the Tate. The Lady of Shalott in her boat looks as if she has just taken opium)” (13). Like the Lady of Shalott, Kitty also dies when later on she ventures into the public sphere and joins the women’s movement. Rather than following a Sir Lancelot like her Pre-Raphaelite counterpart, Kitty becomes one of the leaders of (a fictional version of) the largest rally of the Women’s Social and Political Union, which took place in Hyde Park in 1908 and dies from the injuries she sustains when the horse she is leading, frightened by a firecracker, kicks her. For information about this historical meeting at Hyde Park, which was attended by a quarter-million people, see Sandra Stanley Holton, Feminism and Democracy: Women’s Suffrage and Reform Politics in Britain 1900–1918 (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 38, 46.

5. In “Revisiting the Serial Format of Dickens’s Novels; or, Little Dorrit Goes a Long Way,” David Barndollar and Susan Schorn voice the concern of teachers of the Victorian novel over the reluctance of students to read these books. Phoebe Wray, who teaches in a private college of high standards, for instance, protests, “It’s as if these middle-class, rather privileged kids . . . are from the mines of the 19th century. They do not read. Some of them do not know how to read. They have not a clue about HOW to read in a close way.” See Functions of Victorian Culture at the Present Time, ed. Christine Krueger (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2002), 174.
Notes to Conclusion
